

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9416370

**The touristic text and sociopolitical struggle: An application
of the principles of Mikhail Bakhtin to the study of tour
guidebooks of Japan, 1955 to 1991. (Volumes I and II)**

Holt, George Richard, Ph.D.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1994

Copyright ©1994 by Holt, George Richard. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**THE TOURISTIC TEXT AND SOCIOPOLITICAL STRUGGLE:
AN APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF MIKHAIL BAKHTIN
TO THE STUDY OF TOUR GUIDEBOOKS OF JAPAN, 1955 TO 1991**

BY

GEORGE RICHARD HOLT

B.S., Southern Illinois University, 1985

M.S., Southern Illinois University, 1986

THESIS

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Speech Communication
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1994**

Urbana, Illinois

© Copyright by George Richard Holt, 1994

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

DECEMBER 1993

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS BY

GEORGE RICHARD HOLT

ENTITLED THE TOURISTIC TEXT AND SOCIOPOLITICAL STRUGGLE: AN APPLICATION OF THE
PRINCIPLES OF MIKHAIL BAKHTIN TO THE STUDY OF TOUR GUIDEBOOKS OF JAPAN, 1955 TO 1991

BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Gene G. Helvin

Director of Thesis Research

Gene G. Helvin

Head of Department

Committee on Final Examination†

Gene G. Helvin

Chairperson

Ruth Anne Clark

Michael J. Lee

† Required for doctor's degree but not for master's.

THE TOURISTIC TEXT AND SOCIOPOLITICAL STRUGGLE:
AN APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF MIKHAIL BAKHTIN
TO THE STUDY OF TOUR GUIDEBOOKS OF JAPAN, 1955 TO 1991

George Richard Holt, Ph.D.
Department of Speech Communication
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1994
Jesse G. Delia, Advisor

The critical theories of Mikhail Bakhtin and his circle are employed to analyze the texts of selected editions from two series of comprehensive guidebooks to Japan: the Fodor's guidebook series, 1962 through 1990; and the Japan Travel Bureau's Japan, the Official Guide, 1955 through 1991. The textual material in each of the guidebook series is considered as the product of communicative acts of cultural representation, and are analyzed according to five dimensions derived from the writings of the Bakhtin circle. The dimension of specificity states that all communication is always specific, performed by specific people in specific circumstances; it can never be truly described by abstraction, theory, or generality. The second dimension, the dimension of ownership, states that all communication is jointly owned by all social actors; it can never be held privately or limited to a subunit of society. Dimension three, the dimension of tension, holds that all communication simultaneously exhibits two tendencies: one which impels communication toward predictability and standardization, and another which impels it toward unpredictability and uniqueness. The fourth dimension, the dimension of open and closed perception, says that all communication is based on the belief of the communicator that his/her own system of perception is open and unfinished, but that the system of perception of those s/he describes is closed and finished. The fifth dimension is the dimension of uncompletedness; it states that all communication is fashioned in the awareness of a potential response from those for whom it is fashioned, and in the awareness of

previous and subsequent communication on the same subject—hence, no communication can ever be said to be the “last word” on a subject.

Textual analysis of the guidebook series results in a detailed description of Fodor’s and JTB’s acts of cultural description of Japan, revealing that the tour guidebook—far from being simply an information vehicle or an example of public relations—is laden with ideological assumptions that reflect the sociohistorical development of the relationship between Japan and the Western world. Implications for further application of Bakhtin’s principles to the study of international tourism are suggested.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
The Importance of International Tourism	1
Tourism's Economic Impact	1
Tourism's Cultural Impact	1
Tourism's Political Impact	2
Studies of Tourism	3
A Negative Image of Tourism	4
Scant Literature on Studies of Tourism	4
The Political Repercussions	6
Purpose and Scope of this Study	7
Touristic Text as a Form of Representation	9
Bakhtin's Literary Theory as an Analytical Framework	9
Japan as Focus of Attention	12
Conclusion	13
CHAPTER TWO: TOUR GUIDES AND CULTURAL COMMUNICATION	15
Japanese Tour Guidebooks—An Overview	15
Overview of Japanese Tour Guidebooks	15
General overview of Japanese tour guidebooks	15
1960 to 1965	15
1966 to 1970	18
1971 to 1975	19
1976 to 1980	20
1981 to 1985	21
1986 to 1990	22
Place of Fodor's and JTB's Among Japan Guidebooks	26
Basic Content of Fodor's and JTB's Guidebooks	28
Categories of coverage	28
<i>General content analysis system</i>	28
Basic content analysis	30
Stability over time	32
<i>Fodor's guidebook series</i>	32
<i>JTB's guidebook series</i>	35
Limitations and focus of needed additional analysis	37
<i>Limited yield of content analysis</i>	37
<i>Needed analysis of cultural representation as</i> <i>communication</i>	41
Two Approaches to "Cultural Communication"	41
Presentation of Culture and Cultural Meanings	42
What this approach entails	42
Why this approach is not taken	44
Representation of Culture as Communication Process	46
What this approach entails	46
Why this approach is being taken	47

Present Focus—Representation of Culture from Bakhtin Approach	49
Bakhtin’s Framework as Perspective for Analysis	50
Overview of Bakhtin’s Perspective	50
General overview	50
Categories of analysis derived from Bakhtin	51
Sketch of the Five Dimensions of Analysis	52
Specificity.....	52
Ownership	53
Tension	54
Open and closed perception	54
Uncompletedness	55
Value of Comparative/Longitudinal Analysis	56
Overviews of Subsequent Chapters	57
Basic Framework of Each Chapter	57

CHAPTER THREE: THE DIMENSION OF SPECIFICITY AND THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION	58
General Overview	58
Yield of Comparative Analysis of Specificity—An Overview	59
Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Specificity—An Overview	62
Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to Specificity in Fodor’s and JTB’s Descriptions	63
Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Specificity of Fodor’s Descriptions.....	63
Fodor’s—Superiority of West, inferiority of East	64
Fodor’s—Reinforcing stereotypes of Japan and Japanese	69
<i>Japan as underdeveloped</i>	69
<i>Japanese as cultural borrowers</i>	71
<i>Japanese as workaholics</i>	72
<i>Japanese women as passive and subservient to men</i>	75
Elements of temporal change relating to specificity in Fodor’s descriptions	79
<i>Key passages unchanged</i>	79
<i>Changes in authorship</i>	79
<i>Change in tone—From distant to personal</i>	81
<i>Change to culturally-sensitive information</i>	84
<i>Inclusion of Japanese author</i>	88
<i>Greater level of detail on key topics</i>	91
Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Specificity of JTB’s Descriptions	93
Elevating Japan to equal status with the West	94
JTB—Answering stereotypes about Japan and Japanese	97
<i>Japanese as warlike</i>	97
<i>Japanese as cultural borrowers</i>	99
<i>Japan religious shrines as tourist attractions</i>	100

Elements of temporal change in the specificity of JTB's description	102
<i>Change in voice—More apologetic to more assertive</i>	103
<i>Increasing recognition of international tourism</i>	110
<i>Change in depiction of key sites and locations</i>	113
Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Specificity in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions	115
Fodor's—Stylistic mechanisms	116
<i>Omniscient authorial voice</i>	116
<i>Strategic use of specificity</i>	124
<i>Imaginary narrators and scenarios</i>	131
<i>Excess specificity—Redirecting reader attention</i>	140
JTB—Stylistic mechanisms	142
<i>Use of detail to enhance credibility</i>	142
<i>Use of "inside" information</i>	143
<i>Inadequate specificity—Link to the past</i>	145
<i>Excess specificity—Soothing tourist fears</i>	149
<i>Selective specificity—Targeting reader architectonics</i>	153

CHAPTER FOUR: THE DIMENSION OF OWNERSHIP AND THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION	157
General Overview	157
Yield of Comparative Analysis of Ownership—An Overview	157
Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Ownership—An Overview.....	159
Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to Ownership in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions	160
Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Ownership of Fodor's Descriptions.....	160
Fodor's—Holding to the right to represent	160
Fodor's—Inscription of Japan and the Japanese	162
<i>Restricted readings of Japanese life</i>	163
<i>Selective readings of history</i>	175
<i>Claims to Western ownership of representations</i>	181
<i>Claims to Western superiority</i>	185
<i>Claiming dependence of Japanese culture on Western nations</i>	187
<i>Claiming independence of Japanese culture from other Asian nations</i>	196
Elements of temporal change relating to ownership in Fodor's descriptions	205
<i>Rephrasing of stereotypes</i>	205
<i>Shift to more subtle expressions of ownership</i>	209
<i>Shift to more overtly consumeristic aims</i>	217
Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Ownership of JTB's Descriptions	221
JTB—Reclaiming the right to represent.....	221

JTB—Recasting Japan and the Japanese	222
<i>Fuller, richer descriptions of Japanese cultural life</i>	222
<i>Selective readings of history</i>	228
<i>Claims to Japanese superiority</i>	233
<i>Claims to independent development of Japanese culture</i>	235
Elements of temporal change in the ownership of JTB's descriptions	240
<i>Reformulation of claims about cultural transmission</i>	240
<i>Consistent overloading of detail throughout series</i>	242
<i>Emphasis on the government</i>	244
Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Ownership in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions	246
Fodor's—Stylistic mechanisms	246
<i>Claims based upon questionable evidence</i>	247
<i>Taking refuge in the genre of touristic writing</i>	249
<i>Excessive attribution</i>	253
JTB—Stylistic mechanisms	257
<i>Crowding out other representations</i>	257
<i>Deleting problematic details</i>	259

CHAPTER FIVE: THE DIMENSION OF TENSION AND THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION	261
General Overview	261
Yield of Comparative Analysis of Tension—An Overview	265
Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Tension—An Overview	268
Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to Tension in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions	269
Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Tension of Fodor's Descriptions	269
Balancing out the image of the Orient and the West	269
Emphasizing the internal unpredictable element in Japan	278
Downplaying Japanese technical accomplishments	281
Association of the unpredictable with the distant past	285
Elements of temporal change relating to tension in Fodor's descriptions	287
<i>Greater willingness to employ reports that are unverifiable (unpredictable)</i>	287
<i>Less emphasis on warning as element of unpredictability</i>	289
<i>Less emphasis on clichés and stereotypes</i>	290
Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Tension of JTB's Descriptions	291
Bridging the link between "traditional" Japan and the "modern" West	291
Bridging the link between experienced and unexperienced	308
Making the known unknown	312
Elements of temporal change in the tension of JTB's descriptions	315

<i>The emergence of the "unknown" Japan</i>	315
<i>From observing to participating in Japanese cultural life</i>	316
<i>Increasing emphasis on government's role in reducing unpredictability</i>	317
Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Tension in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions	318
Fodor's—Stylistic mechanisms	318
<i>Utilization of stereotypes</i>	318
<i>Providing "inside" information</i>	325
<i>Combining "contradictory" elements of Japanese culture</i>	328
<i>Evaluating contrasting elements of Japanese culture</i>	334
JTB—Stylistic mechanisms	339
<i>Using information in a casual way</i>	339
<i>Creating unfamiliarity through fulsome description</i>	341
<i>Selective combination of predictable and unpredictable elements</i>	343

[The following material appears in Volume II.]

CHAPTER SIX: THE DIMENSION OF OPEN AND CLOSED PERCEPTION AND THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION	349
General Overview	349
Yield of Comparative Analysis of Open and Closed Perception— An Overview	351
Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Open and Closed Perception— An Overview	354
Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to Open and Closed Perception in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions	355
Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Open and Closed Perception of Fodor's Descriptions	355
Association of Japan with "traditional," West with "modern."	355
<i>Linking Japan's past and present</i>	356
<i>Japan's modernization as source of problems and confusion</i>	364
Classification of Japanese as cultural borrowers and learners	368
Elements of temporal change in open and closed perception of Fodor's descriptions	382
<i>Unchanging theme of superiority-inferiority dichotomy between West and East</i>	382
<i>Assignment of more positive connotation to the label, "traditional."</i>	389
<i>Granting more recognition to Japanese religious traditions</i>	390
Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Open and Closed Perception of JTB's Descriptions	395
The struggle to define Japan within the "modern" /"traditional" dichotomy	396
<i>"Modern" and "traditional" as parameters</i>	396

<i>Consistent equation between "Western" and "international."</i>	399
Inscription of Japan's positive image	402
<i>Providing an excessive amount of information</i>	403
Elements of temporal change in open and closed perception of	
JTB's descriptions	405
<i>Recognition of the category "traditionality."</i>	405
<i>Asserting Japan's political power</i>	408
<i>Indications of increasing self-assurance</i>	411
Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Open and Closed	
Perception in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions	415
Fodor's—Stylistic mechanisms	415
<i>Pseudo-specification</i>	415
<i>Use of extravagant closures to set perceptions of locales</i>	419
<i>Applying the established closure to more than one situation</i>	421
<i>Closure by comparison with the familiar</i>	423
JTB—Stylistic mechanisms	424
<i>Establishing the illusion of extended activity</i>	424
<i>Closure through elevation</i>	427
<i>Closure through extended analogy</i>	431
<i>Closure through selective use of evidence</i>	433
Conclusion	437

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE DIMENSION OF UNCOMPLETEDNESS AND	
THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION	439
General Overview	439
Yield of Comparative Analysis of Uncompletedness—An Overview.....	442
Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Uncompletedness—An Overview.....	448
Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to	
Uncompletedness in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions	454
Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Uncompletedness of	
Fodor's Descriptions.....	454
Fodor's—Response to discourse about the "backward East"	
(Japan)	456
<i>Japanese as superstitious</i>	456
<i>Japanese as violent</i>	458
<i>Japanese as passive</i>	460
Fodor's—Response to the discourse of East-West contact	465
<i>Incursion of West into Japanese realm of influence</i>	466
<i>Japanese economy as dependent upon the United States</i>	471
<i>Japanese art as influenced by the West</i>	476
Elements of temporal change relating to uncompletedness in	
Fodor's descriptions	479
<i>Gradual abandonment of Japan's "exotic" associations</i>	480

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Uncompletedness of JTB's Descriptions	486
JTB's conceptualization of its audience	486
<i>The audience of "Western visitors."</i>	491
<i>The audience of "youthful visitors."</i>	502
Negotiating Japan's international political status.....	504
<i>Japan and the West</i>	505
<i>Japan and the East</i>	507
<i>Japan and the concept of traditionality</i>	510
Elements of temporal change in uncompletedness of JTB's descriptions	511
<i>Response to changing international politics</i>	511
<i>The role of history in the description of touristic sites</i>	514
Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Uncompletedness in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions	517
Fodor's—Stylistic mechanisms.....	517
<i>Orientation toward "academic" discourse</i>	518
<i>Use of ideologically "loaded" discourse</i>	520
<i>Imprecise connection of evidence to described phenomena</i>	523
JTB—Stylistic mechanisms	525
<i>Adjustment to changing discourses</i>	526
Conclusion	529
 CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION	 530
Summary	530
Limitations of the Present Study	532
Importance and Yield	535
Future Directions	537
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 539
 APPENDIX: MIKHAIL BAKHTIN AND HIS CIRCLE—A SOCIOHISTORICAL SUMMARY OF BASIC CONCEPTS	 546
Introduction	546
Mikhail Bakhtin and His Work	546
Biography	547
The Major Periods of Bakhtin's Career	552
Bakhtin's Ideas of Communication	554
Communicators.....	555
Self	556
<i>Self and others</i>	556
<i>The text</i>	558
Summary	560
Point of view	561
<i>The concept of architectonics</i>	562
<i>Discourse as contested</i>	564

Ideology	566
<i>The concept of ideology</i>	567
<i>The role of signs</i>	567
<i>Summary</i>	571
Exotopy	571
<i>Otherness</i>	571
<i>The text</i>	572
<i>Summary</i>	574
Voice	575
<i>Literary voice</i>	575
<i>Speech genre</i>	576
<i>Summary</i>	578
Message	578
Utterance	579
Signification and dialectic	583
Context	587
Heteroglossia	588
Dialogism	595
Uncompletedness	602
VITA	605

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Importance of International Tourism

By any measure, tourism is a significant force in the modern world. While tourism is often associated with terms such as “vacations,” “holidays,” “recreation,” and “leisure,” tourism is a far more complex activity. Not only does tourism influence the economic growth of nations and induce major cultural effects, it also has important political implications.

Tourism’s Economic Impact

Economically, tourism is the second largest international industry, next only to petroleum, having grown at an average rate of ten per cent per year since the early 1960s (Crick, 1989). In fact, tourism yielded its position as the world’s largest industry only in the 1970s, after the dramatic worldwide increase in petroleum prices, and some have speculated that by the year 2000, if it continues to grow at its present rate, tourism will once again be the largest industry in the world (Kahn, 1980).

Tourism’s Cultural Impact

In addition to its economic importance, tourism has significant cultural effects. Several authors have attempted to elevate the practice of tourism by comparing it to various important social activities. Tourism has been characterized as a quest (MacCannell, 1976), as a pre-eminent means for moderns to define reality (Horne, 1984), as the essence of the restless Western spirit (Carroll, 1980), as a rite of passage which results in spiritual renewal (Graburn, 1989), and as a prototype for the ordering of relations between strangers (Machlis & Burch, 1983).

Tourism's Political Impact

In the increasingly visible debate about tourism, issues concerning the vast differences in resources of various nations are foregrounded. The question of how much developing countries should involve themselves as sites for tourists to visit has proven difficult to answer. Beginning in the 1960s, tourism was viewed as a nearly universal solution to the economic woes of developing nations (Erbs, 1973; Jafari, 1974; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1967). Organizations such as the World Bank and the United Nations enthusiastically promoted tourism, seeing it as a virtually limitless source of growth for nations in need of capital.

However, the intervening two decades have pointed up two flaws in this assessment. First, the predictions about economic growth were overly optimistic. Because international tourism encompasses a number of highly unpredictable components (including elements such as seasonal fluctuations, fads in international travel patterns, economic downturns and upswings in the developed countries which supply tourists, volatile economic factors such as oil prices, and so on), it has proven highly unreliable as a growth industry (Lengyel, 1975). As a result, the optimistic predictions of the 1960s have given way to the more sober realization that neither tourism nor any other industry can by itself lead to the economic development of an emerging nation (Bryden, 1973; Sadler & Archer, 1975). Moreover, international tourism is a capital-intensive enterprise, particularly in its initial phases (Diamond, 1977). Because many countries must borrow foreign capital to begin development of tourism, they are often placed in the position of being more, not less, dependent upon more developed countries (Davis, 1978). For these and other reasons, international tourism as a growth strategy has proven to be fraught with unforeseen difficulties.

Beyond the failed economic promise of international tourism, however, a number of undesirable social outcomes have emerged, related primarily to the marked difference in political and economic power between hosts and visitors. Tourism,

according to Hiller (1979), “. . . represent[s] the way the powerful nations perceive and relate to the rest of the world” (p. 51), that is, at best, as playgrounds for the leisured class. The somewhat sterile economic models advanced in introductory textbooks on tourism and leisure (see, for example, Hudman’s 1980 work, Tourism, A Shrinking World) seldom take account of the social complexities of the interactions between international tourists and the cultural Others they visit. Often these interactions are shot through with issues of status and power. International tourists, for example, often travel to relieve stress caused by their working lives in economies of the “developed” world (Graburn, 1989). At the same time, people in host countries are asked to perform work in the tourist industries, in order to advance their economic status.

Moreover, the cultural practices of the tourists are imposed upon the people of the host country; for their part, the host country’s residents are compelled to assume cultural behaviors acceptable to the tourist or else face the removal of the tourist’s money to another site. Since tourists are carriers of their “home” cultures, practices which might be overlooked in the tourist’s country (such as drug use or prostitution) often must be endured by the members of the host country, whether the host country’s “official” culture sanctions such practices or not. While these examples represent only a tiny portion of the potential problems associated with “invasions” by international tourists (Nash, 1989), they do suggest that international tourism is hardly a politically neutral activity.

Studies of Tourism

Despite the growth of international tourism to its present level of influence, scholarly inquiry into the subject has shown severe limitations. On the one hand, the image of tourism is often negative, while on the other hand, scholars have tended to avoid serious analyses of the touristic enterprise. From a survey of the literature on

studies of tourism, it is clear that these studies cannot ignore the various forms of political repercussions which accompany the activity of tourism.

A Negative Image of Tourism

Tourism has inspired perhaps more than its share of negative characterizations. More often than not, international tourists are depicted in scholarly writing as intruders, invaders, barbarians, or worse. They are frequently criticized as unprincipled and unwelcome visitors, monied and privileged, who use the host country merely as a temporary playground before returning to their own "developed" societies (Nash, 1989).

How scholars choose to describe tourism and tourists is revealing. For example, consider the unflattering metaphors in the titles of these influential works: The Golden Hordes (Turner & Ash, 1975), Tourism: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly (Rosenow & Pulsipher, 1979); Ambiguous Alternative: Tourism in Small Developing Countries (Britton & Clarke, 1987); The Image: A Guide to Pseudoevents in America (Boorstin, 1975); Tourism: Blessing or Blight? (Young, 1973); and so forth.

Scant Literature on Studies of Tourism

Until very recently, this negative image has caused social scientists to avoid discussing tourism. According to Crick (1989), the first anthropological study of tourism was published as recently as 1963 (Nunez, 1963), but the first scholarly conference on tourism was delayed until more than a decade later, in 1974. Numerous writers have complained that their early interest in tourism research was discouraged or looked down on (Mitchell, 1979; Nunez, 1978; Smith, 1978). Although there are now several overviews of tourism research (Cohen, 1984; Crick, 1989; Nash, 1981), together with a scattering of influential collections (de Kadt, 1978; Smith, 1989) and a scholarly journal specializing in tourism research (the Annals of Tourism Research, first published in 1977), full-scale monograph-length studies of international tourism are

rare. Indeed, with the exception of MacCannell's 1976 book, The Tourist, A New Theory of the Leisure Class, even the findings which have been reported have had little effect beyond those who specialize in touristic research.

As a general rule, an emergent field of cultural study first grapples with broad theoretical issues, turning to analysis of specific cultural products later. This has certainly been the case with studies of international tourism. Because scholarly studies of tourism remain in their theoretical infancy due to inattention, it is hardly surprising that the specific artifacts associated with the international touristic enterprise (photographs, souvenirs, handicrafts, brochures, advertising, descriptive literature, and so on) have received little or no attention.

Studies of tour guidebooks, for example, are extremely rare. Apart from a single dissertation (Lew, 1986), there are no extended treatments of the touristic guidebook available. Chang and Holt (1991) provide a comparative analysis of depictions of Taiwan in three tour guidebooks, but their approach is selective and critical rather than comprehensive, dealing with short representative passages from the analyzed guidebooks. Brief references to tour guidebooks are to be found in Boorstin (1975) and MacCannell (1976), while one short journal article on the subject of brochures appears in an early issue of the Annals of Tourism Research (Buck, 1977). Brief general references to the tour guidebook as they relate to specific case studies occur in Boissevain's study of Malta (Boissevain, 1979), and in de Kadt's introductory summary to his edited collection (de Kadt, 1979).

To summarize, while it is impossible to deny the economic, social and political effects of tourism, and in the face of tourism's rather extreme representations in academic literature, international tourism may be one of the most interesting, promising, and yet understudied of the social forces directed at developing countries. Indeed, perhaps it is both tourism's impact and the extremity of its representations that point simultaneously to its importance: as Crick (1989) has remarked, "A trivial

activity could not generate such religiously constructed, lopsided, and ambivalent representations as exist about tourism" (p. 310).

The Political Repercussions

What are the reasons for scholarly neglect of an industry which affects so many people and exerts so much economic and social influence? Some have blamed the field of anthropology, arguing that anthropologists, whose job it has been to represent cultures in other countries, have a professional interest in distancing themselves from other temporary residents—such as tourists—in host countries (Boissevain, 1977). Since these "temporary residents" are viewed as "intruders," anthropologists as "scholars" are not equal to tourists. It may be, as Crick (1989) speculates, that anthropologists and international tourists are so similar that the subject of tourism is unsettling to many anthropologists.

The more important political implications of international tourism have emerged in the early stages of the study of tourism as an academic subject. Academic neglect of international tourism, some argue, arises from a general reluctance to elevate the cultural Other to the status of primary source of information. Focusing upon the impact of tourism on so-called "third world" countries, scholars read and cite literature written by other scholar/specialists, so that writings about international tourism are virtually devoid of the voices of the people involved (both the tourists and the visited cultural Other) (Boissevain, 1977). One cannot venture very deeply into the study of tourism without being forced to revise previously held ideas about the cultural Other. This often requires extensive reconceptualization of the status of the visited country. Rather than an economically deprived, "less developed" object to be represented in scholarly discourse, the subject country must be seen as a revenue-generating, complex society.

These explanations, and others as well, rest on the increasingly evident fact that tourism is far more complex than it seems. The experience of travel is the first, perhaps the only, personal contact many tourists will have with people of other cultures in their own countries. Since all countries are politically and economically unequal, and since, in the touristic transaction, the residents of the host country are working at the same time the guests are playing, the process of international tourism has significant political repercussions.

Purpose and Scope of this Study

Thus far, I have assessed the social, economic, and political importance of international tourism upon the lives of tourists and hosts; described studies of tourism in terms of their impact on the published work of social scientists; and analyzed problematics in the studies and treatments of international tourism.

In the mix of these multiple issues, I believe writings about tourism serve as an index to the complexity of the touristic enterprise, and hence warrant serious attention. Touristic writings, such as tour guidebooks, are consolidated within a particular social-political context, aimed at a specific audience, and written from a particular vantage point.

The architecture of touristic text can be profitably analyzed by utilizing the literary/cultural theory of the Russian literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin and his colleagues (these theories are described in detail in the Appendix). The purpose of the present investigation is to apply the critical methodology espoused by Bakhtin and his associates to touristic writing about Japan, covering the period 1955 to 1991.

Application of the Bakhtinian methodology to touristic writing will result in three distinct advantages. First, it will permit a greater understanding of the work of Bakhtin and his associates and its application to the concerns of speech communication. While Bakhtin's circle focused most of its attention on literary

studies, applications of their work in many fields, from anthropology to architecture, have achieved significant results. With its central concern for the activity of human communication, the field of speech communication seems particularly well-suited for an extended treatment of Bakhtin's thought.

A second advantage to applying Bakhtinian methodology to touristic writing is that it will permit an expanded and enriched perception of the nature of touristic cultural description. As we explore in detail passages from tour guidebooks in subsequent chapters, it should become evident that touristic writing is far more than advertising or public relations copy written and read in support of leisure activities. Indeed, application of the Bakhtinian dimensions of cultural description show convincingly that the ideological underpinnings of touristic writing are highly complex, frequently conflictual, and endlessly fascinating as indexes to sociohistorical struggles within and among nations and cultures. As a consequence, the tour guidebook, much maligned and frequently dismissed in academic discussions, is revealed as a topic worthy of extended treatment in this and future investigations.

Third, application of the Bakhtinian methodology to tour guidebooks about Japan should enrich understanding of the Japanese people and Japanese culture. While Japan and its people have been the subject of myriad books, articles, and other writing, certain facets of Japan and the Japanese remain puzzling, particularly to Western audiences. In subsequent discussion, I trust that the reader will gain at least some insight into some alternative casting of these paradoxes, thereby offering the possibility that they may be resolved through realization of the role of sociohistorical conflict in the depiction of cultures, both of Japan and other nations.

While it is difficult to state precisely which of these three resultant advantages represents the chief contribution of this dissertation, it is my view that the second advantage—elevating perception of touristic writing, particularly tour guidebooks—is the most urgent in terms of needing the attention of speech communication scholars.

While there has recently been a flood of writings about Bakhtin, and a more steady outpouring over many years of writing about Japan, treatment of touristic writing in general, and the guidebook in particular, have lagged considerably behind analyses of other cultural descriptions and representations. As I hope will become evident, the contents of tour guidebooks, when considered against the backdrop of fully-fleshed descriptions of sociohistorical struggles among cultures, are given meaning in unexpected, important, and provocative ways.

Touristic Text as a Form of Representation

As noted earlier, studies of touristic texts are relatively scant. Beyond the tourist activities themselves and their implications, how tourism is depicted is an equally important issue, particularly since any text is constructed and thus can be considered analogous to a cultural product. The touristic text as a form of representation—it portrays tourism in specific ways, gives legitimacy to tourism's existence, and is open to the interpretation of its audiences—reveals not only how tourism is viewed and described, it also constructs the symbolic reality of tourism. Since international tourism is heavily laden with social, cultural, and political implications, so also can its presentation be viewed as a reflection of the social-political environment. In subsequent discussion, I will demonstrate that the tour guidebook text, in the guise of providing straightforward information in the service of leisure activity, in fact smuggles questionable and even damaging ideological assumptions which prevent, rather than facilitate, understanding between members of the host and guest cultures.

Bakhtin's Literary Theory as an Analytical Framework

To engage in a critical analysis of tour guidebooks and other touristic writing, I believe the theories of Bakhtin and his colleagues provide a particularly insightful vantage point against which touristic text can be examined.

Bakhtin's group refused to view communication as individuated action chosen and enacted through individual mental activities. Rather, acts of communication—among which touristic written texts are but a single kind—are performed through interconnections of individual communicators, and are located in a specific social-historical context. While a detailed description of Bakhtin's views is advanced in the Appendix, briefly, a Bakhtinian analysis of text can be summarized as embracing five basic dimensions of description.

First, Bakhtin's work advances the dimension of specificity. All communication is always specific, performed by specific people in specific circumstances; it can never be truly described by abstraction, theory, or generality. Second is the dimension of ownership. All communication is jointly owned by all social actors; it can never be held privately or limited to a subunit of society. Third is the dimension of tension. All communication simultaneously exhibits two tendencies: one which impels communication toward predictability and standardization, and another which impels it toward unpredictability and uniqueness. Fourth is the dimension of open and closed perception. All communication is based on the belief of the communicator that his/her own system of perception is open and unfinished, but that the system of perception of those s/he describes is closed and finished. The fifth and final dimension is the dimension of uncompletedness. All communication is fashioned in the awareness of a potential response from those for whom it is fashioned, and in the awareness of previous and subsequent communication on the same subject—hence, no communication can ever be said to be the “last word” on a subject.

The Bakhtinian dimensions are ideally suited to the analysis of the touristic text. The dimension of specificity locates the description of a culture and its members in a specific time and place, and hence addresses issues related to abstraction of another “culture” in terms which deny its present and future needs and resources. The dimension of ownership speaks to the problems involved when the ideas of one

representer of a culture are placed into the active realm of discourse about the subject, thus becoming jointly “owned” by its readers and others with differing perspectives. The dimension of tension shows itself in the tendency of touristic texts to “fix” the culture and its members, declaring what the culture “is” at the present moment in contrast to the reality which is always open to reinventing the culture and changing it at any given moment. The fourth Bakhtinian dimension, the dimension of open and closed perception, is seen in the nearly universal tendency for touristic texts to make broad-based stereotypical declarations (of the form “The Japanese are warlike/industrious/polite”), thus closing the world of the members of the culture, while at the same time opening the world of the representer who assigns to him- or herself the right to make such declarations in the service of the touristic enterprise. The fifth and final Bakhtinian dimension, the dimension of uncompletedness, is shown by the effects of touristic discourse, as governed by the perceptions of the author regarding how such discourse will be perceived, as well as the preceding discourse which makes formulation of the touristic description possible. Questions of whether the author either has or will consider the potential responses of cultural members, or simply of visitors to the culture, or simply of wealthy visitors to the culture, all are foregrounded, together with questions of who the author is writing to and more importantly, why the author frames his or her messages in a particular fashion.

There is a plethora of approaches to textual analysis (see, for example, the review by Hanks, 1989), and many of these could be, and indeed some have been, applied to touristic materials. The attractive features which make the Bakhtinian approach particularly useful for this task, however, are, first, that the Bakhtin circle’s literary theories are interlinked with their ideas about social theory and culture to a far greater degree than other forms of textual analysis; and second, that the Bakhtinian approach to the text is relentlessly eclectic and holistic, a position which places the perspective in opposition to the dominant forms of structural and formalist literary

criticism. My contention in this dissertation is that the touristic text is a far more complicated and socially significant form of discourse than is generally supposed. Hence, one needs a method of study of touristic texts which is both broad enough to encompass the manifold textual features of the touristic text, yet at the same time, capable of relating those features to the broader cultural climate in a consistent and rigorous fashion. The Bakhtinian method adequately fulfills both of these requirements.

Japan as Focus of Attention

Among the many nations influenced by international tourism, I have chosen Japan as a focus of attention for the following reasons. First, following the second World War, Japan has risen to the ranks of the top economic powers of the world. As a traditional country transformed into a "modern" country within a very short period of time, the success of the Japanese is not only the envy of many nations, but remains a mystery which invites one to ask how the link between the traditional and the modern is bridged. As international tourists often are interested in searching for a nostalgic past (MacCannell, 1976), Japan becomes particularly attractive as a modern nation providing traditional flavor. This character is revealed in Japanese tour guidebooks from 1955 to 1991, outlining the historical underpinnings of Japan as a touristic site.

Second, the contrast between East and West is worthy of study, since the differences between the two cultural traditions is yet another motivation for international tourists. The East, populated by the exotic "Oriental," is often seen as mysterious and rich with cultural traditions, an image that provides tourists an impulse to "consume" elements (Said, 1978) of the "Orient" through the activity of tourism. Since Japan is a country of "the East," a nation which often sees itself as the primary representative of "Oriental culture" when introducing itself to the West, how

international tourism is played out in Japan's encounters with the West becomes particularly complicated and revealing.

Third, among the many products of the Japanese economy, tourism is one of its major "indigenous industries." One can see in the Japan Tourist Bureau's Official Guide to Japan (Japan Tourist Bureau, 1955, 1975, 1991) a meticulous attention to detail and presentation that reveals the priority that Japanese assign to their tourist industry. Japan is one of the leading nations competing to advance its economic and political status by urging international tourists to visit.

For these reasons, I have chosen to analyze touristic writing about Japan, not because it is the only nation that deserves serious attention, but because its context best illustrates the complexity involved in the touristic representation, particularly as concerns the effects of history and status differentiation between the East and the West. One must note that Bakhtin's theory would be equally informative when applied to analysis of touristic depictions of other nations, and it is to be hoped that such research will be engaged in the future by other investigators.

The data to be analyzed in this study are two specific bodies of touristic literature: (1) the Fodor's guidebook series on Japan (1962 to 1990); and (2) the guidebooks published by the Japan Travel Bureau (1955 to 1991). Further justification for the choice of these two guidebook series is offered in Chapter Two.

Conclusion

The importance of tourism in modern society is revealed in the political and social implications of the seemingly straightforward touristic transaction. The tentative growth of international tourism has become a focus of scholarly inquiry, as is evidenced by examining how the tour guidebook and other forms of touristic writing have fared in the emergent literature on international tourism.

The present study is organized according to the following divisions. In the second chapter, I provide a detailed explanation both of the touristic literature on Japan for the years covered in this survey, and a discussion of the Bakhtinian approach to textual criticism and how it is adapted for this study. Chapters Three through Seven discuss each of the five Bakhtinian dimensions, analyzing in detail both key passages from the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series, as well as longitudinal changes in each series over the years and comparative analysis of key themes. An Appendix discusses of some of the primary ideas in the work of the Bakhtin circle, together with a description of the career of Mikhail Bakhtin.

CHAPTER TWO

TOUR GUIDES AND CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Japanese Tour Guidebooks—An Overview

Overview of Japanese Tour Guidebooks

To prepare the way for a more extensive inquiry into the complexities of how tour guidebooks about Japan represent Japanese culture, it is important to place the examined series—Fodor's and JTB's Japan, the Official Guide—in the context of touristic representations of Japan. In the following, I take up two issues: (1) a general overview of Japanese tour guidebooks; and (2) the place of Fodor's and JTB's series among Japan tour guidebooks.

General overview of Japanese tour guidebooks. According to the Subject Guide to Books in Print, few guidebooks to Japan were published in the 1950s (apart from JTB's Japan, the Official Guide, which has published since the early 1920s¹). In 1957,² Ogrizek's Japan is published, there are no entries for 1958, and in 1959, the JTB's Japan: Pocket Guide is published. I will situate the discussion of subsequent tour guidebooks to Japan in the following historical categories: (1) 1960 to 1965; (2) 1966 to 1970; (3) 1971 to 1975; (4) 1976 to 1980; (5) 1981 to 1985; and (6) 1986 to 1990.

1960 to 1965. According to Johnson (1988), Western interest in Japan as a tourist site began in earnest in the 1960s. In addition to two JTB publications (Japan: Pocket

¹ Despite numerous inquiries to the Japan Travel Bureau, I have been unable to determine the precise starting date of Japan, the Official Guide. The earliest English edition I have seen is dated 1939; an informant in Taiwan reports having seen a Japanese edition dated 1925. In the 1991 edition, the president of the Japan National Tourist Organization, Shunichi Sumita, is quoted as saying that Japan, the Official Guide has been the most reliable publication on Japan for "more than seventy years" (p. 1). Therefore, I have approximated the starting date to have occurred in the early 1920s, although it is possible that JTB may have begun publishing somewhat earlier than that.

² Because the first Fodor's guidebook was published in 1961, I began my search of Books in Print approximately three decades before the year I started this project (1990). Later, I extended my beginning year (1960) back to 1955, based on the date of the earliest postwar revision of Japan, the Official Guide (1955).

Guide, and Guide to Kyoto, Nara, Kobe), 1960 also saw publication of Clark's All the Best in Japan. While Clark's book has not been republished, both of the JTB guidebooks published subsequently in revised versions. One can see that, through 1960, despite the JTB's publications, guidebooks to Japan remained relatively scarce.

This situation changed dramatically in 1961 with the introduction of Fodor's Japan and East Asia. The recognition of the East Asia region by Fodor's, the well-known authors of the industry's most extensive set of tour guidebooks, constituted an unofficial conferral of Western interest in Japan. Johnson (1988) suggests that the Tokyo Olympics in 1964 may have marked the beginning of recognition of Japan as a tourist locale by people in the Western world; if so, the announcement of Tokyo as Olympic site a couple of years earlier may have caused organizations in the tour guidebook industry (such as Fodor's) to anticipate a potential consumer need for information about Japan.

Regardless of their motivations, in addition to the Fodor's guidebook, publishers introduced a number of other Western guidebooks to Japan in 1961: Briggs's Orient Guide; Gluck's Japan and the Far East on \$5 a Day (a Frommer's guide); and Sheldon's Enjoy Japan: A Highly Unofficial Guide. In addition to issuing revised editions of its earlier publications in 1961, the Japan Travel Bureau added two new titles: Japan in Four Seasons, and Okada's Japan Travel Dictionary of Tourist Resorts.

The modest number of guidebooks to Japan continues into 1962. The Fodor's, Frommer's, and JTB's primary series offered revised editions, as did the three JTB series, Guide to Kyoto, Nara, Kobe, Okada's Japan Travel Dictionary of Tourist Resorts, and Japan: Pocket Guide. While no new guidebook appeared in 1962, the title (and one presumes the subject matter) of Briggs's book changed from its former title, Orient Guide, to Orient-Hawaii Guide.

In 1963, Kaneko's Guide to Japanese Art is introduced, along with a new book titled Vacation Guidebook to Japan (published by Cornerstone). The JTB's and Fodor's

primary series underwent minor revisions, and the Frommer's guidebook changed its focus, as reflected in the revision of its title: from Japan and the Far East on \$5 a Day, to simply Japan on \$5 a Day. The author of the Frommer's guidebook also changed, from Gluck to Wilcock.

The year 1964 witnessed an apparent decrease in interest in introducing new Western guidebooks about Japan. The major change of note was the introduction of a briefer version of Japan, the Official Guide, titled Japan, the New Official Guide, consisting of "general information" meant primarily for the visitor to the Tokyo Olympic games:

With the object of preparing a warm welcome for visitors to the 18th Olympics to take place in Tokyo this autumn, we are publishing the first part separately, for the time being. When the latter part on actual travel information has been completed, both parts will be bound together in a single volume and published with a detailed index, as a complete "thesaurus" on things Japanese. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1964, p. iii)

According to the 1975 edition (p. 2), the complete Japan, the New Official Guide saw publication in 1966³ and remained the JTB's standard guidebook until the revised 1975 edition.

However, in addition to continuing the industry "standard guidebooks" such as Fodor's, Frommer's and JTB's primary series, there were three new introductions in 1965: (1) Engel's Vacation Guidebook to Japan; (2) Rea's Japan; and (3) Nagel Travel Guide to Japan. JTB's Guide to Kyoto, Nara, Osaka, Kobe, as well as Japan: Pocket Guide, continued to publish annual editions with minor revisions.

To summarize the period 1960 through 1965, one can note that it is in this period that the publishing world takes its first real notice of Japan as a site in which

³ Despite diligent searches of dozens of libraries in the United States, as well as extensive searches undertaken by colleagues in Taiwan and Japan, I have been unable to obtain a copy of the 1966 edition in either Japanese or English.

tourists might show sufficient interest to purchase a guidebook. On the other hand, Western guidebooks during this period tend to treat Japan in a grouping with other countries (such as "East Asia," the "Far East," or "the Orient"). Finally, during this period, one cannot overstate the importance of the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games, which not only apparently stimulated the introduction of several Western guidebooks but prompted a major revision of the JTB's Japan, the Official Guide.

1966 to 1970. There were no introductions of new guidebooks in 1966, merely revisions of the standard series, as well as of Engel's and Rea's books. Much the same situation continued in 1967, except that Wilcock published two books, one with Frommer Publishing, Japan on \$5 and \$10 a Day, and one with Simon and Schuster, Japan on \$5 a Day. The offerings for 1968 are even more sparse: the only books published are the Fodor's guide and Wilcock's Japan on \$5 and \$10 a Day. Fodor's and JTB's primary series both published minor revisions in 1969, joining a new release by Roberts, Scholar's Guide to Japan (published by Christopher).

In 1970, however, there is a marked increase in new offerings, including some by Japanese authors writing for Western publishing companies, such as Itoh's Imperial Gardens of Japan: Sento Gosho, Katsura, Shugaku-in (published by Weatherhill), and Kushida's These Splendored Isles (Weatherby). Also making their first appearance are Japanese publishers other than the Japan National Travel Office and the Japan Travel Bureau, such as This is Japan, compiled and edited by the Asahai Shimbun Publishing Company and Japan All-Around, edited by the Miura Publishing Company. Western newspapers, too, are represented by Japan, A Businessman's Guide, published by the London Financial Times. Finally, Drake Publications offers in 1970 Duncan's Guide to Japan.

To summarize, the period 1966 to 1970 was marked by an anemic beginning in the wake of the Japanese Olympics, a trend that continued through 1970, which saw a sharp upturn in several sectors of the tour guidebook publishing market. By 1970, one

notices two factors which will later assume significance. First, there is the publication of Japanese tour guidebooks by Japanese writers, perhaps reflecting demands in the consumer market for more authentic descriptions of Japanese culture than are perceived to be available in standard offerings.⁴ Second, however, the book by the London Financial Times targets a market segment which assumes greater importance in later years: the businessperson who wants to engage in tourist activities while doing business in Japan.

1971 to 1975. Following the watershed year in 1970, 1971 saw the publication of only three guidebooks: revisions of Duncan's book for Drake, and the Fodor's series, together with the introduction of a new title, Cochard and Hardiman's Hammond Guide to Japan. The year 1972 offered the perennial Fodor's, as well as Arthur Frommer's Japan on \$10 a Day (published not by Frommer's publishing house, but by Simon and Schuster) together with another Simon and Schuster offering, Simon and Schuster Travel Guide to Japan. In 1973, in addition to Fodor's, there were revised editions of two works, Cornerstone's Travel Guide to Japan (introduced in 1963) and Japan (authored by Rea in its inaugural edition in 1965, though Rea is listed in the 1973 edition as the editor of the "revised and enlarged" edition published by Lane and authored by the editors of Sunset magazine). 1974 marks the introduction of De Mente's popular P's and Cues for Travelers to Japan, together with the inaugural

⁴ On the other hand, the reading public for touristic materials often seems to respond more to form than substance. Many of the so-called "alternative" guidebooks offer far less verifiable information than the JTB's Japan, the Official Guide, or for that matter, Fodor's. Indeed, they sometimes celebrate the lack of objective evidence used to support the opinions of their authors. Nevertheless, the "alternative" guidebooks seem to appeal to a sector of the market which feels the need to "go beyond" the discourse of standard guidebooks to discover "the real Japan." At any rate, "alternative" guidebooks, whatever their level of coverage, appear to have found a firm niche in the marketplace of touristic discourse about Japan.

edition of Frommer's Dollar-Wise Guide to Japan.⁵ Only two books were published⁶ in 1975, the JTB's guidebooks, and a new offering by De Mente, The Businessman's After Hours Guide to Japan.

To summarize, the period 1971 to 1975 can be characterized as a period of moderate to slow activity in the publication of guidebooks to Japan, that is, a period of downturn following the increased activity in 1970. The period is marked primarily by the reissuance of guidebooks from the 1960s, although there is still an understated but persistent appeal to visitors' cost-consciousness, indicated primarily by De Mente's business-oriented guidebooks, as well as the introduction of the Frommer's "Dollar-Wise" series.

1976 to 1980. The period 1976 to 1980 began uneventfully, with only a single guidebook in 1976: the Frommer's Dollarwise Guide to Japan and Hong Kong. Nevertheless, this volume is important because of its shift in focus from simply Japan to Japan and Hong Kong. Perhaps reflecting a higher degree of concern for consumer cost, the new Frommer's edition focused on two nations which are very unlike each other, except for the fact that both (particularly in the mid-1970s) were renowned for the availability and cost of their consumer goods. Hence, the chief focus of the 1976 Frommer's guidebook is shopping. No guidebooks were published in 1977; in 1978, there were two: (1) Fodor's Japan and Korea; and (2) Nagasawa and Condon's Eating Cheap in Japan. 1979 saw four new offerings. Fodor's responded to the rising mood of cost-consciousness on the part of tourists with its Fodor's Budget Japan. Western publishers offered three new titles: (1) Cooper's Exploring Kamakura (Weatherhill); (2) Nagel's Encyclopedia Guide (Masson); and (3) Lamplugh's Trans-Siberia by Rail.

⁵ One cannot resist pointing out that the Frommer's editors in 1974 seem no longer eager to guarantee that the tourist can see Japan on five or ten dollars per day, merely that visitors need to keep careful track of their money.

⁶ I should point out here that, due to a peculiarity of categories in the Subject Guide to Books in Print, a given year can list two different editions of a guidebook series. Thus, the Fodor's guidebook, which has published annually since 1961, has both the 1974 and 1975 editions listed as being published in 1974.

In 1980, De Mente's P's and Cues for Travelers in Japan was reissued, together with Nagasawa and Condon's Eating Cheap in Japan. Fodor's continued its regular series (retitled Fodor's Japan and South Korea), as well as its alternate series, Fodor's Budget Japan.

The period 1976 through 1980 was marked by a scaling back of publications, both in number and in terms of what was recommended to travelers. This process was probably aided by a number of factors in the international arena, including the worldwide threat of terrorism to deter international travelers and an oil crisis to drive up the price of airline tickets,⁷ but most of all by the increasing cost of visiting Japan.

1981 to 1985. The period 1981 to 1985 began with the 1981 introduction of both Condon and Condon's The Simple Pleasures of Japan, and Watanabe and Rogers's Instant Japan. In 1982, Robert Fisher, co-editor of the Fodor's series for more than twenty years, inaugurated the Fisher Annotated Travel Guides with Japan Nineteen Eighty-Three (published by NAL). 1982 also saw the introduction of a guide to Japan from perhaps the best-known of the "alternative" guidebook series, the Lonely Planet Guides (Japan: A Travel Survival Kit). Finally, Bisignani introduced Moon Publications's Japan Handbook in 1982.

1983, however, witnessed a dramatic increase in publication activity, with four new guidebooks entering the market: (1) Baedeker's Japan marked the entry of the venerable British guidebook series into the competition for touristic representations of Japan; (2) Brown and Kmetz's Exploring Tohoku: A Guide to Japan's Back Country; (3) Pitt's A Tourist's Guide to Japan; and (4) Wharton's Jobs in Japan: Complete Guide to Living and Working in the Land of Rising Opportunity. Other series—including Fisher's, Fodor's (both budget and primary series), and Bisignani's—were revised for

⁷ Figures from the JTB, quoted by Johnson (1988, p. 101), confirm that the mid- and late-1970s showed a decline in American visitors to Japan. Following a peak in 1972 (315,897 visitors), there are only 249,012 visitors in 1973. The number of American visitors fluctuates at levels lower than 1972, until 1981, in which there are 311,755 visitors, a number which continued to increase through 1986.

1983. Baedeker's, Fisher's, and Fodor's series underwent minor revisions in 1984, taking their place alongside four new entries: (1) McDermott's How to Get Lost and Found in New Japan; (2) McDermott's How to Get Lost and Found in Fiji, Tahiti, Cook Islands, Australia, Japan; (3) Ogaki's Shopping in Japan; and (4) Waldorf's Japan at Your Feet. Finally, in 1985, there were two new books: (1) JTB's Must See in Nikko; and (2) Collins Publishing Company's A Day in the Life of Japan.

Clearly, the period 1980 to 1985 is marked by great activity in the publication of tour guidebooks about Japan. The publication of at least five major series—Fodor's, Fisher's, Baedeker's, Lonely Planet, and JTB's—were evidently not enough to satisfy consumer demand, necessitating entry into the market of a number of more specialized guidebooks. Some of these alternatives appear to be directed toward the changing reader perceptions of Japan: for example, the publication of Wharton's Jobs in Japan is one indication of Japan's emergent status as an economic superpower. Moreover, the period is noteworthy for its introduction of several series emphasizing the integrity of Japan's cultural history (for example, A Day in the Life of Japan or The Simple Pleasures of Japan). In general, the period 1980 to 1985 witnessed the emergence of Japan into the Western consciousness as a fully "developed" nation, worthy of appreciation not only for its cultural traditions but for its modernity.

1986 to 1990. The year 1986 was noteworthy for having the largest number of new guidebooks about Japan for the period surveyed. Berlitz joined Baedeker's as a relatively late arrival among touristic industry mainstays to the market for tour guidebooks about Japan, with the publication of its Berlitz Travel Kit. Japan Travel Bureau offered two new titles: The Salaryman in Japan, and A Look into Japan (both published by Books Nippan). Two new titles reflecting increased reader interest in more specialized subjects about Japanese cultural life also appeared in 1986: (1) Krouse's A Guide to Food Buying in Japan (Tuttle); and (2) Ward's Japan's Capitals: A Cultural, Historic and Artistic Guide to Nara, Kyoto and Tokyo (published in

separate editions by Hippocrene and by Oleander). Other new guidebooks in 1986 reflect a greater awareness of the need of modern tourists to explore “off the beaten track”; in addition to the revision of Lonely Planet’s Japan: A Travel Survival Kit, there was also Kanno and O’Keefe’s Japan Solo: A Practical Guide for Independent Travelers. Other new issues appearing in 1986 include the following: (1) De Mente’s Passport’s Japan Almanac; (2) Wurman’s Tokyo-access (Access Press); (3) Hunter Publications’s Insider’s Guide to Japan; (4) Country Guide to Japan (MacMillan); (5) Poponoe’s Japan for Westerners; and (6) Hippocrene Books’s Japan.

Although not marked by as much activity as 1986, the year 1987 continued the trend for increasing numbers of new releases of Japan guidebooks. De Mente offers Japan at Night: A Complete Guide to Entertainment, while the journal The Economist addresses the needs of business travelers with The Economist Business Traveller’s Guide. Other new guides include the following: (1) Old’s Japan in Twenty-Two Days; (2) the Post Guide to Japan (Hunter Publishing); (3) Randle and Watanaba’s Coping with Japan (Basil Blackwell); and (4) Fisher’s The Crown Insider’s Guide to Japan. Further appeal to the adventurous tourist is addressed in Weatherly’s Japan Unescorted: A Practical Guide to Discovering Japan on Your Own.

In addition to revised editions of many previous books, 1988 saw six new guidebook issuances: (1) De Mente’s Discovering Cultural Japan (National Textbook); (2) Fodor’s Great Travel Values (McKay); (3) Hunt’s Hiking in Japan: An Adventurer’s Guide to the Mountain Trails (Kodansha); (4) Japan Cultural Institute’s Today’s Japan; (5) Passport Series’s Japan, Land of Many Faces (National Textbook); and (6) Richie’s Different People: Pictures of Some Japanese.

The drive to advance new editions of guidebooks to Japan appeared to taper off somewhat in 1989. Fodor’s offered, in addition to its primary series (Fodor’s ‘89 Japan), the newer Fodor’s ‘89 Tokyo. Also new to the market were Tokyo City Guide by Connor and Yoshida (Kodansha Publishers), and Gantz’s Let’s Visit Japan (Simon

and Schuster). By 1990, the number of new offerings was down to a trickle: besides Kinoshita and Palevsky's Gateway to Japan: A Complete Traveler's Guide, there was only Frommer's Dollarwise Southeast Asia.

The latter half of the 1980s apparently marked the peak of tourist interest in Japan guidebooks. The vast increase in new books during this period targeted three major market segments: (1) business travelers (reflecting the increased level of economic activity in Japan); (2) those desiring specialty guidebooks more narrowly focused on increasingly specific aspects of Japanese cultural life (such as temples, food buying, and the like); and (3) the traveler who wanted to taste the "real Japan" by touring "off the beaten track." The increase in numbers of new books targeted to these populations reveal many things, but perhaps most importantly that the Japan of the late 1980's is comfortably represented both as a country with complex and deep traditions, as well as a modern nation competitive with the rest of the world. Japan came to terms with itself in the late 1980s; the number of guidebooks on a vast array of different subjects by both Western and Japanese authors (sometimes in collaboration with each other), by both Western and Japanese publishers, and by both standard and alternative representational formats, demonstrates that the Japanese had become comfortable with the notion of being many things to many people. As we will see in the detailed analysis of passages from the Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks, this pattern is clearly confirmed.

In contrast to general, comprehensive, or "standard" guidebooks, specialty guidebooks to Japan appear to respond to cyclic expressions of consumer need. Specialty guidebooks are to be distinguished from comprehensive guidebooks due to their more narrow focus on some particular elements of Japanese life, or their direction toward a certain audience segment. For example, 1979 saw the publication both of JTB's guidebook to Kamakura and the Fodor's budget series. Because of their different focuses, these guidebooks are considered distinct from the JTB's and Fodor's

comprehensive series. As Japan has become increasingly popular as a tourist site, the number of specialty guidebooks has increased significantly; notice particularly the marked increase in specialty guidebooks in 1986, which saw the release of twelve new guidebooks, the largest number for any single year surveyed.

Based on detailed analysis of sample passages contained in the Fodor's and JTB's series, I believe that the increase in specialty guidebooks to Japan reflects a desire on the part of tourists to more deeply and thoroughly explore Japanese culture. As Japan has becoming increasingly popular as a tourist site, tourist expectations about the country have passed through several stages: from the perception of Japan as an exotic country fit primarily for the more adventurous tourist, to a popular location that can adequately be covered by standard guidebooks, to a very popular location which demands deeper exploration in order to gain a sufficient level of insight. Moreover, as will become evident in the detailed analysis of passages in subsequent chapters, there is also reason to believe that the readers of tour guidebooks may have had some difficulty dealing with the omniscient and often ethnocentric authorial voice of Western standard guidebook series such as Fodor's.

Since the beginning of the 1950s, the number of people visiting Japan has been steadily growing. American visitors, for example, who in 1951 numbered only 6,600, by 1986 had grown to an estimated 480,000 (Johnson, 1988). Johnson explains the effects of America's increasing fascination with the Japanese on Japan's burgeoning tourist industry:

The decade of the 1960s truly launched American tourism to Japan. . . . In 1961 the number of American visitors for the first time passed 100,000 a year, and by 1970 it had passed 300,000. The period embraced, in 1964, the first Olympics to be held in Japan (or in any Asian country, for that matter), and, in 1970, the first Japanese-based world's fair. Japan presented an extraordinarily attractive visage to foreigners during this decade. The grinding hardships of the immediate postwar years were over, and life was becoming more comfortable—particularly for the tourist taking advantage of a favorable exchange rate. Japan was rapidly

becoming a modern, industrialized nation, but not so rapidly that the old culture could not still be seen and savored. It was, in short, a perfect time visit Zen temples and gardens, to buy lacquerware and mingei pottery, and also to travel in brand-new “bullet” trains and air-conditioned taxis, and buy cameras and watches. (pp. 100-101)

Regardless of its origins or its direction, it is certain that Japan’s intriguing combination of the modern and the traditional has led it to become a highly desirable tourist location. Tourists often seek an ideal combination of the exotic and the modern in the sites they favor: tourists prefer the exotic because it is different enough from their normal lives to be interesting, but at the same time they want to perceive the exotic in surroundings that permit them to luxuriate in the modern conveniences and accommodations to which they have become accustomed.

According to Johnson, Japan attracted Americans precisely because of its combination of traditional features together with modern conveniences. As we examine the details of how Japan is represented in tour guidebooks, I will continually orient my findings back to this basic frame of reference. The representations of Japan to be found in Western guidebooks such as Fodor’s, as well as the representations encountered in Japanese guidebooks such as JTB’s Official Guide to Japan, are best viewed against the backdrop of the historical process of Japan’s largely successful attempts to recover from the damage of World War II and to assert its identity as a modern nation in the face of the Western world’s initial denial and gradual acceptance of Japan’s status.

Place of Fodor’s and JTB’s Among Japan Guidebooks

In the following, I want to situate the Fodor’s and JTB’s series with regard to other tour guidebooks about Japan. The first Fodor’s guidebook to Japan, titled Japan and East Asia, appeared in 1961. Although many Fodor’s guidebook series to other nations had been published for many years, making Fodor’s books a staple of the tour

guidebook industry,⁸ Fodor's entry into the market for tour guidebooks about East Asia can be seen as a milestone for Japanese tourism. Since, as Johnson (1988) noted, real American interest in touring Japan began in the 1960s and was certainly spurred by worldwide interest in the Tokyo Olympic Games in 1964, the appearance of the first Fodor's guidebook in 1961 seems to have been a response to an emerging need for Westerners (primarily Americans) to learn about Japan.

A second feature which helps situate the Fodor's and JTB's series in relation to other guidebooks to Japan is their subject matter. Both Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks are comprehensive, that is, they are conceived by their editors to be the only references necessary for tourists to consult concerning the details of their trip to Japan. While the "standard" guidebook series to Japan, such as Fodor's and JTB's, have always been a staple of the tourist industry, beginning with the marked increase in Western interest in visiting Japan in the early 1960s, the number of guidebooks has increased, though not steadily.

Third, in general, the comprehensive guidebook series, particularly the Fodor's books and JTB's Japan, the Official Guide series, have served as industry staples for many years. The stated goal of both series is to be the only guidebook that the tourist will need. In many specialty guides, on the other hand, references are sometimes made to the need for a comprehensive guidebook to supplement the more narrowly-focused topics in specialty guidebooks. Thus, the standard guidebooks such as Fodor's and JTB's, as well as the more narrowly-focused specialty guidebooks, depend upon each other for the definition both of the material they cover and the market segments they address. Without standard guidebooks, specialty guidebooks would have no standard against which to compare in order to emphasize their greater depth, nor would they be able to recommend specialty guidebooks as a supplement to "more

⁸ Advertising in the front material in the 1990 edition boasts more than one hundred and forty different titles in the Fodor's line.

comprehensive works.” On the other hand, without the incursion of the specialty guidebooks into the markets once wholly controlled by the comprehensive guidebooks, it is unlikely that the major guidebooks would have felt the need to change and revise their descriptions in order to appeal to audiences more informed about Japan.

Basic Content of Fodor’s and ITB’s Guidebooks

In this section, I offer a sketch of some of the issues which face the analyst of touristic discourse. From a general discussion of content analysis, I want to move to a detailed justification for considering cultural representation in touristic discourse as a communicative activity. Specifically, I address the following four issues: (1) categories of coverage; (2) basic content analysis; (3) stability of the guidebook series over time; and (4) limitations and focus of needed additional analysis.

Categories of coverage. In this section, I introduce the topic of the contents of tour guidebooks by explaining what is generally expected of guidebooks by their readers.

General content analysis system. Regardless of who writes or publishes them, most tour guidebooks contain an enormous amount of information on a great variety of topics. To be valued, a tour guidebook is expected to present a significant amount of factual information on current conditions in the described culture (including data, prices, photographs, maps, and so on), together with background information on general topics, specific sites, cultural practices, evaluations, and so on.

Some of the standards commonly used to rate guidebooks can be seen in Heise’s (1981) evaluation of the 1974 book, Kites, Crackers and Craftsmen (by Carry Gordon and Kimiko Nagasawa): “The book invites travelers to discover the traditional Japan through its crafts and craftspeople. Few guides open up an

area's culture to visitors as clearly as this one. The practical information on the shops is complete and very accessible, and the descriptions, along with the color photographs and illustrated maps, bring the wares and their creators to life.

When used with a more comprehensive guide to Japan, the book is one of the best ways to explore and discover the unique charms of the country" (p. 42).

Heise has evaluated Gordon and Nagasawa's book in terms of its completeness (despite generally praising the book, Heise recommends it be used with a "more comprehensive" work), its graphics, and the soundness of its information.

As Heise's appraisal confirms, tour guidebooks tend to be evaluated both in terms of the quality of their travel-related information and in terms of how, more generally, they address the perceived needs of tourists. However, the difference between standard and specialty guidebooks lies primarily in the degree of attention paid both these kinds of information. In the standard guidebook, more emphasis is placed on travel-related information; although the perceived needs of tourists are an important factor in fashioning standard touristic discourse, they frequently constitute a hidden dimension to cultural description, expressed covertly rather than openly. The specialty guidebook, on the other hand, celebrates its appeal to the tourist's needs, which are often very well-defined and somewhat narrow (focusing upon such areas as a specific geographical location, a specific practice such as sculpture or photography, or a specific activity such as business or shopping). At the same time, the specialty guidebook tends to be less systematic or diligent about providing the most up-to-date information on a wide variety of topics. Typically, the specialty guidebook is expected to be informed on current conditions in the more restricted area it describes, presenting information on other topics only incidentally. Standard and specialty guidebooks, then, should be viewed, not as

being directed toward separate audiences, but as addressed to different needs of the same audiences.

Basic content analysis. Comparing various guidebooks to Japan, it is evident that the same or similar topics tend to be discussed, regardless of who publishes the guidebook series. In order to generate more identifiable and clear content categories utilized by tour guidebooks, I have chosen to compare topic areas shared by three major guidebook series—Fodor's, Frommer's, and JTB's—resulting in a list of the most widely agreed upon topics (these are the eighteen key topics referred to below). Series such as these three seem to set the standards against which other guidebooks are to be measured, perhaps because these series seem to be more complete and stable over time. The three lists varied in number of items from twenty-five (Frommer's) to thirty-seven (JTB's), and included topics related not only to cultural elements of Japan (such as history), but also to standard forms of information (such as currency exchange), as well as sites and locations that have come to be associated with Japan (such as Mt. Fuji, Nara, and Kyoto). Comparing the three lists, I first found that, regardless of individual variations among the three, the major guidebook series discussed the same eighteen basic topics. These eighteen topics were further subdivided into four categories: (1) daily living (including the topics accommodations, currency, general description, tourist information, and transportation); (2) sociohistorical matters (including the topics geography and history); (3) customs and culture (including the topics customs, fashion, festivals, food, and language); and (4) sites and locations (including the topics Fuji-Hakone-Izu, Kyoto, Nara, Nikko, Osaka, and Tokyo).

That these eighteen topics break naturally into the four categories is due largely to the predictable nature of the discourse found in standard tour guidebooks to Japan. The standard guidebook, as noted earlier, often portrays

itself primarily as the only book a tourist will need when visiting a foreign country. To aspire to that status, the standard guidebook must provide sufficient information for the visitor to be able to “get by” on a daily basis. Topics closely related to this primary activity I have classified as daily life.

However, if they are to stimulate enough reader interest to persuade the consumer to buy the guidebook, authors cannot appeal simply to the routine, day-to-day activities in a country such as Japan: they must also provide information about what makes Japanese culture unique and special. Thus, one often finds in guidebooks information stressing how Japanese life is distinct from the tourist’s ordinary experience. Topics giving expression to the need of tour guidebooks to provide this sort of information to their readers were summarized under the general heading customs and culture.

Despite the fact that most standard comprehensive tour guidebooks contain a significant amount of information on customs and culture, tourists still demand to know more about some locations than they do about others; these locations or “sites,” then, become the focus of even more detailed explanations in the guidebooks. The idea of sites is deeply ingrained in the activity of tourism, and involves complex sociological issues which need not be taken up here. It is sufficient to note that touristic expectations are such that certain sites, corresponding to previously held beliefs in the meaning systems of readers, are so strongly associated with Japan that further elaboration about them is considered essential if a guidebook is to be perceived as credible. Six of these locales are brought together under the general heading sites and locations.

The final category, sociohistorical matters, includes the relatively “fixed” features of the culture, such as history and geography. These are placed under the same category primarily because they both are relatively inescapable aspects of the culture. Japan’s history cannot be changed, nor its geographical elements

significantly altered. At the same time, one cannot understand customs and culture, daily life, or sites and locations without situating them in time and space. Moreover, it is interesting to note how frequently history is made a part of the discussion of the other three topic areas⁹ (there is hardly a site or location described in either the Fodor's or JTB's series that is not prefaced by a discussion of history), not to mention how often the activity of touring is oriented toward movement in space (a geographical orientation).

Stability over time. In the following, I sketch a broad picture detailing how the Fodor's and JTB's series have evolved over the period which provides the sampled volumes (for the Fodor's series, 1962 through 1990; for the JTB's series, 1955 through 1991), focusing upon the features of the two series which have characterized their approaches, and which have tended to remain relatively constant despite year-to-year revisions.

Fodor's guidebook series. Fodor's has published a guidebook to Japan each year since 1961. Changes have come slowly to the series. Analysis shows little change from the 1962¹⁰ through 1969 editions; there are minor changes in format, content, and general appearance for the 1976 edition carried through the 1982 edition, followed by a major overhaul of content, format, approach, coverage, and tone in the 1990 Fodor's edition. Another noteworthy change in the Fodor's series lies in the breadth of its coverage, the following countries being covered in the sampled editions: in the 1962 and 1969 editions, Japan and other East Asian nations; in the 1976 and 1982 editions, Japan and South Korea; and in the 1990 edition,¹¹ Japan alone.

⁹ See Chapter Three, pp. 154-156.

¹⁰ Since the 1961 edition was unavailable at the time the project began, I used the 1962 edition as the first edition to sample for this research.

¹¹ The first Fodor's edition to address Japan alone was the 1983 edition. When I first assembled the guidebooks I wanted to analyze, the 1983 edition was, unfortunately, not available, so I substituted the 1982 edition (I obtained a copy of the 1983 edition in August, 1993). While it is true that the 1983 edition is the first Fodor's to deal with Japan by itself, the descriptions are very close to the 1976 and 1982 editions, with little additional material. The 1983 edition, in fact, is about thirty pages shorter than the

Generally, these editions fall into two major categories: (1) the category I refer to frequently in the detailed analysis of the text as the “early editions,” that is, editions for the years 1962, 1969, 1976, and 1982; and (2) the 1990 edition. While this may seem like a rather unusual categorization scheme, even cursory examination of the Fodor’s series will demonstrate its validity. The 1990 Fodor’s edition represents a dramatic break from previous editions. Moreover, the four “early editions” are remarkably similar in content and appearance. I turn briefly to a discussion of three factors which confirm the great similarity of the editions 1962 through 1982, together with comments on how the 1990 edition differs: (1) identity of authors included in each edition; (2) retention or change of format; and (3) stability or alteration of content and phrasing.

First, there is comparatively little change in authorship of the Fodor’s series 1962 through 1982. The most significant change in the early editions occurs between 1969 and 1976. In the 1962 and 1969 editions the key introductory chapter (the first substantive chapter following general tourist information) is titled, “Japan and its People—A Crowded, Lonely Land,” and is written by University of Michigan professor Edward Seidensticker. In the 1976 and 1982 editions, however, the introductory chapter is titled, “Japan and its People—Land of Contrasts and Contradictions,” and is written by a New Zealand travel correspondent named Douglas Moore Kenrick. As will be evident in the detailed discussion of several key passages from these introductory chapters, Seidensticker’s tone is considerably more negative than Kenrick’s, as indicated by the latter’s neutral subtitle, “Land of Contrasts and Contradictions,” as compared to the former’s more censorious, “A Crowded, Lonely Land.” A second important authorial change is the addition in the 1976 and 1982 editions of a chapter on religion, “Religion in Japan—Duality, Plurality, and Tolerance,” also by Douglas Moore Kenrick. Finally, the 1976 edition adds an

section on Japan in the 1982 edition. Thus, even though in 1983 Japan rates a volume of its own in the Fodor’s series, there is no increased coverage and very little additional information.

anonymously authored chapter titled, "Osaka—the Second City." Apart from these changes, however, the authorship of the Fodor's series on Japan remains remarkably stable over a span of two decades, from its inception in 1961 all the way through the 1982 edition.

None of the authors included in the 1962 through 1982 editions are retained for the 1990 edition. The 1990 edition is also distinguished by the fact that nearly all chapters are attributed to one or more authors (earlier editions of Fodor's attributed about half of their chapters to anonymous authorship). In the 1990 edition, approximately three-quarters of the book is attributed to six identified authors.

Second, the 1962 through 1982 editions of Fodor's are remarkably similar in format and appearance. Each of the four editions is sized similarly and bound identically, differing year to year only in the color of the cover. The 1962 and 1969 editions use identical typefaces and layout, and the 1976 and 1982 editions, while using a different, slightly more dense, typeface and more closely compressed layout as compared to the 1969 edition, are nevertheless virtually identical to each other. Photographs, line illustrations, and maps, with rare minor exceptions, are identical in each of the four editions.

In the 1990 edition, however, the older format, typeface, style, and layout are discarded in favor of a sleeker, more magazine-like appearance. Information is more clearly demarcated through use of numerous typefaces and more noticeable graphics. Line drawings at the front of each chapter are replaced with inkwash portraits, and photographs are absent. There are also more maps, together with a generally more pragmatic approach to offering the tourist information: in the 1990 edition, editors seem to assume that the greatest priority should be given to getting the tourist through the process of touring as efficiently as possible.

Finally, the 1962 through 1982 editions are marked by a notable stability in descriptions of key elements of Japanese life. If one ignores variations from the 1969 to

the 1976 editions, such as the change in authorship of the introductory chapter from Seidensticker to Kenrick or the addition of chapters, then one finds almost no major textual changes in the Fodor's editions for two decades (1962 through 1982). Of course, each edition exhibits some minor changes of phrase or deletion of material that no longer applies to Japan; at the same time, in most instances, there is almost no change¹² in the broader characterizations of Japan, particularly those in the all-important section introducing key elements of Japanese life.

In the 1990 edition, of course, the overhaul in format and authorship means that none of the textual descriptions from the earlier editions remain. Moreover, the 1990 edition does not even retain the chapter structure or schedule of topics from the earlier editions; thus, not only are the descriptions themselves thoroughly altered, but the 1990 edition does not even address the "same" subject matter.

Together, these three characteristics confirm the original pattern for conceptualizing the evolution of the Fodor's guidebooks. While the Fodor's series remains stable from its inception in 1961 through the 1982 edition, in 1990 it makes a dramatic and thoroughgoing break with its earlier format and content. Indeed, the distinction between the 1990 edition and earlier editions would not seem so noticeable were it not for the remarkable stability of the editions from 1962 through 1982.

JTB's guidebook series. The JTB's series, Japan, The Official Guide,¹³ on the other hand, has published annually since the 1920s. The JTB's series publishes in both Japanese and English.¹⁴ While it is possible that I could have gained valuable

¹² This point is dramatically demonstrated in computer comparison of scanned texts from the Fodor's series. For example, the chapter on history, compared over the years 1962 through 1982, demonstrates that more than eighty-nine percent of the text is unchanged after two decades of "revised" Fodor's editions; this, despite the fact that the social and economic conditions in Japan changed drastically over this same period. Similar stability of text can also be demonstrated for the chapters on food, arts and entertainment, and shopping.

¹³ In 1964, the title of this series is changed to Japan, the New Official Guide.

¹⁴ Since I neither read nor speak Japanese, I have not determined whether the English version is an exact translation of the Japanese version. I am assuming that they are substantially the same.

information by examining JTB guidebooks from their inception (assuming these editions were available), I chose to begin my study with the year 1955, for a number of reasons. First, the 1955 edition represents the first major revision of the JTB guidebook following World War II. The elements of the touristic transaction which I am most interested in exploring are differences in international economic and political status between Japan and the West, and particularly how such differences come to be reflected and negotiated within the cultural descriptions in tour guidebooks. Without question the series of modern events which most define differences in international status between Japan and the West are related to World War II and its aftermath, particularly the Occupation by Allied forces. Therefore, examining guidebook editions before the war would offer little in the way of insight concerning how Japan and the West negotiate and define their interaction in the international community—the war and its aftermath altered these relations forever.

The examined editions of the Japan Travel Bureau's guidebook series were for the years 1955, 1975, and 1991.¹⁵ The JTB's series,¹⁶ in contrast to the Fodor's series, exhibits far more stability in content and format over time. Since its inception in the 1920s, the JTB's guidebook has retained essentially the same chapter structure. Comparing the 1955 and 1991 editions, for example, one finds virtually the same topics, and, as in the Fodor's guidebook series, that a significant portion of the textual descriptions of Japanese cultural life remains identical. One can contrast the two series in the following way: in the Fodor's series, after two decades during which editors seemed to see little need for change, in the 1990 revision, editors obviously felt strong

¹⁵ These years mark what JTB editors portray in their forewords or prefaces as "major revisions." Although another major revision was performed in 1964, the resultant text was considerably more abbreviated (approximately one-half the length of a "normal" Japan, the Official Guide) and hence did not permit precise enough comparisons with previous and subsequent issues to be included in this study.

¹⁶ The terms "JTB's series" or "JTB's guidebook" will be used in this dissertation to refer to the annual series, Japan, the Official Guide (after 1964, it is titled Japan, the New Official Guide), despite the fact that the Japan Travel Bureau (JTB) also publishes other guidebook series.

pressures to change from the ground up; in the JTB's series, on the other hand, editors apparently did not feel the need to change radically, preferring instead to elaborate on and improve a format that they evidently think has worked very well for them.

Limitations and focus of needed additional analysis. The purpose for writing this dissertation is to expand the repertoire of the analyst of culturally descriptive communication by providing the means to extend beyond the limitations of content analysis. In the following, I first discuss why the yield of content analysis is limited, generally in regard to cultural description and particularly as concerns touristic descriptions of culture. Second, I advance the arguments for considering cultural representation as a process of communication.

Limited yield of content analysis. Content analysis can provide valuable information to the critical reader of touristic discourse. Systematic content analysis is an excellent means of presenting information that guides the analyst toward deeper exploration of textual meaning. The Bakhtinian analyses undertaken in this discussion are frequently bolstered by more conventional content analyses, including computer comparison of scanned text, as well as nonparametric statistical analyses based on frequency and positioning of selected passages.

Nevertheless, according to the Bakhtin group, the analysis of texts by means of categories or explanatory models is somewhat limited. In analyzing cultural description such as that typically contained in tour guidebooks, for example, content analysis demands that one classify linguistic units (phrases, words, sentences, and so on) according to categories, then to analyze the members of those categories according to their frequency or placement in texts (Holsti, 1969). While such an approach can yield valuable results, there is a great danger that the analyst relying solely upon content analysis will ignore the more subtle or intuitive suggestions of the data, particularly if these are difficult to fit into a system of categorization.

Despite their plebeian reputation and ubiquitousness, touristic descriptions may remain opaque even to the most rigorous content analysis. This is primarily because the act of representation of another culture, for the purpose of commercial profit, engages social forces far beyond those involved in the immediate touristic interaction. At minimum, factors such as the comparative socioeconomic levels of the visitor and visited are greatly exaggerated, leading to disparate perceptions of what the touristic encounter involves:

The necessary cause of tourism . . . appears to be a level of productivity sufficient to sustain leisure. If productivity is the key to tourism, then any analysis of touristic development without reference to productive centers that generate tourist needs and tourists is bound to be incomplete. (Nash, 1989, p. 39)

Nash's admonition provides only the beginning of an account of the complexity of touristic representation. If, in evaluating tourism and its description in touristic discourse, one must pay attention to economic factors, then one must also consider the social forces which lead to economic conditions. These may involve politics, ethnic identity, war, the urge of human groups to migrate, religion, weather—in short, all things which comprise one's cultural existence may conceivably impinge upon the difference in socioeconomic status between the "host" country and its "guests."

For the analysis of the manifold implications of socioeconomic differences, content analysis alone is inadequate, particularly with regard to the complexity of cultural representation. For one thing, content analysis proceeds by perceiving, then settling upon, then refining, and lastly utilizing systems of categorization in which increasingly broad circles of complexity are rigorously excluded. The successful content analyst must find ways to "deal with" the kind of troublesome issues suggested by Nash. More often than not, given the limitations of most communication models to deal with high levels of complexity, troublesome issues are simply ignored.

While the simplification of the complex is an inevitable by-product of categorization, simplification becomes problematic when one is dealing with the complexities of cultural representation; the most troublesome elements of cultural description are those that are least immediately available for inspection (such as hidden racism, ethnocentrism, bias, or assumptions of cultural superiority).

While communication scholars today might argue that a number of modern communication theories do recognize sociohistorical specificity, one must remember that the standard toward which the Bakhtin group's criticism was directed was the strict sender-receiver model of Saussure.¹⁷ Obviously, a number of developments have taken place since Saussure's work in the early twentieth century, some of which are directed toward more fully accounting for sociohistorical forces in communication process (for example, sociohistorically specific elements of context are a central concern of the growing fields of sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication).

However, as perhaps will become apparent in the detailed analysis which follows in subsequent chapters, it is precisely the "troublesome" detail that most urgently demands the attention of the critical reader of touristic cultural description. The change of a phrase or even a word as part of the representation of another culture often has profound significance, not because it is obvious—indeed, it is highly unlikely that anyone would ever compare editions of the same tour guidebook so closely—but because of what it suggests about the broader social forces behind the writing of the guidebook. To write and publish a tour guidebook is an expensive and complex undertaking; therefore, changes in it must be initiated for good reason and in the expectation that commercial consumption of its descriptions will thereby be increased. However, such alterations in language, particularly if they are less obvious or infrequent, may well be lost to the content analyst.

¹⁷ See Appendix, pp. 555-556, et seq.

An example will perhaps make this point more convincingly. The country of Japan, contrasted with Western countries such as the United States, has long been considered inferior both in terms of living conditions and economic achievement in general. Although this impression has changed somewhat in recent years, Japan has always been pressured by the need to measure up to the standards of Western countries, particularly in regard to quality of life and particularly since the end of World War II. The traditional Japanese inn—called a ryokan—has been both a source of charming diversion for the Western tourist and some embarrassment for the Japanese. While ryokan clearly reflect Japanese culture, to the Western visitor expecting certain amenities from his or her hotel accommodations, the traditional Japanese inn may prove to be a disappointment.

With this background in mind, I turn to two seemingly insignificant changes in the JTB's guidebook's descriptions of ryokan.¹⁸ In the 1955 edition, ryokan are portrayed somewhat apologetically, with the JTB suggesting that perhaps they will not meet the expectations of Western visitors. In the 1975 edition, ryokan are said to meet "certain international standards" (implying that some, though not all, of the Western tourist's expectations will be met). In the 1991 JTB's edition, ryokan are said simply to meet "international standards."

Under the categorization procedures proposed by content analysis these two changes in wording may be seen as relatively minor. However, once one considers such revisions in light of the complex changes in sociopolitical status between Japan and the West, they may take on considerably greater significance. For example, one could explore the interesting parallel shown, on the one hand, by the increasing economic status of Japan, and on the other, JTB's increasing reluctance to apologize for their ryokan. I do not wish to belabor this or similar points at this juncture, except to

¹⁸ This example is explored at length in the discussion of the dimension of tension in Chapter Three, pp. 104-107, and Chapter Five, pp. 291-296.

note that to explain the complexities of cultural representation takes a broader range of approaches than can be obtained through content analysis alone.

Needed analysis of cultural representation as communication. Given the limitations of the traditional content analytical method in analyzing the subtleties involved in the composition of touristic texts, I argue the following: (1) that touristic writings are forms of cultural representation; and (2) that such cultural representations ought to be considered a process of communication. The purpose of this dissertation is to bring the ideas of the Bakhtin circle to the service of more fully elaborating cultural description of Japan. Since content analysis—even qualitative or interpretive content analysis—seldom seeks to tie its findings to specific sociohistorical circumstances, features of touristic interaction which are related to differences in sociohistorical circumstances such as political and economic power remain hidden. As noted in the discussion of the Bakhtin circle’s views of communication,¹⁹ the group often found itself at odds with the “sender-receiver” model of communication. Bakhtin and his associates argued that this and all other models of communication fail adequately to capture the sociohistorical richness of the contexts in which communication activity is situated. In order to explain why I choose to utilize a Bakhtinian framework to analyze touristic descriptions about Japan, I will elaborate two approaches toward cultural communication in the following sections.

Two Approaches to “Cultural Communication”

In the following, I discuss two approaches to the presentation of culture and cultural meanings: (1) the standard approach; and (2) the description-as-communication approach.

¹⁹ See Appendix.

Presentation of Culture and Cultural Meanings

The first approach is what I term the standard approach (or the received view) which has given us both the majority of touristic descriptions, as well as the bulk of anthropological and ethnographic accounts of the cultural Other. First, I will explain what the approach entails, and second, why I am rejecting it as the primary approach toward cultural description analyzed in this dissertation.

What this approach entails. Culture is often described through a set of categories imposed by its interpreters (Geertz, 1973). In the realm of touristic descriptions, this means, essentially, that the cultural Other is understood by the describer of culture in certain ways. This process requires that both the author of cultural representation, as well as those who read or listen to such representations, respond to a variety of meaning systems, including but not limited to the following: (1) the meaning systems of the author, including his or her education, experiences with the culture being described, personal level of awareness of cultural integrity of the described culture, and so on; (2) what the author estimates to be the meaning systems of those who are imagined to be the readers/listeners (involving estimates about what the audience will be able to understand, how the description is likely to fit into the preconceptions of audience members, the contribution likely to be made to future knowledge about the described culture, and so on); and (3) the meaning systems of the editors, reviewers (if it is academic discourse), publishers, and others who will critically evaluate the cultural description; and so on.

However, this richer and more complex view is seldom suggested on cursory examination of the process of cultural representation. In most cases three conditions are to be satisfied: (1) the author is assumed to be somewhat knowledgeable concerning the culture he or she describes; (2) the publication venues in which the author's opinions are expressed are assumed to be somewhat reputable; and (3) most

of the audience is generally assumed to be seeking knowledge about the culture and expect to find this knowledge in the words of the describer.

As an example, consider the communicative situation in which the reader buys a tour guidebook about a country that he or she intends to visit in the future.

According to the more straightforward, standard model of cultural representation, the first condition to be satisfied is to establish the authority of the representer. This can be done in a number of ways (some of which are explored in detail through analysis of textual samples in subsequent chapters): chapters are frequently prefaced with notes establishing the credentials of the author (for “cultural outsiders,” for example, such notes often refer to the length of time the author has spent in the culture, or to other works the author has written about the culture).

The second assumption of the standard process of cultural representation is that publications which contain such representations are reputable enough to help authors to convince readers that their interpretations of the described culture are valid. For tour guidebooks, reputability is established in a variety of ways: for example, guidebooks often simply declare themselves to be “the authority” on a given culture (both Fodor’s and JTB’s guidebook series state this directly). As another means to establish authority, reference is sometimes made to the reputation of the guidebook’s publishers (for example, the Fodor’s guidebook to Japan reminds its readers of the extensive offerings of the complete line of Fodor’s guidebooks, while the JTB’s guidebook series sometimes bases its claims to authority in part on the fact that its authors are Japanese writing about Japan, as well as the fact that the series has been very highly regarded for more than seventy years). In the chapters that follow, I explore a number of other ways in which guidebooks try to establish their own authority.

The third assumption about the standard model of cultural description is that readers seek knowledge which they expect to find in the words of the authors of

cultural description. In the case of tour guidebooks, although it is of course possible that some readers perceive what is written about a country such as Japan from a position of superior knowledge about Japanese culture, more often one reads touristic description in the hopes of gaining cultural knowledge. Given that touristic interactions are perceived primarily as leisure activity, readers are particularly susceptible to declarations on the part of the authors of guidebook descriptions. Lacking other substantive sources of knowledge about a culture, readers are prepared to rely most immediately upon what they perceive in the text they are reading at the moment, thus lending a given cultural description somewhat greater authority than it might otherwise be able to claim.

This, then, is the “standard” way in which cultural description is perceived, both generally and specifically in terms of the tour guidebook. As will be evident in the detailed examination of discourse samples in later chapters, there is far more to the process of cultural description than is implied by this relatively straightforward rendering. In advance of that more detailed discussion, I turn briefly to a description of why the standard model is inadequate.

Why this approach is not taken. I have found the “standard” model of cultural representation to be inadequate, particularly as applied to touristic descriptions. The chief weakness of the standard view of cultural representation lies in its ambivalence toward the complexities of sociohistorical circumstance. Like the received view advanced by Saussure’s sender-receiver model of communication,²⁰ the standard model of cultural representation is somewhat sterile. The standard view cannot offer a credible account of cultural representation because it assumes too much about the motivations of representers of culture, about the adequacy of editorial management and infrastructure to monitor the representations of its authors, and about the

²⁰ See Appendix, pp. 555-556.

motivations of readers who might seek information about another culture. According to the Bakhtin group, as confirmed by the analysis of passages from the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series in subsequent chapters, discourse is never judged in the abstract, antiseptic terms espoused by the standard model. Writers' credentials are not simply established by the words of the text; they are offered in the stream of social discourse where their adequacy may be judged by readers. Readers do not seek out information merely from a desire to increase their store of data, but rather are driven by emotions, by memories, by urges for self-expansion in the future, and by a host of other motivations. The reputability of the publishers of a guidebook is never established according to some abstract scaling mechanism, but by complex forces in the marketplace which dictate supply and demand, by the responses of readers who judge the text's information to be consonant or dissonant with perceptions of the culture gained from other sources, by availability of the book, by the cost of the book, and so on. For these and other reasons, a cultural description analyzed by the standard or received view of cultural representation conveys only a very narrow range of information about the true nature of the activity.

This sketch of the standard view of cultural representation indicates why it is ill-suited to describing the touristic transaction. As Nash (1989) noted in the passage quoted earlier,²¹ the host and the guest in the touristic transaction—indeed, in any transaction between specific human beings—do not interact on an equal footing. The imbalance between the two individuals, the tourist and the member of the host country, can often be quite dramatic. At a surface level, the tourist is sufficiently well off to be able to afford international travel, while the member of the visited culture is frequently less affluent and perhaps a part of the substratum of society which is said to “need” tourists' dollars in order to become more economically developed. (de Kadt,

²¹ See this chapter, p. 38.

1979) Beyond the surface level, however, host and guest bring to their interaction the histories of their countries, not just in relationship with each other, but with the other nations that have interacted with the cultures of host and guest in the past. Innumerable acts of communication inform the immediate interaction between guest and host, just as they have informed all of the social elements leading up to the interaction. In the analysis of cultural description, such factors are not given full recognition concerning their role in the touristic description. Rather, analysis proceeds on the assumption that the meaning of the author resides in the words of the text to be appropriated by the reader as a matter of personal choice.

Representation of Culture as Communication Process

The second approach I call the description-as-communication-process; this approach is favored by critical readers as a means of providing a thicker analysis of cultural description. As in the previous discussion, first, I will explain what the approach entails; however, second, I will explain why I favor the description-as-communication-process perspective, as exemplified by Bakhtin, as the primary approach toward cultural description analyzed in this dissertation.

What this approach entails. Considering representation as a communication process is one means of avoiding some of the limitations of the standard model of cultural description. One begins by assuming that the linear explanation espoused by the standard model inadequately reflects the complexity of the communication context. Taking the view of the Bakhtin group that language is the outcome of sociohistorically specific activity, then, one expands on the standard or received model of communication (sender-receiver) by elaborating the elements of the model:²² sender/receivers (addressed in the Bakhtin group's work by the topics self, ideology, point of view, exotopy, and voice); message (addressed in the Bakhtin group's work

²² See Appendix, pp. 555-556, et seq.

under discussion of utterance and signification/ dialectic); and context (addressed by Bakhtin and his colleagues under the topics heteroglossia, dialogism, and uncompletedness). The elaboration of the sender-receiver model by application of the writings of Bakhtin and his colleagues expands and diversifies the received model of communication. Communication acts are rendered more complex through their linkage to the broader social environment. At the same time the provocative nature of the Bakhtinian observations are rendered more clearly by comparison and contrast with the standard view.

The final step in fashioning the cultural description-as-communication model was to formulate dimensions of cultural description whereby specific examples can be analyzed systematically. Five dimensions—specificity, ownership, open and closed perception, tension, and uncompletedness—emerged from the examination of the Bakhtinian elaboration of the basic received model of communication. These dimensions are described in detail in a subsequent section of this chapter, as well as in the chapters devoted to each individual dimension.

Why this approach is being taken. Using the cultural-description-as-communication perspective offers two distinct advantages to the analyst of touristic representations. First, the approach highlights the complexity of the communicative context, rather than attempting to discount complexity in the service of theoretical elegance. In other words, the cultural-description-as-communication approach makes touristic description somewhat more “messy,” but does so in interesting and potentially fruitful ways. The very sociohistorical elements of communicative context which are ignored or factored out of the standard model of cultural description are emphatically foregrounded in the analysis of cultural description as communication. One assumes that the motivations of the communicators, the nuances of expression in the turn of a phrase or the addition or deletion of a word or phrase, the past history of interaction between the cultures of the representer and the represented, as well as

many other aspects reflecting the complexity of the communicative context, are important and reflective of the mix of sociohistorical factors which influence and impinge upon the interpretation of the meaning assigned to “straightforward” cultural description.

Second, considering touristic description as communication makes more obvious its significance as a means of preparing the tourist for his or her encounter with the cultural Other. Too often, touristic representations are dismissed as trivial, value-neutral expressions which merely serve as elements in a primarily commercial transaction. However, as will quickly become evident in the detailed analysis of samples of touristic discourse explored in the extensive discussion of the five dimensions of cultural description taken up in subsequent chapters, the seemingly innocent cultural descriptions in tour guidebooks seem to be shot through with the prejudices and biases of their authors, reflecting differences in status and power, as well as identifiable agendas that recognize the needs of their editors and publishers.

Given the importance of these forces in shaping touristic descriptions, the reader of the tour guidebook can hardly approach the activity of perceiving cultural description without taking in the flavor of the sociohistorical forces which led to its composition and publication. For example, we will see numerous instances showing the ways in which the Fodor’s guidebook’s authors frequently appeal to—and thereby reinforce—common stereotypes about the Japanese people, as well as evident efforts by the JTB’s guidebooks to reframe Western stereotypes, answering and correcting commonly held beliefs about Japan shared by Western readers. The reader, encountering such descriptions, engages their assumptions according to his or her unique systems of meaning. If the Western reader comes upon an interpretation that reinforces a previously held stereotype about Japanese in the Fodor’s guidebook, for example, that stereotype is likely to be strengthened. On the other hand, if the Western reader encounters a description in the JTB’s guidebook that causes him or her to

reconsider previously held beliefs, then the stereotype is likely to be weakened. In any case, what is chosen by the author for inclusion in cultural description cannot enter the mind of the tourist unencumbered of the circumstances surrounding the past history of the interactants, their countries or cultures, or the previous interpretations of the culture that have become part of the meaning systems of author and audiences.

Present Focus—Representation of Culture from Bakhtin Approach

At the outset of this study, among the various perspectives from which one could conceivably analyze cultural description as communicative activity, the Bakhtin approach seemed to offer the best likelihood for defining the hidden tensions in touristic representations, primarily for three reasons. First, the Bakhtin approach is eclectic. It does not concentrate on one or a few aspects of sociohistorical circumstance, but tries instead, often at considerable effort, to bring all sociohistorical circumstance to bear on the analysis of texts. Second, the Bakhtin approach is grounded in history. It accents preceding and subsequent discourse as progenitor and progeny of cultural description, emphasizing the role of the past in the social construction of the present, thereby making the perspective particularly useful for the exploration of long-standing historical elements important to touristic transaction, such as ethnocentrism or past conflictual relationships between two cultures. Third, the Bakhtin perspective advances a form of analysis that extends progressively outward, connecting cultural description to ever-wider circles of social elements which influence one's interpretation of texts, as contrasted with traditional forms of content analysis which tend to limit the number of social elements to be accounted for in interpretation. Given the purpose of the present investigation—to explore the deeper and more subtle implications of the act of cultural representation—the Bakhtinian approach enables the critical analyst to perceive more potential textual influences in the realm of sociohistorical circumstances.

In the next section, I explore in greater detail the advantages of the Bakhtinian approach to the analysis of cultural description.

Bakhtin's Framework as Perspective for Analysis

Overview of Bakhtin's Perspective

Before undertaking a detailed preview of the five dimensions of analysis derived from the work of the Bakhtin circle, it is essential to address two key issues: (1) a general overview of the basic philosophy of the Bakhtin circle; and (2) a discussion of the procedure whereby the writings of the Bakhtin group were analyzed to discover the categories on which the five dimensions are based.

General overview. The approach espoused by the Bakhtin circle poses a challenge to the vast majority of scholarly discussions of cultural description. To the Bakhtin group, the mistake made in most evaluations of cultural description center around excessive use of abstract theoretical categories and the resultant arguments about the categories rather than the living language which is purportedly to be described by such categories. As discussions of living discourse grow increasingly abstract, the Bakhtin group argued, realization by the critical analyst of the sociohistorically specific character of such discourse grows increasingly obscure and difficult to formulate. The group's work, then, must not be seen as an attempt to discard theory from discussions of social language; rather, the principles of Bakhtin and his colleagues should be seen as an attempt to restore balance to theoretical discussions of language. There are far too many theories about the language used in cultural description, and far too few in which there is theoretical discussion counterposed with discussion of the sociohistorically specific character of language. By the same token, however, sociohistorical circumstances are infinitely rich and complex, making it equally impossible for the analyst of culturally descriptive discourse to rely solely on elements of specific sociohistorical circumstances to

adequately explain or analyze cultural description. In other words, given the infinite variety of sociohistorical specificity, abstraction is essential to summarize details which resist the ability of the analyst to exhaustively catalog specific elements of context.

One can easily see the tension engaged by the introduction of Bakhtin's perspective to standard analysis of cultural description. The model of communication implied by the standard view is more or less straightforward: the describer renders culture into categories accepted by both the describer and his/her communicants. These descriptions are advanced in venues which are expected by both the describer and his/her audience.

However, the Bakhtin group argued that the understanding of cultural description which stops at this straightforward explanation misses a good deal of what is going on. To advance beyond the linear view espoused by this perspective, they said, it would be necessary to develop a conceptual vocabulary which would be able to elaborate the specific sociohistorical circumstances of communication context. In the next section, I turn to a discussion of the procedure for deriving this vocabulary from the work of Bakhtin and his associates, as well as an exploration of some of the advantages and disadvantages of the process.

Categories of analysis derived from Bakhtin. Briefly, the approach I take in this dissertation is to draw from the works of Bakhtin and his colleagues a set of five dimensions of cultural description to more fully analyze discourse samples from two guidebook series about Japan. However, the broad-ranging character of the critical approaches of the Bakhtin circle make it extremely difficult to derive categories of analysis. Indeed, given the group's persistence in arguing against interpretation by means of models, abstractions, or categories, it is possible that the idea of cultural description through application of dimensions stands counter to the very heart of the Bakhtin group's project.

However, despite the difficulties associated with linking the ideas of the Bakhtin group to the process of cultural description, the Bakhtinian view of language presents the best possibility among available alternatives for analyzing touristic descriptions of culture. To forge a bridge between Bakhtin's ideas and cultural description, I began with the assumption that cultural description is essentially a communicative process. I sought to fit the basic concepts of the Bakhtin group to a model of communication; since much of the group's work was formulated in response to the standard sender-receiver model advanced by Saussure, I organized the ideas of Bakhtin to explicate the elements of that model:²³ (1) sender/receiver (or, "communicants"); (2) message; and (3) context. Although the ideas of the Bakhtin group did not of course evolve as a point-by-point response to the sender-receiver model of communication, it is possible to relate most of the major ideas of the circle to elements of the standard model. The final step in the process of formulating the ideas of Bakhtin and his associates into a systematic set of tools for analyzing cultural description was to fashion a set of dimensions based on the elaboration of the sender-receiver model. This yielded five dimensions which are explained in detail below.

Sketch of the Five Dimensions of Analysis

In the following I briefly take up the descriptions of the five dimensions and their relationship to the core construct of cultural representation. The five dimensions are: (1) specificity; (2) ownership; (3) tension; (4) open and closed perception; and (5) uncompletedness.

Specificity. The dimension of specificity situates cultural description with respect to sociohistorical circumstance. The dimension of specificity states, "All communication is always specific, performed by specific people in specific circumstances; it can never be truly described by abstraction, theory, or generality."

²³ See Appendix, pp. 555-556, et seq.

According to the Bakhtin group, once linguistic utterances are described by abstractions (as a paragraph, a sentence, a response, a cultural description), to a certain extent they lose some meaning. As one analyzes examples of cultural description from the tour guidebooks under the lens of specificity, one can, for example, see how sociohistorically specific information can be manipulated in the service of persuading readers of the truth of the author's description. Authors in both the Fodor's and JTB's series use more than enough specificity, use deficient specificity, and use specificity selectively in ways that permit the critical reader to render a more sensible account of the cultural descriptions to which the lens of specificity is applied. Moreover, when one examines the use of specificity against the backdrop of historical circumstances which surround the writing of cultural descriptions over the years, one is able to see clearly how the use of specificity has altered as the relationship between Japan and the West has changed.

Ownership. The dimension of ownership situates cultural description with respect to members of society. The dimension of ownership states, "All communication is jointly owned by all social actors; it can never be held privately or limited to a subunit of society." According to the Bakhtin group, once cultural description enters the stream of social discourse, it becomes, not the sole property of the person who formulates it, but the property of every social actor. The group believed that, potentially, any social actor or group might conceivably lay claim to some aspect of meaning assigned to a given cultural description, regardless of whether that description was specifically directed toward them or not. As one analyzes examples of cultural description from the tour guidebooks under the lens of ownership, it becomes clear that authorial claims to ownership can be used in the service of promoting an identifiable authorial or editorial agenda. Authors in both the Fodor's and JTB's series employ ownership to fashion selective readings of history, to reinforce claims either to Japanese or Western superiority, or to establish that Japan is

primarily dependent upon, or else independent of, the Western world. Ownership is employed in the service of these and other authorial and editorial goals in ways which permit the critical reader to expand and enrich cultural descriptions to which the lens of ownership is applied.

Tension. The dimension of tension situates cultural description with respect to two polar forces which engender meaning. The dimension of tension states, "All communication simultaneously exhibits two tendencies: one which impels communication toward predictability and standardization, and another which impels it toward unpredictability and uniqueness." According to the Bakhtin group, no communication can be comprised solely of elements which are already known to the audience (each utterance is unique and cannot be replicated), nor comprised entirely of elements which are unknown to the audience (since an entirely unknown utterance could never be sensibly interpreted), but rather of both kinds of elements combined in a state of tension with each other. As one analyzes examples of cultural description from the tour guidebooks under the lens of tension, one can see how the predictable and unpredictable elements combine to allow authors to selectively portray elements of Japanese culture. Authors in both the Fodor's and JTB's series balance predictable elements (those elements which are expected by the reader and hence make him or her comfortable) with unpredictable elements (those elements which are new or surprising and hence disturb the reader's sense of certainty) in identifiable patterns that allow the critical reader more fully to explain what appears to be the central idea behind tourism: that it must have enough unexpected elements to interest the tourist, but that it also must have enough expected elements that the tourist will not feel threatened.

Open and closed perception. The dimension of open and closed perception situates cultural description with respect to author and audience perception. The dimension of open and closed perception states, "All communication is based on the belief of the communicator that his/her own system of perception is open and

unfinished, but that the system of perception of those s/he describes is closed and finished.” According to the Bakhtin group, the world of the author of cultural description is open and free because the author is permitted to choose among various resources open to his or her perception; on the other hand, once cultural description is fashioned, the world of the described culture is limited or closed, particularly to the reader whose perception may be governed by the resources chosen by the describer to fashion his or her description. The more the reader relies only on a particular cultural description as a source of information about the culture, the more completely is the perception of the reader closed to other possible alternative ways of perceiving the other culture. As one analyzes examples of cultural description from the tour guidebooks under the lens of open and closed perception, one can see how the opening of the perception of the author together with the simultaneous closing of reader perception of the cultural Other allows authors to inscribe Japan as either primarily a modern or a traditional country, and as either cultural inventor or cultural borrower. Authors in both the Fodor’s and JTB’s series balance opening and closure of perception in ways that permit the critical reader to analyze more extensively the respective agendas of the authors and editors.

Uncompletedness. The dimension of uncompletedness situates cultural description with respect to preceding and subsequent discourse. The dimension of uncompletedness states, “All communication is fashioned in the awareness of a potential response from those for whom it is fashioned, and in the awareness of previous and subsequent communication on the same subject—hence, no communication can ever be said to be the ‘last word’ on a subject.” According to the Bakhtin group, no cultural description can enter the stream of social discourse disjoined from other discourse, particularly from the discourse to which it answers and the discourse which it expects as an answer. The group held that cultural description may not be regarded as finished, but only considered as a moment in an ongoing

conversation about the culture. As one analyzes examples of cultural description from the Fodor's and JTB's series under the lens of uncompletedness, it becomes clear that each descriptive utterance answers to voices preceding it, while at the same time containing clues to the responses it expects from its audiences. Authors in both the Fodor's and JTB's series fashion their cultural descriptions in obvious awareness of other discourses on their subjects, accomplishing through this process, not a forging of a completely new discursive path, but a following of previous trajectories and a projection into probable paths which will combine to fashion subsequent discourse. Through this situating of discourse, authors in both series orient cultural description toward topics in which readers have shown an interest in the past, frame their messages in language and formatting which are familiar to their readers (but which nevertheless alter over time in response to other discourses), and offer opinion and evaluation in terms and phrasing which, to a greater or lesser extent, come to be known and either accepted or rejected by the readers of tour guidebooks. Tracing the origins and modification of the discourses to which authors in the guidebooks apparently respond enables the critical reader to identify and analyze the past and future development of cultural description.

Value of Comparative/Longitudinal Analysis

My research design incorporates both comparative analysis (that is, comparison and contrast of cultural representations in the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series) and longitudinal analysis (that is, analytical tracking of elements in the guidebook series as these change from one edition to the next). The inclusion of both of these approaches is vital to the meaningful application of the Bakhtin approach to the analysis of cultural representation. As noted in previous discussion, the Bakhtin approach is firmly grounded both in the historical circumstances of discourse production (more amenable to study by analysis of longitudinal change) as well as consideration of the

effect of other discourses upon the quality of a given discursive example of cultural description (more amenable to study by comparison and contrast between two guidebook series, each with its own unique characteristics of “voice”).

Overviews of Subsequent Chapters

Basic Framework of Each Chapter

Each of the next five chapters (Chapter Three through Chapter Seven) describes one of the five dimensions, showing how it relates to the core construct of cultural representation. To establish this relationship, the material in each chapter consists both of general observations and detailed exploration of selected passages. The outline of each of the next five chapters is similar. First, there is a brief description of the dimension which is being discussed. Second, a summary of the results of the analysis comparing Fodor’s and JTB’s use of the dimension is presented. Third, I present results of separate analyses of how each series has evolved over the years covered by the surveyed guidebooks (1962 through 1990 for the Fodor’s guidebook, 1955 through 1991 for the JTB’s guidebook). Fourth, I analyze content themes, as well as themes related to temporal change, separately, for each series, Fodor’s and JTB’s.

Throughout these discussions, selected passages are analyzed for suggestions about how their authors are employing each dimension. Moreover, for certain key utterances, evidence is offered to indicate the typicality of the utterance (such as footnotes offering other examples of similar uses of discourse by the same author or the same guidebook). Chapter Eight offers a summary of the dissertation, together with a discussion of the advantages and limitations of a Bakhtinian approach to analysis of touristic cultural description, as well as an exploration of some promising avenues for future research.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DIMENSION OF SPECIFICITY AND THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION

General Overview

The dimension of specificity was introduced as the first of five dimensions derived from the work of the Bakhtin circle. As an element of cultural representation, specificity links cultural description to the specific sociohistorical circumstances which surround the writing and reading of that description. In many ways, cultural descriptions carry the flavor of their times; as circumstances change, there is an increased likelihood that representations will also change. Of course a virtually limitless number of elements could conceivably be shown to influence the writing of a particular description; the passages from the Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks which are examined below as reflecting the dimension of specificity represent a selection from the available elements.

The Bakhtin group argues that no writing can be considered in the abstract: it is written by specific people in specific circumstances for specific audiences. One way that sociohistorical circumstance dictates changes in touristic representation is through differences in the individual architectonics¹ of the author; not only do individual authors project different views of reality differently, but the same author can, over the years, come to describe the "same reality" in different ways. Each author, at different times, possesses a unique architectonic system, constructed through a specific sociohistorical context.

No representation can escape the specificity of its sociohistorical circumstances. While it is often easy for people to conclude that writings about oneself are "biased" to

¹ A detailed explanation of architectonics can be found on pp. 562-564 of the Appendix.

favor one's own images, seldom do we recognize that writings about the other are equally biased. Consider the situation faced by Japanese writing about Japan. Even before one reads the JTB Guide (published by the Japan Travel Bureau, a governmental organization), one would predict the narratives to favor the Japanese more than visitors. The distrust of government-sponsored touristic materials is not specific to representations of Japanese, however. The doubt arises because most people believe that it is impossible for people to write about themselves objectively.

While such a speculation is not unreasonable, it is more important to recognize that it is impossible to write descriptions objectively, regardless of whether the author is writing something about him- or herself, or about other people. This inability to achieve objectivity is not due to lack of ability on the part of the author, but to the fact that narratives themselves are never acontextual and ahistorical productions.

The same sort of situation is faced by Westerners writing about Japan, although the bias is of a different kind, conditioned by the sociohistorical context within which the West comes to observe, analyze, and inscribe Japan in their touristic descriptions of the country. From a Bakhtinian perspective, these sociohistorical parameters make objectivity impossible for Fodor's or any other guidebook. No understanding can be engaged without observing the "signs of the times" within the discourse itself.

Yield of Comparative Analysis of Specificity—An Overview

Comparing the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series, one can see a number of distinct differences when analyzed through the lens of specificity. First, in the Fodor's series, there is a noticeable emphasis upon specific information and historical circumstances which simultaneously establish the superiority of Western nations and the inferiority of Japan. Particularly in the earlier editions of Fodor's (1962 through 1982), it is difficult to find any passage which admits that Japan is superior to the West

in any respect. The JTB series, on the other hand, highlights information and events which elevate Japan to a status equal to that of Western nations.

Second, in the Fodor's series, particularly the earlier editions, the editors provide evidence supporting stereotypical images of Japan and Japanese; such stereotypes can be seen as elements of sociohistorically specific circumstances recognized by the authors and instantiated in their cultural descriptions. In particular, one finds passages supporting the negative stereotypical views that Japan is underdeveloped, that Japanese are cultural borrowers and workaholics, and that Japanese women are passive and subservient to men. In the JTB guidebooks, in contrast, the emphasis is often upon answering such widespread preconceptions about Japan. While the JTB guidebook seldom declares that its intention is to counteract stereotypes about Japan, textual analysis of key passages reveal that a basic motif in JTB's treatment is to answer Western perceptions reflecting the imbalanced encounter between East and West.

Third, the style of writing in the Fodor's guidebooks employs elements distinctive to the series. Stylistic mechanisms, as part of the author's repertoire of available material to persuade the reader, also reflect the specific circumstances of the time and place in which the description is written. In the Fodor's series, the following stylistic mechanisms are observed: (1) the authorial voice tends to be omniscient; (2) specificity is employed strategically both to imply that research underlies the conclusions and to defer specifying support when it seems lacking; (3) there is considerable use of imaginary narrators and scenarios for the purpose of persuading the reader; and (4) excess specificity is sometimes used as a strategy to redirect reader attention. Working together, these stylistic elements instantiate the unequal distribution of power between Eastern and Western nations. Moreover, until very recent editions, the Fodor's series adopted a style that avoided reliance on extensive

proof or support. Writing from the position of cultural dominance, Fodor's simply inscribes the less-powerful culture.

An equally distinctive style characterizes the JTB series: (1) a high level of specificity and detail is employed to enhance the guidebook's credibility; (2) the narrative frequently conveys the sense that the authors possess "inside information"; (3) inadequate specificity (used either to refer to Japan's remote past or to justify opinion) is employed to establish links to the past; (4) excessive specificity is used to allay tourist fears and to establish authorial credibility; and (5) selective detail is used to target reader architectonics. In contrast to Fodor's, the JTB displays information based on cultural knowledge an outsider could not possibly share.

To summarize, given the context of the imbalanced exchange between the East and the West within which Japan has gradually emerged as a world power, the narrative voice assumed by the Fodor's guidebook series is superior, prone to orient new information to previously existing stereotypes, and omniscient, whereas the narrative voice taken by the JTB guidebook series struggles to establish parity with the West and combat commonly-held stereotypes, relying on sometimes excessive factual detail. Neither the JTB nor the Fodor's series is the more "objective"; each is written from distinct perspectives based on unique historical grounding, to achieve specific goals, and to cater to the needs of their projected audiences.

Of course, history is always evolving. As historical circumstances change, so do touristic descriptions. In the next section, I briefly summarize some of the more important changes revealed through the lens of specificity that occur over the twenty-eight years covered by the five sampled volumes of the Fodor's series (1962 through 1990) and the thirty-six years covered by the volumes of the JTB series (1955 through 1991).

Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Specificity—An Overview

As noted in Chapter Two, in general, links to sociohistorical specificity in the Fodor's series can be characterized as a long period (1962 through 1982) with little or no change, followed by a dramatic change in the 1990 edition. The 1990 edition of Fodor's marks a thoroughgoing alteration in form, content, tone, and coverage. In the early editions, the Fodor's editors tended to maintain the chapter structure and content with only minor revisions in information and phrasing. The 1990 edition, however, contains no material from any of the previous editions. Change in the JTB series, on the other hand, can be characterized as a more or less gradual elaboration of a basic structure that has remained the same over the period covered by the sampled volumes. While sociohistorical circumstance has made it necessary to change some representations, the Official Guide to Japan shows none of the dramatic reorganization and rewriting evident in the Fodor's guidebook between 1982 and 1990.

Specifically, the following key points can be made about the evolution of the Fodor's guidebook series: (1) for the period 1962 through 1982, key passages remain virtually or completely unchanged; (2) at the same time, there are some noteworthy changes in authorship of central chapters in the 1976 and 1982 editions (leading to marked changes in authorial architectonics); (3) there is a noticeable shift from the distant tone of the editions 1962 through 1982 to a highly personalized style in the 1990 edition; (4) in contrast to the previous editions, there is an attempt in the 1990 edition to emphasize highly specific, culturally-sensitive information; (5) the 1990 edition marks the first contribution by a Japanese author (a dramatic shift in authorial architectonics); and (6) the 1990 edition contains more detailed information on several important topics than did the previous editions. Taken together, changes such as these demonstrate that Fodor's exhibits a dramatic shift reflecting Japan's emergent political and economic power.

Even though alteration in the JTB series over the period sampled is less dramatic, one can note several changes in content and style, arising from the changing specific sociohistorical circumstances: (1) gradual change in authorial voice from more apologetic to more assertive; (2) increasing recognition of the importance of international tourism; (3) sense of increasing responsibility toward the government; (4) change in orientation toward other countries (particularly those in Asia); and (5) change in depiction of key sites and locations. In contrast to the resistance in the Fodor's series to recognizing Japan's increasing political and economic status, one sees in the JTB guidebook series a steadily growing assertiveness across the decades considered; comparing each edition with the last, one can sense a growing confidence in the JTB's voice, so that by 1991 there are virtually no apologies for any aspect of Japanese cultural life.

Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to Specificity in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions

This section presents a detailed analysis elaborating upon and bolstering the general sketch just presented. The analysis is organized into three major sections. The first identifies the major themes and temporal changes in the Fodor's descriptions opened up through the lens of the specificity construct; the second section identifies similar themes and changes in the JTB's descriptions. This is then followed by a section that discusses stylistic devices used by the two series for managing specificity.

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Specificity of Fodor's Descriptions

In this section, first, I will discuss two content themes relating to specificity which occur repeatedly in the Fodor's series: (1) reinforcement of a perception of Western superiority and Eastern inferiority; and (2) reinforcement of Western stereotypes about Japan and the Japanese people. In addition, I will discuss six

elements of change relating to specificity in the Fodor's guidebooks from 1962 through 1990.

Fodor's—Superiority of West, inferiority of East. The sociohistorical context which undergirds Fodor's writing about Japan is the conception of the encounter between the East and the West. From the outset, the Fodor's guidebook orients its "Western" visitors to their Oriental fellows: "The intelligent Westerner," announces the 1962 Fodor's edition, "is now setting out to discover new worlds in his traveling" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 3). The "new world" is the "mysterious Orient,"

Of course, the Orient is different from our world and the usual label we pin on it is "mysterious." But this mystery can be pierced if we are prepared to give some thought to the differences separating us and if we are willing to junk many of our preconceived notions. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 4)

This statement also occurs in three later editions of the Fodor's guide (1969, 1976, and 1982), reflecting an unchanged attitude regarding the purposes of the tour guidebook series. The touristic context—the visitor and the visited—from the viewpoint of the Fodor's guidebook, links "intelligent Westerners" and the "mysterious Orient." This contrast between the "we" and the "they" is unambiguous in the Fodor's series.

The political and historical contact between East and West has long been an unbalanced exchange: the political and military power of the West has forced many Asian nations to follow models set up according to Western standards, dictating how "less developed" nations should be more industrialized, more modernized, and even more "Westernized." This sociohistorical context is what leads the Fodor's guide to claim that Westerners have a "superiority complex" whereas Easterners have an "inferiority complex."

We can further situate Japan among other Eastern nations who are subjected to meanings imposed from this overall sociohistorical context. Although Japan was once

considered part of other Eastern countries classified as “less developed,” it nevertheless has gradually emerged as an economic superpower following its defeat in World War II. The historical grounding of the East-West contact has fashioned a set of constraints from which Japan has had to extricate itself; it has faced the task of ridding itself of the label of a “less developed” country and finding a way to make other countries recognize it as “modern” and “industrial.”

One interesting variation of Fodor’s tendency to minimize Japan’s status is the authority the guidebook grants itself to rank order all the nations of Asia. Among many nations in East Asia, Fodor’s clearly grants Japan the most important status. In both the 1962 and 1969 editions, the guidebook is titled, Fodor’s Guide to Japan and East Asia. Here Japan is compared with the rest of “East Asia,” which is composed of twelve other nations (in the 1969 edition, thirteen other nations).

The 1976 and the 1982 editions concentrate only on two nations: Fodor’s Guide to Japan and Korea (the 1982 edition is titled, Fodor’s Guide to Japan and South Korea). While the traveler may see the different title as merely a matter of convenience, as we examine the sociohistorical context behind this grouping, a more complex picture emerges. Among all of the thirteen East Asian nations treated by Fodor’s, only Japan is always identified independently in the title and placed in first position. The importance placed upon Japan, as compared to other Asian nations, is further confirmed in the amount of information provided: among 741 pages of the 1962 edition, Japan occupies 402 pages; among 749 pages of the 1969 edition, Japan occupies 402 pages. In other words, over fifty percent of the book is devoted to Japan alone, while the other Asian nations occupy less than fifty percent of the book.

In the 1976 and 1982 editions, Korea, once one of the group of thirteen other East Asian nations, is isolated out and placed second to Japan, but the guidebook still gives Japan the lead position: of the 512 pages of the 1976 edition, 437 pages are devoted to Japan; and of 463 pages of the 1982 edition, 410 pages are devoted to Japan.

Other so-called "East Asian" countries now receive their own tour guidebooks; however, from Fodor's point of view, Japan has always been the major tourist attraction in Asia.

As Japan is presented in the Fodor's guide, it is clear that Japanese are considered the leaders of all Asia. This analysis is in line with the stated purpose of the Fodor's guidebook:

We have given the title, Japan and East Asia, to this book for two reasons, the first of which is the obvious fact that Japan is still the primary tourist target in Asia, and as a highly developed country with thousands of sights to see, it nearly rates a volume of its own. (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 15-16; identical paragraph found in the 1969 edition, pp. 15-16)

There is more here than simply designation of Japan as the "primary tourist target in Asia"; the Fodor's guide points out that Japan is "a highly developed country with thousands of sights to see," a particularly intriguing comment. As Japan's modernization places it ahead of many other Asian nations, so the Fodor's guidebook is willing to give the country a more significant place as a tourist site. In fact, Japan "nearly rates a volume of its own," a prediction which eventually comes true for Fodor's in 1983.

However, regardless of how important it is in comparison to other Asian nations, Japan is always situated within the East. From Japan and East Asia, to Japan and Korea, Japan's placement with other Asian countries is considered central to its identity. It takes the Fodor's guide more than twenty years (until 1983) to give Japan an independent status in touristic discourse.² This reluctance can be understood within the broader context of East-West contact. The writing of the Fodor's guide is specific to the sociopolitical context which defines the East and the West. In this

² In the 1960s, all Fodor's countries guidebooks give only European nations guidebooks of their own. While other so-called less developed nations, such as Ireland, Israel, and Turkey, were eventually treated in separate volumes of their own in later years, there is no Asian nation given a book of its own.

context, the meaning of Japan is derived principally from the idea of Westerners going to visit an Oriental country.

The 1990 guidebook is the first of the sampled Fodor's editions to be devoted solely to Japan (the first edition to be solely about Japan was published in 1983³), a situation compelled by changing sociohistorical circumstance. This shift may reflect a growing realization by Fodor's editors of Japan's rising popularity as a site for tourists, as well as its increasing political and economic power, necessitating considering the country by itself, rather than as merely a stop on broader itineraries through "Asia."

The lens of specificity may also be employed to reveal Fodor's retreat from detailed explanations of Japan and its culture. Rather than directing the reader's attention toward some phenomenon—such as Japan's increasing attractiveness as a touristic site—the author may deliberately obscure the connections between a description and the sociohistorical circumstances which might give it meaning. This is similar to the situation in day-to-day discourse in which one might say that a speaker is being "deliberately vague." In illustration of this process, consider the description of the city of Kyoto in Francis King's 1962 chapter from the Fodor's guidebook.

In Kyoto, more than anywhere else in Japan, one is aware of East and West, the old and the new existing side by side; but they exist not in opposition, but in perfect harmony and peace. At first it may seem strange that through a modern boulevard, flanked by steel and concrete office buildings, there should sway a procession of huge wooden floats dragged along by sweating men in the costumes of the Tokugawa era, to an accompaniment of a monotonous music played on antique flutes, gongs, and drums. But soon the spectator feels that there is nothing discordant in juxtapositions of this kind. What is best of past and present has here been united; to mediate between the two has been the role of Kyoto for the last 1,000 years. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 278)

³ As noted in Chapter Two, however, the 1983 edition is a minor variation of the section on Japan in the 1982 edition. The 1990 edition, on the other hand, is a major revision devoted entirely to Japan.

Often, the function of generalized descriptions is to reinforce stereotypical thinking on the part of the tourist; in this example, King extends the generality of the descriptors to a considerable extent, speaking not of Japanese and non-Japanese, but of "the East" and "the West." Having made this extension, King proceeds to state the relation between "East" and "West," asserting that they exist "in perfect harmony and peace." Again, one sees the author tending toward the "generality" end of the generality/specificity continuum, struggling to find a connection between two descriptors, and discovering that connection by taking an extremely idealistic stance (not simply "harmony and peace," but "perfect harmony and peace").

However, this is not the only instance illustrating the function of the specificity dimension in King's statement. Another instance occurs with the elaboration of the metaphors "East" and "West." Notice that King, in order to explain what he means by these metaphors, offers a parallel, ". . . East and West, the old and the new . . ." By choosing to specify the metaphor in precisely this way, King further restricts perception of Kyoto and its cultural heritage. Modernity, or progress, is excluded from "the East" and is assigned instead to "the West." Apparently, "perfect harmony and peace" is possible only if the West is assigned the superordinate role.

This general conclusion is reinforced by the second underlined passage, in which King again avoids specificity by assigning an extremely general covering description of the role of Kyoto, stating that the city's purpose is to "mediate" between the "past and present." It is only in the eyes of the idealist that such a statement could be true; indeed, earlier in the paragraph, King himself admits that the juxtaposition may seem strange at first, thus implying that the city is not governed by "perfect harmony and peace" at all times, but rather that the conjunction of these qualities must come to be appreciated over time. Moreover, it is doubtful that changes in culture ever come easily to the inhabitants of any large city, making it very unlikely that Kyoto has harmoniously merged "past and present" for "the last 1,000 years." Rather than

describing the city itself, King manipulates the specificity of description to place Kyoto in the generalized space where qualities such as “perfect harmony and peace” become not only believable to the casual reader, but indeed come to represent a standard way of describing any visited country.

Fodor’s—Reinforcing stereotypes of Japan and Japanese. In touristic writing, as well as any other form of cultural representation, it is impossible to entirely avoid stereotypes. No cultural circumstance can be described without resorting to images presumed to be shared in reader architectonics. Indeed, to a certain extent, invoked images must arise from the shared experiences of the readers. As such, they necessarily must fit specific instances only in the most general fashion. On the other hand, our experiences with Japan have taught us that there are certain stereotypes that ought to be avoided or critically addressed. In this section, I want to discuss four such stereotypes and how, whether deliberately or not, they are reinforced in the Fodor’s guidebook series. The stereotypes are: (1) Japan as an economically underdeveloped nation; (2) Japanese as borrowers of the cultures of other nations; (3) Japanese as workaholics; and (4) Japanese women as passive and subservient to men. As will become clear, the contents of these stereotypes are defined by the sociohistorical context which provides the justification for Fodor’s judgments.

Japan as underdeveloped. In discussing standards of living, one finds the following claim⁴ in the Fodor’s guidebook:

To the Westerner who arrives after having seen other Asian countries, Japan may seem like home, or at least an approach to it. The efforts of the Japanese to be well-groomed must be described as successful, and a commuter train in one of the big cities is likely to contain fewer frayed cuffs than a New York subway train. Japanese consumer habits fall somewhere between the bare subsistence level of continental Asia and the luxury of North America and western Europe. Indeed Japan is perhaps

⁴ Portions of this passage are also analyzed in Chapter Five (pp. 332-334) and in Chapter Seven (pp. 471-474).

the one Asian country that has a standard of living, if by that is meant a level which permits of some luxury and which everyone deems it within his rights and powers to strive for. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 82)

The sociohistorical circumstances of these statements are very intriguing. Japan is not taken on its own terms, but from within the historical meaning of East and West. Japan's identity comes from its comparison with other Asian nations and with nations in the West. Japan's living standards, Japanese consumer habits, and many other aspects of Japanese cultural identity, are to be examined and understood within the divergence of East and West, a dichotomy created and shaped by the complexities of history that justified Western hegemony over the East.

The Fodor's guide thus is clearly an expression of Western political power over Eastern nations; nations are judged by the yardsticks of modernization and industrialization that have been set up by the West. The opening statement summarizes this view: "To the Westerner who arrives after having seen other Asian countries, Japan may seem like home, or at least an approach to it" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 82). This statement immediately puts all Asian nations, including Japan, into a lower position in the eyes of "Westerners." "Home" here is defined not by someone else, but by Westerners themselves. Hence, Japan's accommodations have quality only as they "approach" the ideal standards of the West. The description is laden with the sociohistorical implications.

It is thus highly interesting that this account remains unchanged in the four sampled editions of the Fodor's series through 1982. Through nearly twenty years of rapid economic development, while the Japanese standard of living has moved past that of many Western nations, the Fodor's guide still credits the Japanese only with "an approach" to acceptable Western standards.

The Fodor's guidebook gives Japan credit with seeming reluctance. Japanese are said to have engaged in some "effort" to be "well-groomed," which "must be

described as successful.” What is successful about Japan? That their commuter trains contain “fewer frayed cuffs” than New York subway trains! Japan’s success is always measured against standards of the West, and in this case, not even very high standards. Japan is given the coloration of comparative advantage only in comparison to continental Asian nations. “Japan is perhaps the one Asian country that has a standard of living,” the Fodor’s guide says, and immediately reestablishes the Westerner’s right to define what is meant by “standard of living”: “. . . a level which permits of some luxury and which everyone deems it within his rights and powers to strive for” (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 82).

Japan is said to be situated between “the bare subsistence level of continental Asia” and “the luxury of North America and Western Europe.” The author’s description further strengthens the stereotypical images Westerners have about people of the East: backward, underdeveloped, ignorant, and so on. Certainly not every part of Continental Asia is at the “bare subsistence level,” and certainly not every part of North America and Western Europe is luxurious, but it remains for the Fodor’s guidebook and its readers to describe and locate all Asian nations in this way.

Preserving the image of the “mysterious Orient,” Western visitors are reminded about the terrible situation Asian nations find themselves in, so that Westerners (as advised in the foreword) will have the chance to learn to treat Easterners “as equals.” However, the very act of description sustains a structure of inequality. Historically, the West has had the power to force Asian nations to open their doors, to permit Western nations to exploit their economic circumstances, and as in the Fodor’s guide, to place Asian nations in an inferior status symbolically.

Japanese as cultural borrowers. In explaining how Japan has become a great borrower of other cultures, in a section titled, “Wholesale Importers of Ideas,” Edward Seidensticker (a well-known translator of Japanese literature and widely published commentator on Japan) writes in his essay in the Fodor’s guidebook:

Yet another essential fact about Japan has been more important than these others in shaping the Japanese people and their culture: insularity. The Japanese are fond of comparing themselves to the English, but two facts make the Japanese the more remotely insular of the two people: that they are much farther from their most important continental neighbors than the English are from France, and that they share a common language with no one except some of their former colonials, the Formosans and the Koreans. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 61)

From the author's point of view, Japan is "insular" and does not deserve comparison with the West. In commenting on the dissimilarity between Japan and England, Seidensticker paints Japanese contact in general terms (other countries in its vicinity are called "continental neighbors"), while the "continental contact" of England is identified specifically as France. However, when describing problematic aspects of an island nation's relationships to its continental neighbors, the author is not hesitant to specifically mention two of Japan's colonies, Formosa and Korea. While the writer is glad to point out England's proximity to France, Japan's continental contacts go unidentified as "Eastern countries," thus reserving name and status for the West, while Japan's former colonies can be identified without hesitation (as if the West were morally superior and without a history of colonialism).

Seidensticker's account is one of a number of descriptions in the Fodor's series suggesting that Japan has depended on other countries for its culture; this perspective is what permits Seidensticker to characterize Japanese as "wholesale importers of ideas" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 61; identical statement is found in Fodor's, 1969, p. 61). While acknowledging that Japan has altered the ideas that it imports to such an extent that they can be said to belong to the Japanese people, Seidensticker, by concentrating almost entirely on the borrowing of culture, never actually credits the Japanese for their efforts to adapt the culture of others.

Japanese as workaholics. As we have seen, by selecting certain key details out of the fabric of sociohistorical circumstances, a guidebook author can create a picture

which conveys stereotypic images while ignoring the conventions of evidential support normally considered appropriate to grounded discourse. The technique—which in reality increases distance between actual events and their description and is thus examined here as an instantiation of the dimension of specificity—works by creating an imaginary world which appears to be grounded in specificity. There are several examples of this style contained in the 1990 Fodor's chapter on dining ("The Discreet Charm of Japanese Cuisine," by Diana Durston, pp. 64-77).

This phenomenon is discussed at length later. However, for now, take the passage from Durston quoted below. To fully appreciate how this passage functions as an example of the specificity dimension, one should be aware of how frequently the author of this section utilizes the imaginary tour; rather than situating the reader in a world of specific images (that is, images derived from, and verifiable by empirical reference to, actual physical settings), the author situates the reader in a world which is alleged to have been derived from the author's own experiences (other examples of the use of imaginary scenarios are discussed under the section, "Fodor's: Stylistic Mechanisms," later in this chapter).

Red paper lanterns dangling in the dark above a thousand tiny food stalls on the back streets of Tokyo. To the weary Japanese salaried man on his way home from the office, these akachochin lanterns are a prescription for the best kind of therapy known for the "subterranean homesick blues," Japanese style: one last belly-warming bottle of sake, a nerve-soothing platter of grilled chicken wings, and perhaps a few words of wisdom for the road. Without these comforting nocturnal way stations, many a fuzzy-eyed urban refugee would never survive that rumbling, fluorescent nightmare known as the last train home. (Fodor's, 1990, p. 64)

The chief advantage of this discursive style is that the reader does not have to be burdened with an overwhelming amount of specific information. Indeed, given the author's implied statement that these food stalls are common in Tokyo (note the use of "a thousand" to suggest large numbers), specific description of the variations among

vendors would be futile. To suggest a general picture, on the other hand, one need only mention the specific activities of some of the stalls (the sale of sake or chicken wings, for example) and to couple these statements with other statements about what the author takes to be the motivation of the people who frequent these vendors.

However, as will be evident in several of the passages analyzed, touristic discourse is sometimes marked by an inertial quality governing generalizations: what begins as description may end up as a flurry of ill-considered stereotypes of the cultural Other.

Notice that the passage describing the food stalls begins by making general observations about the number of vendors as well as the services they provide. However, the generalizations begin to run aground when the author talks about Japanese businesspeople as weary, “fuzzy-eyed” refugees in need of “therapy” to deal with the “nightmare” that faces them as they ride home. Yet surely it cannot be all businesspeople who are customers of the food stalls are overworked “urban refugees” who need to have their nerves soothed. That being the case, what is the reason for choosing this particular description to exemplify the kind of business conducted by food vendors?

One explanation for the inclusion of these details is that they play into the general stereotype of Japanese as workaholics. As noted previously, the failure to include specificity in a description, particularly in touristic discourse, is often a signal that the author’s purpose would not be served by reference to detail; for example, a more inclusive description of the clientele of the food vendors would not enable the author to sharpen the vivid description of Japanese businesspeople.

However, the vividness of the description not only makes the passage more memorable, it makes it more likely that the author’s position cannot be challenged. One finds it difficult to believe that the author is describing what she thinks is the typical customer, not simply as a weary businessperson, but indeed as a weary

businessperson who needs fortification for the nightmarish ride home. By manipulating the description away from specificity, the author is permitted to imply things which would be impossible or unlikely under more conventional discursive procedures.

Japanese women as passive and subservient to men. In the passage quoted below (from the 1990 edition of Fodor's), the author (Nigel Fisher, editor of the magazine Voyager International) provides details to inform the tourist about the town of Shimoda. Shimoda is interesting to tourists because it was once the residence of American diplomat Townsend Harris. In 1854, Harris became the first Westerner to make official contact with the government of Japan. However, Shimoda is also a tourist site because of Harris's clouded relationship with a Japanese woman named Okichi. Both elements of Shimoda's fame are recounted in the passage below:

However, for history none of these resort towns has the distinction of Shimoda.

Shimoda's meeting with the West occurred when Commodore Perry anchored his ships off the coast in 1854. To commemorate the event, the Kurafune Matsuri (Black Ship Festival) is held annually May 16-18. It was here, too, that the first American Consulate was located before being transferred to Yokohama in 1857. Townsend Harris was the consul, and Tojin Okichi was his consort. There are several versions about the Harris-Okichi relationship. With the Japanese penchant for sad romance, the heroine is Okichi. One version has Okichi being ordered by the authorities to leave her lover and comfort Harris so that he may feel at home. Another version suggests that Harris picked Okichi out of line of prostitutes. In either case, when Harris returned to America, he abandoned her. (Harris's version is that he forthrightly declined her advances.) Whatever is the truth, apparently when Harris left poor Okichi, she tried for a reconciliation with her old lover. When that failed, she opened a restaurant, took to drink, and eventually took a final plunge into the river. (Fodor's, 1990, p. 251)

In earlier editions of the Fodor's guidebooks,⁵ Shimoda was dismissed as a town trading on "erotic memories" and a "lurid past." These earlier descriptions hardly mentioned the role of the town of Shimoda in the success of Harris's historic mission. At first glance, the weaknesses of the earlier accounts appear to have been avoided in Fisher's 1990 rendering: Shimoda is both acknowledged as a location without equal in terms of "distinction," while at the same time, Fisher explains a number of details about the story of Townsend Harris and Okichi. On closer examination, however, Fisher's passage can be seen to involve a convoluted manipulation of the specificity dimension. Moreover, Fisher's account bears the stamp of sociohistorical circumstance just as clearly as the earlier accounts bore theirs.

Considering first the information about the historical significance of the town of Shimoda, there is little support offered to justify the claim of the first sentence of the passage ("for history none of these resort towns has the distinction of Shimoda"). The significance of Shimoda as a site for Harris's pioneering diplomatic initiatives is treated almost offhandedly, serving primarily as a stage to set up what the author evidently considers to be the important portion of the passage, the discussion of the relationship between Harris and Okichi. Shimoda holds profound historical significance, both for Americans and Japanese (notice, for example, that Fisher mentions the annual Black Ship Festival). However, Fisher's passage fails to highlight the historical significance of Harris's work.

Moreover, further examination of the information about Harris' alleged affair is based less upon fact than on speculation. Notice that there is no specific information presented to substantiate whether Harris and Okichi were romantically involved. Rather, Fisher simply offers a number of rumors recounting Harris's version, Okichi's version, another version that suggests Okichi was picked out of a line of prostitutes,

⁵ See Chapter Four, pp. 171-174.

and yet another version which holds that she was ordered to provide "comfort" to Harris. No support is offered for any of these versions; indeed, Fisher's narrative style suggests that he gives no more credence to one of the versions than any of the others. He does, however, seem to be certain that Okichi died an unhappy death, thus somehow satisfying the Japanese predilection for "sad romance."

In some ways, this variation on specificity, elaborating the brief reference to Shimoda's "lurid past" found in the earlier Fodor's guidebooks, ill serves the Japanese people, particularly Japanese women. Notice how many stereotypes about female Japanese are reinforced by this description: that they are passive; that they can be ordered by authorities to perform sexual favors; that they must be attached to a man (according to some accounts, Okichi left her "lover" to go to Harris, then tried and failed to achieve a reconciliation with her former lover); that they are fond of unhappy romances; that they view suicide as a solution to emotional difficulties; and so on. It is not so much that these characteristics are asserted to be true of Okichi herself as that they are mentioned in this particular context. As Johnson (1988) has noted, these and other stereotypes are part of what she terms the "sexual nexus" of beliefs about Japanese women which have been held by Western culture since its first contact with Japan. Thus, the specificity dimension, which in the earlier editions concealed by generalization, here conceals by excessive detail.

In some ways, then, the 1990 version, while providing more detail about the affair, is even more egregious in reinforcing stereotypes than the previous editions. In the previous editions, the text could be criticized for being more suggestive than specific, and thus failing to acknowledge the cultural integrity of Shimoda. In the 1990 edition, Fisher goes into greater detail, but it is a form of specificity which is designed to denigrate the image of Japanese women. Fisher makes no apology for the gossip he reproduces as alternative explanations of the relationship, but it is nevertheless clear that Fisher (and through Fisher, the editors) display little sensitivity to "poor" Okichi's

reputation and indeed even include her ignominious end as a coda to the story. The rationale for the inclusion of these particular details is unclear and dubious at best: they seem to have been placed in this context primarily because they reinforce the tragedy of Okichi's death and thus become components of a "sad romance." That this is an opportunistic reading of the events connected with Shimoda is easily demonstrated by comparing the 1990 Fodor's account with the version contained in the 1991 JTB guidebook,⁶ which explains in detail Harris's historical significance without mentioning Okichi; it becomes clear that, given the proper engagement of historical specificity, an account of Shimoda becomes possible without reference to its "lurid past." It is significant to note here that stereotypes have not been banished from the 1990 Fodor's edition; they have simply undergone transformation into stereotypes more acceptable in a changed sociohistorical context.

Another example of discourse from the Fodor's series which reinforces stereotypes about Japanese women through manipulation of the dimension of specificity concerns the Japanese geisha, and is particularly fascinating in its illustration of the difficulty experienced by the Fodor's author as s/he tries to decide whether the geisha is an entertainer or a courtesan:

. . . [S]o many geisha were available for other services to men with sufficient money that the geisha and the prostitute became hopelessly intertwined. Today one can only say that all sorts of people call themselves geisha. Some are among the most accomplished musicians and dancers in Japan, and others but take a tentative plunk at a samisen now and then to evade the anti-prostitution law. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 88)

Here the specificity dimension is applied (or rather is avoided) through the use of terms which pretend to quantify a population, but which in fact do not: "so many geisha . . .," "some are among . . .," and "others but take a tentative pluck . . ." Reading

⁶ See Chapter Four, pp. 259-260.

the passage, one would be hard-pressed to know whether there exists in Japan the problem of geishas generally working as prostitutes or not, or whether they are as a rule accomplished artists or not. In fact, read briefly, the passage seems to suggest forethought and perhaps even a neo-Victorian propriety in not condemning the entire population of geisha outright. However, by cloaking the statement in these general descriptors, the author is in fact suggesting the opposite: that the “problem” is more extensive, but is not to be discussed in a “reputable” guidebook.

Elements of temporal change relating to specificity in Fodor’s descriptions. The Fodor’s editions from 1962 through 1982 show little change in content or form, while the 1990 Fodor’s differs dramatically from the earlier editions. In this section, I will focus on five elements of the Fodor’s series which illustrate its evolution: (1) many key passages remain unchanged from 1962 through 1982; (2) there a few changes in authorship of key material from the 1962 through 1982 editions; (3) the 1990 edition changes in tone from distant to personal; (4) the 1990 edition includes more culturally-sensitive information; (5) the 1990 edition includes for the first time a Japanese author; and (6) the 1990 edition contains a greater level of detail on key topics.

Key passages unchanged. Comparatively little of the Fodor’s text is altered over the period from the 1962 through the 1982 edition. However, the 1990 Fodor’s reflects a significant change in both format and content. Since there are far too many examples of passages that remain unchanged over the period 1962 through 1982, I will not dwell on them here: no change is nearly always the rule for the first four editions of the Fodor’s series. Rather, I will direct attention to the minor changes in specific examples as they are relevant in this longitudinal analysis.

Changes in authorship. Although there is general textual stability in the Fodor’s series from 1962 through 1982, there is one noteworthy change in authorship of a key chapter: in the 1962 and 1969 editions the introductory chapter is written by Edward Seidensticker; in the 1976 and 1982 editions, this chapter is written by another well-

known Western author who frequently writes about Japan, Douglas Moore Kenrick. Even though major changes reflecting greater respect for Japan do not come until the 1990 edition, there are hints that as early as the 1976 edition the editors are beginning to suspect that something has to be done.

First, let us consider Seidensticker's chapters (Fodor's, 1962, 1969). In these introductory chapters, Tokyo and Yokohama are said to be ugly and ill-designed:⁷

Tokyo and Yokohama are not beautiful cities, nor are they well-planned. In neither is the proportion of streets to total area anything like that in any major American or European city, and particularly in Tokyo, what streets there are follow no discernible plan. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 58)

These judgments register the voice of time. One can discern a sense of arrogance, derived from the superior attitude of a Westerner toward Japan. The intriguing issue is why the author needs to compare cities in Japan with those in the West. Moreover, this comparison is not simply a tallying of manifest differences, but a value judgment made at the author's own volition. The author assumes that any city should follow a "discernible plan" and should be "well-organized," as would be the case in any "major American or European city." Clearly, the model in Seidensticker's comparison has been set up by his projection of a particular Western ideal that is assumed appropriate for everyone in the world.

The valuation of the differences is sustained by the well-established distinction between the East and the West. The author's comparison, by making reference to cities in the East and West, serves to further reinforce this gap, a gap that must exist if the accustomed discourse about the East and the West is to function.

The devaluation of Japanese cities and the high value given Western cities show the lingering imprint of the West's assumed dominance over Eastern nations, even in

⁷ Portions of this passage are analyzed later in this chapter, pp. 118-120.

making these seemingly innocent and irrelevant judgments about Japanese cities. This presumed dominance persists not only in the political or economic spheres, but as well in the symbolic space of touristic discourse. The historical inscription of the meanings of being Western and being modern defines the meaning of this passage. Far more than being simply an account provided to facilitate tourists' visits to Japan, these statements acquire their meanings from a deeply embedded sociohistorical context that is itself marked and continued through such narratives.

Not surprisingly, having the introductory chapter to the 1976 and 1982 editions written by a different author, Douglas Moore Kenrick, projects a very different perspective. There is no criticism of the traffic, the outlook of Tokyo, or the Japanese people; Tokyo and other major cities are described in a less judgmental tone. As Japan acquires more power in international politics and becomes more lucrative to Fodor's as a tour site, the guidebook's discourse becomes less harsh, and more favorable, in depicting Japan.

Change in tone—From distant to personal. The dimension of specificity is instantiated much differently in the Fodor's 1990 guidebook than in the previous guidebooks in the Fodor's series. In the 1990 edition, there is a much more overt recognition of certain sociohistorical circumstances (primarily the increasing power of Japan) dictating how the guidebook is written. This can be seen principally in two ways: (1) by the tentative nature of much of the phrasing; and (2) by the tone and approach of the introductory chapter.

In contrast to the declaratory and encompassing style of the phrasing contained in much of the descriptions found in earlier Fodor's guidebooks, one finds a much more tentative approach in the 1990 guidebook. There are fewer instances of statements on the order of Seidensticker's subtitle for his chapter in the 1962 edition, describing Japan as "a crowded, lonely land" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 55). Rather, one sees far more statements such as this (from the introductory chapter, written by Oliver

Statler):⁸ "Inscrutable is an adjective that has long been applied to the Japanese; in my opinion, it's misapplied." The tone here is cautious; the author does not declare absolutely that Japanese are or are not "inscrutable," but rather states a general belief about which the author has an opinion. Another example, from the chapter on history by Jon Spayde: "To patriotic Japanese, the China campaign had an irrefutable logic: the territorial gains for which Japanese servicemen had shed their blood in 1895 and 1905 had been stolen by the jealous West. . . ." This account, while not providing an excuse for Japanese aggression, at least seems prepared to consider that Japan may have had its own reasons that justified engaging in military expansionism. In the earlier editions, there is virtually no indication that Japan may have been justified in its military activities. Another example, from Fisher's introductory chapter, concerns the cultural homogeneity of Japanese: "I do not put much faith in analyses that attempt to explain the Japanese character and personality."⁹ This is a drastic departure from the large number of declaratory summations of what the Japanese "are" which populate the earlier editions, particularly in the introductory chapter by Edward Seidensticker.

Of the many reasons there may be for this change from declaratory to tentative phrasing, certainly one of the most significant is that, by 1990, it had become far more fashionable to "take cultures on their own terms," and not judge them by the standards of the visitor's culture. Moreover, Japan had also become a more powerful nation. To accommodate these changed circumstances, the later edition could not afford to be seen as adopting a demoting attitude toward Japan. Instead, its commentary needed to allow for the validity of other opinions.

I noted above that in the editions prior to 1990, the Fodor's guidebooks on Japan included an introductory chapter (the first "substantive" chapter, following the

⁸ This statement is analyzed in discussion of the dimension of tension, Chapter Five, pp. 290-291.

⁹ This statement is analyzed in greater detail in the discussion of open and closed perception, Chapter Six, pp. 387-388.

preliminary current tourist information) that is extremely negative in tone. Particularly in the 1962 and 1969 editions, this chapter, authored by Edward Seidensticker, has virtually nothing positive to say about Japan; the information which is complimentary to the country is couched in phrases which suggest that, despite these good qualities, Japanese do not now, nor could they ever, measure up to "Western" standards.

Only occasionally does one find such negatively phrased descriptions in the introduction to the 1990 edition. Moreover, the introductory chapter has been moved to the very front of the book, preceding Chapter 1 ("Essential Information," pp. 2-42). The tone of the 1990 introductory chapter is in fact overly cautious, making virtually no declarations about the country that are not immediately qualified as being the personal opinion of the author, Oliver Statler. Moreover, many of the descriptions in the chapter are deliberately and painstakingly framed as the personal experience of the author: "I first came to Japan when it was an occupied country after World War II" (Fodor's, 1990, p. xxiv), and, "Looking back, I can trace three paths that drew me into this fascinating, beautiful, and exasperating country" (Fodor's, 1990, p. xxiv).

The introductory chapter prepares the reader for the material that will follow. It is a primary source of information which serves to frame the more detailed information in subsequent writing. The introductory chapter is particularly powerful when it is read by someone who knows little or nothing about the host country. Therefore, the decision to endorse either a primarily negative chapter (such as that written by Seidensticker in 1962 or 1969), a less negative chapter (such as that written by Kenrick in 1976 or 1982), or a positive chapter (such as that written by Statler in 1990) is an important indication of how the editors perceive the sociohistorical climate. In fact, the strategy of including a negative description at the beginning of the guidebook was considered successful enough to have been retained by Fodor's through their 1982 edition. Clearly, the editorial perspective has changed by the 1990

edition; through the lens of the specificity dimension and its emphasis on sociohistorical detail, one is led to conclude that the five introductory chapters map Japan's emerging role as an economic and political power across the second half of the twentieth century. With each successive revision of the chapter, there is more recognition of Japan's integrity and status as a nation and less emphasis on its deficiencies.

The section on cuisine by Diane Durston is also replete with examples of highly specific discourse; in fact, in Durston's chapter, it is difficult to find passages which do not seem similar to Statler's highly personalized style. On the other hand, the generalizations characteristic of Durston's subsection are largely unrepresentative of the style of other descriptions in the book; as noted before, the overall tone (even in Statler's chapter) of the 1990 edition is much more reasoned and tentative than is the case in the previous editions.

Change to culturally-sensitive information. In the 1990 edition of Fodor's, along with the exclusion of less negative depictions characteristic of the later editions, one also notes the inclusion of material which specifically shows that the editors are making an effort to be more sensitive to the cultural integrity of the Japanese people. I have already noted, for example, the greater reluctance to summarize Japanese culture so that it appears inferior to "Western" cultures. Another indication is the expanded chapter on Japanese food, titled "The Discreet Charm of Japanese Cuisine" (Fodor's, 1990, pp. 64-77). In the earlier editions, 1962-1982, Japanese food was treated by the Fodor's guidebook as exotic fare best left to the daring (in all four previous editions, the title of the chapter on Japanese dining is, "Food and Drink: A Challenge to the Adventurous"). In the 1990 guidebook, however, Japanese food is described in detail, not simply in terms of its preparation, but its appearance and the requirements for freshness. The 1990 edition contains about seven times as much information about food as any of the four previous editions. Indeed, the 1990 edition's Chapter 2,

“Portraits of Japan,” is in fact comprised of only two essays, one on Japanese history and the other on Japanese food, while the title page to this chapter is illustrated by a drawing of the popular bento lunch box sold by many street vendors in Japan. The chapter closes with a short list of “do’s-and-don’t’s” in table manners for eating in Japan. Such consideration for the integrity of the host country is almost entirely absent in the earlier editions, where cultural idiosyncrasies are treated more as an annoyance for the visitor than activities which must be acknowledged and paid respect.

Another indication that Fodor’s has become more “culturally sensitive” is in the format of the chapters. There are no chapters consisting of the highly-opinionated narratives characteristic of the earlier editions; rather, each chapter is laid out as an itinerary, directing the visitor where to go and what to see. This style of description is less likely to contain broad, covering statements which summarize Japanese culture in objectionably vague terms: by forcing him- or herself to direct the reader in specific contexts, the author has less latitude for pontification or editorializing. In the earlier editions, the style could be described as that of a “textbook” (declaratory, certain); in the 1990 edition, the style is more like a “how-to” manual (straightforward, tentative, suggestive).

A third indication of increasing respect for Japanese culture is to be found in the extensive listing of material for further reading. A three-page section with recommendations for works to consult on Japanese topics closes Chapter 1: included are descriptions of books on Japanese history, religion, literature, sociology, art/architecture, and film. Nor are the listed books in any sense “lightweight”: the list includes such recognized classics as George Sansom’s monumental three-volume History of Japan, and Zen texts such as The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch. Under the listing for art/architecture books, the guidebook recommends not only what books to read, but lists several art museums in the United States with noteworthy Japanese collections that the visitor can go to prior to coming to Japan in order to

become familiar with the styles of the artists. This concern for the integrity of Japanese art could hardly be more different from the treatment of the subject in the earlier editions in which the chapter title was "Arts and Lesser Pleasures," including geisha together with Japanese literature and film. Moreover, in the earlier editions, there was no hint of suggestions for "further reading"; indeed, from the declaratory nature of the descriptions, it seemed as if the authors considered their word on the subject to be final, so that further support was superfluous.

There are far too many instances of Fodor's changed perspective in the 1990 edition to detail them all here. However, the three examples just discussed show that the attitude toward the integrity of Japanese culture expressed in Fodor's descriptions was transformed from the earlier editions. Ironically, just as the Fodor's series, in response to the specific circumstances of history, undergoes a broadening of its perspective, the JTB guidebook simultaneously appears to undergo a narrowing of its perspective. While the 1990 edition of the Fodor's guidebook is the first edition to contain a list of books for further reading, the 1975 and 1991 editions of the JTB guidebook remove the extensive bibliography that was contained in the 1955 edition. One can infer from the JTB's decision that it no longer felt the need to refer readers to outside sources, since the JTB guidebook itself could serve as the definitive source on the matters it takes up. On the other hand, the Fodor's guidebook, perhaps in response to its earlier insensitivity to Japanese culture, seeks in the 1990 edition to bolster its position by referring readers to other sources. This is precisely the situation predicted by the dimension of specificity: each of the descriptions is situated in a specific time, taking meaning as much from the sociohistorical circumstances of the time as from any "intrinsic" meaning in the text.

As a point of comparison for demonstrating how Fodor's has changed its approach to Japanese art, we can examine the 1990 material concerning the Lady Murasaki's The Tale of Genji. In the earlier editions, the work is mentioned as a

Japanese literary classic whose style is dismissed as “discursive and rambling enough.”¹⁰ The inclusion of some specific details, such as its writing style, while excluding other details, manipulates the specificity dimension to move the narrative farther away from sociohistorical circumstances than is appropriate for reader understanding.

In contrast, notice in the passage quoted below how the author chooses details to give the reader a completely different picture of this literary work:

The literary and cultural high noon of this age was the regency of Michinaga Fujiwara (served 996-1027), and the masterpiece of Michinaga’s heyday was Genji Monogatari (The Tale of Genji). This enormous work of fiction was given to world literature by the greatest of Heian’s many women authors and poets, the prim, scholarly court lady we know as Murasaki Shikibu (ca. 970-ca. 1030). Her book is an extended portrait of the age’s beau ideal: Hikaru Genji, the complete courtier. Genji composes poetry with effortless brilliance, judges elegant handwriting with a connoisseur’s eye, and plays the great drum or the flute beautifully at court music sessions. But mainly, Genji is a lover, and the novel is, among other things, a great catalogue of womankind. Its sophisticated truthfulness and psychological subtlety easily survive 900 years and translation into another tongue. (Fodor’s, 1990, p. 47)

In this passage, not only is more emphasis given to the importance of the novel as a watershed in Japanese history, but there are at least two indicators reflecting the author’s awareness of crucial changes in the context to which the new edition of Fodor’s is written. First, one can notice an increased sensitivity to the status of women: the author of the novel is identified by her full name, Murasaki Shikibu (in the earlier editions, she is called “the Lady Murasaki”), and she is described as being one of a number of women authors of her time. Moreover, the novel itself is described as being, “among other things”, a “great catalogue” of womankind (in other words, the key element in the description is not Genji himself, but the women with whom he has

¹⁰ This characterization is analyzed in detail later in this chapter (pp. 117-118).

his affairs). This depiction represents an elevated perception of females that almost certainly results from the struggles of the feminist movement during the 1970s and 1980s.

Second, the hero of the novel is also given a full name—Hikaru Genji—and is assigned a number of laudable qualities, including literary ability, musical talent, and discrimination in evaluating calligraphy. Even more interesting, however, is the fact that Genji's amorous adventures—the feature of the novel for which it is perhaps best known—are relegated to the latter portion of the descriptions, following his other accomplishments. In the earlier editions of Fodor's, attention is focused on how the novel instantiates the values of Heian court life; in other words, the hero of the novel becomes a metaphor for what the author is trying to say about the historical period. In the 1990 edition, however, the author refuses to see Genji as merely a symbol; his individual talents are presented in greater detail. Moreover, the 1990 Fodor's picture of Genji is fully fleshed: his reputation as a "lady's man" is referred to only after his other more elevated qualities have been established.

Both of these indicators may reflect the increased sensitivity to sociohistorical circumstances of the late 1980s, when issues of cultural diversity and gender equity assumed more prominence in American life. In the 1990 edition, the author steps warily in descriptions of the cultural Other. Other changes in sociohistorical circumstances may also be informing the shift in perspective noticeable in the 1990 edition; for example, given the vast increase in writing about the country of Japan during the 1970s and 1980s, and the increasing interest in that country, the dismissal of Murasaki's style as "discursive and rambling enough," as in the 1962 through 1982 editions, cannot be sufficient to satisfy the heightened desire of Western readers to know about the "real Japan."

Inclusion of Japanese author. Another telling indication of the change in the perspective of the Fodor's guidebook can be seen in the fact that the 1990 edition

contains the first contributions by a Japanese author. To demonstrate the distinctive flavor of a Japanese writing about Japan, we can turn to the scene of the Kasuga Shrine at Nara, described in earlier editions as having so many lanterns that the person who possessed perseverance enough to count them all would surely become a millionaire. In the passages from these earlier editions, the author relied on deliberate obscurity to achieve a dubious conclusion. Notice how the tone changes in the passage below, which shifts from the generality of the earlier editions toward specificity. In adopting this style, the author (a Japanese newspaper reporter and freelance writer named Kiko Itosaka) presents a reasonable and restrained picture of the Kasuga, beginning with a specific picture and proceeding to an informed recounting of the history of the shrine.

Cross a small bridge over a stream, and walk along on the path that leads into shady and peaceful woods. At the end of the path, turn left up the staircase before you, and you will be in front of the Kasuga Taisha Shrine. Kasuga was founded in 768 as a tutelary shrine for the Fujiwaras, a prominent feudal family. It is famous for the more than 2,000 stone lanterns that line the major pathways to the shrine, all of which are lit three times a year on special festival days (Feb. 2, Aug. 14-15). For many years after its founding, the shrine was reconstructed, following the original design, exactly every 20 years according to Shinto custom, as is the case with the famous Ise Jingu shrine in Mie Prefecture. (Kasuga, however, has not been rebuilt in many years.) The reason that many Shinto shrines are rebuilt is not only to renew the materials, but also to purify the site. It is said that Kasuga Taisha has been rebuilt over 50 times, the last time being in 1893. (Fodor's, 1990, pp. 391-392)

Note the distinct difference from the earlier editions of the tone achieved by this writer, the first Japanese person to have been featured as an individual author in any of the examined Fodor's editions (Itosaka contributes two other chapters, on Kyushu and Kobe, to the 1990 Fodor's edition). In the passages in the earlier editions, there were indications that the author was referencing a folk superstition without attempting to explain the rationale underlying the image used. By contrast, Itosaka's narrative is devoid of suggestions of folk superstition, relying instead on a

straightforward presentation of historical fact. The reader is given what appears to be an accurate description of the shrine; the account is on its face believable precisely because there is no attempt to make the number of lanterns seem to be greater than there actually are. Moreover, Itosaka adds to her credibility, first, by emphasizing that the Kasuga Shrine has not itself been restored for many years, and second, by mentioning cultural factors unlikely to occur to a non-Japanese author (that the shrines, “by custom,” are restored every twenty years, and that one purpose of restoration is “purification”). These items of information are not mentioned in the earlier editions.

For our discussion, the important factor is that Itosaka writes in a uniquely Japanese voice, situated in a specific set of architectonics and engaging a unique set of sociocultural factors. That sites could be “purified,” that indeed, they could ever be considered as anything other than sites for tourists, least of all as religious locales, is unlikely to occur to someone not a member of Japanese culture. This cultural “blind spot” can also be seen in Fodor’s descriptions of Buddhist religious artifacts: in the Fodor’s guidebook series, religious statuary are treated primarily as art objects, as historically interesting, as awe-inspiring for their size;¹¹ hardly ever is their religious significance explained. From the perspective of cultural members, on the other hand, such objects often possess primarily religious significance, and are considered touristic objects only in a secondary sense. The inclusion of an identified Japanese author such as Itosaka in the Fodor’s guidebook is perhaps the clearest indication of the change in sociohistorical circumstances that the Fodor’s editors are forced, by 1990, to acknowledge. In framing the message in 1990, respect for Japanese cultural integrity is de riguer.

¹¹ See, for example, the discussion of the Daijutsu, later in this chapter, pp. 140-143.

Greater level of detail on key topics. A final element indicating change in specificity in the 1990 Fodor's concerns the use of increased detail on some key topics thought to be of concern to tourists. We have already looked Durston's more detailed chapter on Japanese dining; another example is the 1990 edition's explanation of taxicabs in Japan. Earlier editions described Japanese taxicabs as risky and the drivers as "lawless," reckless, and somewhat hostile. These negative evaluations were expressed in the most general terms, often simply as a phrase; for example, the 1962 Fodor's characterizes the Japanese city as "the world of the undisciplined taxi driver" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 84). In contrast, notice how more specific information is brought into the description in the 1990 edition, muting the author's criticisms by the inclusion of supportive detail.

Taxis are a convenient but expensive way of getting around cities in Japan. The first 2 kilometers cost ¥480, and it is ¥90 for every additional 370 meters (940 yards). If possible, avoid use of taxis during rush hours (8 AM-9 AM and 5:30 PM-6:30 PM).

In general, it is easy to hail a cab. Do not shout or wave wildly, but rather simply raise your hand. Do not try to open the taxi door, because all taxis have an automatic door-opening function. The door will slam in your face if you are too close to it. When you leave the cab, do not try to close the door. The driver will again use the automatic system. Only the curbside rear door opens. A red light on the dashboard indicates an available taxi, and a green light indicates an occupied taxi.

The drivers are for the most part courteous. Sometimes they will balk at the idea of a foreign passenger because they do not speak English. Unless you are going to a well-known destination such as a major hotel, it is advisable to have a Japanese person write out your destination in Japanese. Remember, there is no need to tip. (Fodor's, 1990, pp. 23-24)

The stereotype of the "undisciplined taxi driver" is part of the repertoire of horrifying images possessed by visitors to virtually any foreign city. It is also true that the writers of the earlier Fodor's editions played to this and many other stereotypes in

order to portray Tokyo as an environment whose veil one penetrates only with time and patience.

In the quoted passage, we again note the predominance of qualified phrasing found so often in the 1990 edition. Japanese taxi drivers are “for the most part” courteous; taxis are convenient “but expensive”; and so on. Use of these tentative phrases suggests that the author recognizes his or her responsibility to provide useful information, but one finds in the marshaling of the facts some indication of another sense of responsibility—that toward the cultural integrity of the Japanese people. Throughout the 1990 edition, one senses in the voices of the authors a reluctance to say anything very critical about Japanese. This, of course, is a dramatic departure from the tone characteristic of the earlier editions. Compare the passage quoted above with an earlier description of Tokyo traffic by Edward Seidensticker: “. . . particularly in Tokyo, what streets there are follow no discernible plan. Tokyo has six major traffic jams a day, or did back in 1960, when the Metropolitan Police last exposed the facts to the garish light of the press” (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 56). In Seidensticker’s description little hope is held out for coming to terms with Tokyo’s notorious traffic congestion; the quotation from the 1990 edition, however, is a straightforward statement about what one can expect from a taxi ride in a Japanese city.

One can discover among the various sociohistorical circumstances a variety of reasons for the change in tone from the 1962 to 1990 editions. The most obvious explanation would be that conditions have indeed changed over twenty-eight years; taxi drivers may have become more professional and service improved by 1990. This explanation, however, does not explain why, in the earlier editions, there is little or no specific description about the procedure for riding in taxis in Japanese cities. Even if the taxi service was formerly terrible—indeed, especially if the taxi service was formerly terrible—the responsible travel writer would almost certainly want the potential visitor to know what to do in order to get around in Japan. Notice that, even

in the less critical description found in the 1990 edition, one can find some warnings (taxi are not easy to hail at certain times, one needs to watch automatic doors, and so on). In the general description chapters from the editions from 1962 through 1982, such warnings could also have been included; if the service had indeed been inferior, of course, the negative comments would have clearly outweighed the positive.

However, the strategy pursued in the earlier editions precluded even primarily negative depictions; rather, the attitude of the authors of the earlier editions seems to have been to choose some vague details of taxi rides in Japan, and then to fashion descriptions which played to the fears of the guidebook's readers (traffic bottlenecks, "undisciplined" taxi drivers, and so on). Thus, it is less likely that the change in narrative style reflects an objective change in level of service; rather, it is more likely that it is the authors and sociohistorical conditions that have changed. In 1962, Japan was still associated in the minds of many Westerners with World War II. By 1990, on the other hand, not only had Japan become an acceptable, "safe" location to visit, but it had risen to the status of one of the most advanced and modern nations in the world; hence, Fodor's adopts the strategy of treating the Japanese taxi driver in the same way one would treat the taxi drivers of other large metropolitan areas: straightforward information combined with needed warnings to potential riders. More than reflecting change in taxi service, the changes in emphasis are related to overall changes in perceptions of Japan as a site to be visited.

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Specificity of JTB's Descriptions

In this section, first, I will focus on two content themes relating to specificity which recur in the JTB's guidebooks series: (1) elevation of Japan to equal status with the West; and (2) answers to stereotypes about Japan. Second, I will examine elements relating to specificity which indicate change in the JTB's series over the period 1955 through 1991.

Elevating Japan to equal status with the West. While the Fodor's series reinforces perceptions of the West's superiority over Japan, the JTB series struggles to correct the imbalance, attempting to raise the tourist's conception of Japan to the level enjoyed by "advanced," industrialized Western nations. This process frequently involves complex manipulations of the specificity dimension; facts are arrayed, presented and framed in ways portraying Japan in a favorable light. One noteworthy example concerns the descriptions of the Sino-Japanese war and Japan-Russia war. According to the JTB guidebook, the Sino-Japanese war resulted from the following events:

The war broke out in July 1894. Unable to hold its own against Japan, China pleaded for peace, and a peace treaty was signed in 1895. As a result, China ceded to Japan the Liaotung Peninsula and Formosa. But Russia, Germany and France intervened and demanded that Japan return the peninsula. Japan had no choice but to concede. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1975, p. 135; similar statements are found in the 1955 edition, p. 86)

The words used to describe this event are very carefully chosen. The war "broke out" rather than being initiated by either party; the political state of affairs of the time, not the Japanese, are responsible for the conflict. To say that China "pleaded" for peace suggests a submissive position for China. Russia, Germany and France "intervened" and "demanded," rather than "negotiated" or "reasoned with" the Japanese. No mention is made of what happened to Formosa, which China ceded to Japan (Formosa is known today as Taiwan, Republic of China). The JTB historical narrative, while pretending to objectivity in describing historical events, in fact portrays international politics as simply a matter of give-and-take among interactants. To leave this impression, the JTB authors are forced to choose their language very carefully, picking references which connect to sociohistorical circumstances that are favorable to the case they want to make.

JTB authors, however, seem less concerned about reader reaction to China, which is depicted as having had to “plead” for peace. In the 1991 JTB’s edition, the word “pleaded” is replaced with “requested.” The same historical event thus is given a different interpretation. If China did not “plead” for peace, but simply “requested” it, a more equal status is established between the Chinese and the Japanese. Why was it necessary to change this status implication? The answer may lie in the change of the contemporary sociohistorical context in which the relation between Japan and China is defined. For example, in the 1991 edition, one finds the following description of diplomatic relations between the two countries: “In the diplomatic field, 1978 was a monumental year as the Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Japan and People’s Republic of China was signed” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 103). With the declaration of friendship between Japan and China, China’s role in the Sino-Japanese conflict was modified so that it only had to “request” peace. The recounting of the event is seen to be not simply an issue of “accurate” description, but of how, within the changed sociohistorical context, the event is interpreted and presented.

A similar analysis can also be applied to the description of the Japan-Russia war: “Subsequently, Russia sent troops to Manchuria (now, the northeastern district of China) and gradually made it clear that it had designs on Korea and Chinese territory—a manifestation of her long-cherished desire to secure an ice-free port in the Far East” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 100; similar statements can be found in both the 1975 and 1955 editions, except that, in the 1955 edition, there is no reference to the fact that Manchuria is now the northeastern district of China). Notice that Russia is described simply as having “sent” troops to Manchuria and only “gradually” having revealed its “long-cherished desire” for an ice-free port. Russia did not exploit China or Korea, but simply “had designs” on their territory. Moreover, it is not an issue of whether the invasion took place in China or Korea, but an issue of whether Russia needed a warm-water port in the “Far East.”

Why does the JTB guidebook choose to describe Russia in such a friendly tone, minimizing Russia's ambition and the damages that its incursions may have created for the Chinese and the Koreans? One possible explanation is that Japan, particularly during World War II, was equally, if not more, aggressive in invading other nations. One might conclude that Japan had no right to condemn Russia for what Japan itself had done. However, rather than merely reflecting fairness, this rhetorical formulation provides a means to maintain the dignity of the Japanese themselves: by not blaming Russia, Japan need not blame itself. Moreover, since Japan is at risk of being blamed for its own military adventurism, the JTB guidebook must try to deflect memory of World War II and avoid arousing animosities associated with intentional aggression. Since the potential readers of the JTB guidebook are primarily Westerners rather than those countries invaded by Russia or Japan, such descriptions could be calculated as highly unlikely to arouse objections.

The foregoing provides an interpretive frame for appreciating the following statements, in which the JTB guidebook offers an account of the outcome of the Sino-Japanese and Russia-Japan wars: "The fact that Japan emerged victorious from these two wars was instrumental in elevating its international standing and accelerating the development of its capitalistic structure" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 100; identical statements can be found on page 86 of the 1955 edition, and page 135 of the 1975 edition). Victory simply "emerged"; the suffering and damage caused by these wars is not mentioned, and the most important fact for Japan is that these conflicts contributed to its international standing and economic development. The wars are constructed as "instrumental" to Japan's status as a nation, and no space is created for thinking of the wars as involving suffering and sacrifice.

It is important to note that these complex explanations are made possible because JTB authors, like other authors, must select among a virtually limitless number of sociohistorical conditions to fashion a coherent account of history. The position

assumed by JTB is dictated by the goal of representing Japan in the best possible light; therefore, information is reflected and framed in terms favorable to Japan (just as Francis King had to select among pieces of information in order to paint an idealistic image of Kyoto¹²). As sociohistorical circumstances change, the selection and orchestration of “facts” is altered in response to such changes.

JTB—Answering stereotypes about Japan and Japanese. A recurrent pattern in the JTB’s descriptions is correction of what are taken to be inappropriate images of Japan and the Japanese among Westerners. In this section several negative stereotypes addressed in the JTB guidebooks are identified and discussed to illustrate the centrality of this feature of the guidebook: (1) Japanese as warlike; (2) Japanese as cultural borrowers; and (3) Japanese religious shrines as tourist attractions.

Japanese as warlike. One very important element of its “image” that Japanese must work to correct for its American visitors is a legacy from the World War II period: its identity as a bellicose, aggressive nation. Given the events of World War II, this is a difficult task, not made any easier by perhaps unconscious associations in the Western mind between Japanese and war: it is not coincidence that the first pictorial drawing one encounters in the Fodor’s guidebooks, 1962 through 1982, depicts a menacing samurai warrior with a drawn sword, ready to strike. To show one approach taken by JTB editors toward correcting the popular perception that Japan is hungry for territory, I will examine a passage relating how the Ryukyu islands came to be part of Japanese territory.

The ambiguous status of the Ryukyu islands—whether they belong to the Chinese or the Japanese—has long been a thorny issue in Asian politics. However, at the present time these islands are classified as part of the Okinawa Prefecture under

¹² See this chapter, pp. 67-69.

the terms of an agreement between Japan and the United States in 1971. According to the account in both the 1975 and 1991 editions:

In 1971, Japan signed an agreement on the Ryukyu islands with the United States of America providing for an end to the island chain's postwar occupation rule by the U.S. Forces and its reversion to the homeland as the new prefecture of Okinawa. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, pp. 101-102; in the 1975 edition, p. 137)

In the 1955 edition, there is no mention of the Ryukyu islands as part of Japanese territory because they were not at that time included as part of Japan. The only reference to these islands is to their role in transporting music for the samisen from China to Japan (p. 201 and p. 214). Since the Ryukyu islands became part of Japanese territory in 1971, both the 1975 and 1991 editions of the JTB guidebook include independent sections on the Ryukyu Islands as touristic sites.

This historical account is indeed puzzling. There is no mention of what happened to these islands prior to the postwar occupation by the United States. To take an extreme example, Japan would not need to have signed an agreement with the United States to confirm that Honshu, the largest island in Japan, belongs to Japan. The fact that there was such an agreement concerning the Ryukyu Islands indicates that the claim that these islands belong to Japan was legitimized through the agreement. Moreover, there is no question—according to the JTB guidebook—of the legitimacy of the United States in “giving” the Ryukyu islands to the Japanese.

Without referring to what this agreement actually achieves, without questioning the legitimacy of either the United States or Japan in this matter, and without referring to the historical underpinnings of the confusion over the Ryukyu islands' legal status, the JTB guidebook skillfully allays the doubt one might have over whether Japan does have legitimate claim to the islands. This attempt is not surprising, if one takes into account that the JTB guidebook is written by the Japanese government, and is aimed at

Western readers. The description of this event, then, is specific to its audience and to its sociohistorical circumstances. One might expect such writing to arouse objection, for example, if the readers are Chinese who have been embroiled for many years in a conflict over ownership of the islands. By the 1991 edition, however, Japan has become so confident of itself that it does not even bother to refer to China, instead depicting in comfortable tones the agreement between Japan and the United States.

Japanese as cultural borrowers. Japan has often been criticized for its practice of borrowing elements of other cultures and then adjusting or revising these elements to fit the Japanese culture. In the passage below, the JTB author discusses the revision of architectural ideas during the Meiji Restoration. Here, the JTB guidebook utilizes variations of verb forms to indicate a preference for one side of the dichotomy between “Western” and “Eastern” thought:

The Meiji Restoration of 1868 brought about a complete change of every aspect of Japanese culture and architecture was no exception. When Japan opened its doors to foreign countries, Western architecture began to be vigorously imported. . . . Compromises between Japanese and Western styles, or what might be called quasi-Western structures, marked the beginning of Western architecture in post-Restoration Japan. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, pp. 200-201)

Here one finds the pattern often utilized by JTB to depict themselves as having gone out to Western nations to gain new perspectives: once Japan “opened its doors” to foreign countries, “Western architecture began to be vigorously imported. . . .” However, the management of the guidebook’s intentions is achieved through the deliberate use of active and passive verbs: Japan (actively) “opened” its doors, but Western architecture “began to be imported” (waited for Japanese to open their doors). Essentially, these verb forms connect to different specific aspects of the sociohistorical “reality,” enabling the JTB author to infuse the narrative with different elements of specificity, for the purpose of achieving different goals.

True realization of the implications of the dimension of specificity would demand that other aspects of two-way communication be emphasized, both for the Japanese and for Westerners: each would be depicted as exchanging cultural influence, each would be shown as both gaining and losing through that process, and each would be depicted as both independent and dependent beneficiaries of the process. However, this balanced approach almost never occurs in touristic discourse because it so seldom serves the author's persuasive agenda.

Japan religious shrines as tourist attractions. One of the most striking differences between the Fodor's and JTB's series lies in their treatment of religious artifacts. While the JTB is always careful to explain the religious significance of such artifacts, Fodor's inevitably comments only on their aesthetic qualities or, even more frequently, on their most remarkable physical characteristics. Take, for example, the giant bronze statue (Daibutsu) of the Todaiji Temple at Nara. In the Fodor's guidebooks, 1962 through 1982, the author asserts that the statue is more famous "for its size than its beauty"; the Daibutsu's religious significance as an example of Buddhist statuary is ignored. In the JTB passage quoted below, however, one is struck by the different kind of information used to describe the statue. While the Fodor's author seemed more concerned with the size of the Daibutsu, the author of the JTB guidebook provides highly specific data related to religion:

A National Treasure. The holiest object in Todaiji Temple, it is worshipped with the utmost reverence. The Daibutsu represents Birushana-Butsu (Vairocana), regarded as the original or spiritual body of Sakyamuni by the Kegon sect. In other words, Birushana-Butsu is the root and Sakyamuni is the branch. . . . The figure is seated cross-legged on a tremendous bronze pedestal, the hands forming the mudra—a hand symbol representing preaching. The right hand is a symbol that gives of mind, while the left assumes the symbol that grants wishes. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 716)

The tendency to view religious artifacts as artistic objects or curiosities for touristic consumption arises from a more subtle form of stereotype in which the tourist, failing to understand the religious system of meaning which caused the object to be created, assumes that its greater meaning is beside the point (that is, the perception of the object takes place under the assumption that it cannot be seriously considered as a religious object). In this passage, the statue is said to be memorable for its profound religious significance, rather than its size; although some of the size dimensions are mentioned, they occur later in the passage, so that the reference to the Daibutsu's honored status as a holy object is encountered by the reader first.

Here one sees the dimension of specificity employed to redirect the attention of the reader. This is done in several ways, though all of these mechanisms share the common goal of linking language with specific sociohistorical fact, thereby confirming the principle that language is at all times sociohistorically specific. First, the passage begins with a specific designation: "A National Treasure." This is a highly specific descriptor, applied to the most valued possessions of the country, as determined by government standards. Beginning the description of the Daibutsu in this way cues the reader that he or she is reading about an extremely special object. Since not all objects are so designated, the JTB guidebook directs the reader's attention toward the statue's status in the eyes of the Japanese people. Second, the status of the Daibutsu is also specified in relation to other objects in the Temple: it is the "holiest object . . . worshipped with utmost reverence." By this point in the passage, the reader can hardly have failed to be impressed with the esteem in which the Daibutsu is held in Japan, and certainly would have to rethink the Fodor's author's contention that the statue ". . . is known more for its size than its beauty." Rank-ordering the statue marks it as having a specific relationship to other objects in the temple. Third, the JTB guidebook makes a point of explaining how the statue is posed, particularly with regard to the religious significance of the placement of the hands.

One should note cautiously, however, that the description in the JTB guidebook cannot be considered “better” than the description in the Fodor’s guidebook. Pejorative terms like “better” or “worse” tend to lose their meaning when one analyzes texts according to the principle of specificity. Rather, the principle that all discourse is sociohistorically specific directs one’s attention to how specific pieces of information are chosen and why. All persuasive discourse—particularly opinions expressed about sites and locations in touristic literature—must use specificity in support of claims. Thus, it is less a question of whether specifics will be used, than of which specifics will be used. By examining the traces of the author’s choices, and by comparing these choices against a standard of abstraction, the Bakhtin group argues that one is able to discern what is considered important to the author.

This is no better illustrated than by the JTB guidebook’s clear attempt to direct the reader’s attention away from the Daibutsu’s more sensationalistic status (“the largest bronze statue in the world”) and toward its religious status (an object of “utmost reverence”). One might even speculate that it is because, as the Fodor’s author puts it, the statue is “known more for its size,” that it is necessary for the JTB guidebook to place so much emphasis on other specific characteristics. Clearly, the JTB wants the visitor to take a sense of religious awe from the experience of viewing the Daibutsu, and not simply an impression or set of numbers about how big it is. To accomplish this goal, the JTB must utilize experiences (such as knowledge of Buddhism) which are less accessible to the author of the Fodor’s chapter. By so doing, the JTB authors are able to answer the popular stereotype that natives of a culture do not take their religious statuary seriously.

Elements of temporal change in the specificity of JTB’s description. Despite its generally more stable content and appearance from 1955 through 1991, over the years JTB’s guidebook shows a number of important changes in style. Here, I want to focus on three changes which illustrate Japan’s increasing confidence in presenting itself to

the rest of the world: (1) change from more apologetic to more assertive voice; (2) increasing recognition of international tourism; and (3) change in depictions of key sites and locations.

Change in voice—More apologetic to more assertive. A visible change in the JTB's guidebooks over the decades considered is a shift from being relatively apologetic about things Japanese to greater assertiveness about the value and significance of Japan and its culture. This is evident, for example, in descriptions of Japan's food and accommodations, two important concerns for tourists. Over the years, Japan has become more confident in its ability to comfort foreign visitors, not only because of the improved quality of its restaurants and public accommodations, but also because of the increased socioeconomic status of Japan in the international scene.

In descriptions of food in Japan, JTB authors move from an apologetic and uncertain attitude to a confident and even arrogant tone. In 1955, the JTB guide admits that Japanese food is difficult to get used to: "Japanese food does not suit all palates but some of the dishes served are generally considered quite acceptable for foreigners and form an agreeable change from foreign food" (p. 27). By 1975, under a new topic, "Reception of Foreign Visitors," the attitude has reversed itself: "To the gourmet, probably no country is more enticing than Japan" (p. 40). This rather arrogant statement, however, disappears from the 1991 edition, and is replaced with the more neutral statement, "Japanese cooking is one of the most pleasing" (p. 46).

This is an interesting series of transformations. While in the 1955 edition, it is foreign visitors who are allowed to decide whether Japanese food is acceptable, from 1975 on, foreign visitors are simply told to accept the excellence of food in Japan. Certainly it is true that, in almost forty years, food in Japan may have changed, and many kinds of foods from other countries may have been introduced to Japan (as is evident in the description of other sections of both the 1975 and 1991 editions). However, the quality of the food alone does not explain the attitude the JTB guide

exhibits in each successive edition. In 1955, the JTB guide could have blamed visitors for not being able to appreciate Japanese food. In 1975, the JTB guidebook could have taken a more modest position, allowing its visitors to make their own judgments about food in Japan. And in 1991, the JTB guidebook could have continued its attitude of superiority in asserting Japan as the premier location for gourmet food.

But these positions were not taken. Instead, the sequence of depictions begins with excessive passivity, progresses to arrogance, and then deintensifies toward confident assertion. Not coincidentally, the sequence may be matched to Japan's rise in socioeconomic power. In 1955, the country was struggling to rebuild after its defeat in World War II. In 1975, it had gained some status in the world, but was not yet considered a "world power," thus accounting for the necessity of taking an aggressive tone (gaining in power, but still insecure). By 1991, Japan is secure enough in its status as a world power to recede from the earlier tone of arrogance; it is as if the editors of JTB felt that inappropriate boasting might be seen as a sign of insecurity by a nation that was by the 1990's a favored world tourist site. Thus, the position taken reveals how Japan has managed to gain power in the modern world and is therefore able to enhance its self-image. To gain further insight as to how the specific sociohistorical circumstances give rise to the unique voice of the text, let me turn to the description of hotels.

All three editions of the JTB guidebook talk about two different kinds of accommodations: "modern style" and the "traditional Japanese ryokan."¹³ In the 1955 edition, the establishment of "foreign-style hotels" is explained in this way: "After World War II, many efforts were made to improve lodging facilities for foreign visitors. . . ." As for the Japanese ryokan, they are depicted as being quite problematic unless "foreign visitors" are kind enough to change their attitude and accept the

¹³ The subject of ryokan is also covered in Chapter Five, pp. 291-296.

ryokan as they are: "The accommodation, equipment, and manner of serving in Japanese inns differ widely from foreign requirements, but foreign guests will probably be able to turn all seeming inconvenience and discomfort into an interesting experience, acting as Romans while in Rome" (p. 20). Similar to the description of food, the 1955 edition takes a rather uncertain, apologetic, and even submissive attitude toward potential visitors.

In the 1975 edition, again, with Japan's increasing confidence, the struggle to "improve lodging facilities" is depicted as having, for the most part, been accomplished. In its discussion of "Reception of Foreign Visitors," the guidebook comforts tourists in the following terms: "As for accommodation, there are a large number of Western-style hotels throughout the country, including the government-registered hotels meeting international standards. . . . In addition, there are numerous ryokan, or traditional Japanese hotels or inns. The ryokan, which meet a certain standard of modern requirements, are also registered with the government. . . ." Moreover, ". . . there is a complete network of youth hostels. At the same time, most tourist points of importance are provided by the state with rest-rooms, including Western style toilet facilities" (p. 40). The "foreign-style hotels" discussed in 1955 have become, in the 1975 edition, identified specifically as "Western-style hotels," and the problematic ryokan are said now to "meet certain requirements." More importantly, these standards are all guaranteed by the Japanese government.

The 1991 edition takes a position similar to that of the 1975 edition, but with noticeably increased confidence. First, "The ryokan, which meets standards of modern requirements, are also registered with the government" (p. 45). Here, the ryokan does not meet only "a certain" standard as in the 1975 edition, but simply "meets standards" required of modern facilities. Second, while the 1975 edition is somewhat apologetic in describing ryokan (" . . . foreign visitors may stay at them quite comfortably" [p. 40]), the 1991 edition is proud to conclude, "They are ideal for the

foreign visitor who wants to get a feel for the traditional Japanese life-style" (p. 45). Third, in the 1991 edition, it is no longer an issue of "Western-style toilet facilities" in youth hostels since these facilities have already become part of the hostels and need not be mentioned.

The changing attitude displayed when offering foreign visitors accommodations is in line with the increasing modernization of Japan, a force that gives Japan confidence in orienting itself toward its potential visitors. Several observations can be made about the various descriptions of accommodations. First, modern, international standards, and the "Western" style, are viewed as equivalent. Standards for hotels are always "international," requirements are always "modern," and the "foreign-style hotels" discussed in 1955 have changed to "Western-style hotels" in the 1975 edition. Hence, the conclusion seems unavoidable: it is the West which sets the standard for accommodations. Second, the Japanese government plays an active role in helping to maintain "modern accommodations." Many regulations are imposed by the government, and hotels qualified to meet these standards are those who are "registered" with the government. Clearly, not every hotel is registered with the government, and yet those which are registered are emphasized in the JTB guidebook.

In other words, the Japanese government determines whether accommodations are "modern" or not. Why wouldn't the Japanese government simply leave the determination of whether standards live up to "modern accommodations" to the private owners and their customers? The touristic encounter is simply one manifestation of the sociohistorical meaning assigned to "being modern," and it is this standard toward which the Japanese government aims. The writing of this text is hardly surprising: it is a guide that represents the official view and it is aimed at English-speaking visitors, primarily Westerners, who may demand the Western style among the varying kinds of facilities offered in Japan.

Moreover, in line with the increasing economic power of Japan as it has progressed toward the status of being a “modern nation,” Japan no longer apologizes for its traditionality. Recall that the 1991 edition divides Japan into “modern” and “traditional” elements. Once Japan has defined itself as a modern nation, its traditionality—a distant image—need no longer be embarrassing. Hence, in the 1991 edition, the JTB guidebook not only avoids apologizing for the traditional ryokan, but claims that they are “ideal” for visitors who wish to taste the “traditional Japanese lifestyle.” Similarly, the JTB guidebook no longer needs to apologize for Japan’s food being unsuitable for foreign tastes. Indeed, the question is not so much how Japan has changed, but how it manages to present itself in the awareness of the complexity of the sociohistorical context in which the text is written for specific audiences, and to achieve specific purposes.

Comparison of the JTB’s guidebooks over time reveals that the editors become increasingly comfortable about how Westerners view certain elements of Japanese culture. This is shown by JTB’s discussion of three central topics: Mt. Fuji, Tokyo, and the general condition of Japan.

The first topic concerns how one of Japan’s most well-known tourist sites, Mt. Fuji, is described. According to the 1991 edition, “Once, this conical mountain was regarded as God and was worshipped by many followers. . . . Today, . . . many visitors [enjoy] the challenging hike to the top. . . .” (p. 457). One would expect that even today, there are still followers who “worship” Mt. Fuji. However, by creating the distinction and making the tourists and the followers into different categories, the past becomes part of history, and thus is separated from the present.

A second example which utilizes the same strategy—creating distance between the past and the present—can be found in the description of “Tokyo and Vicinity.” The progress and change of Tokyo over time can be clearly identified. New numbers for the increasing volume of foreign tourists are given in each edition. Moreover,

while the building of the New Tokyo International Airport at Narita is described at length in the 1975 edition, this reference is no longer necessary in the 1991 edition, since the Airport was completed and is now part of Japanese cultural life.

But even more revealing is the process by which, in the descriptions of Tokyo, the definition of the city changes from one time to another. In the 1955 edition, there is no division between the description of activity in Tokyo and its historical background, although this division is present in both the 1975 and 1991 editions. The 1955 edition begins with a description of the historical background of Tokyo, then moves to a discussion of the impact World War II had on Tokyo, in both damage inflicted and the effort to rebuild. Only in the final paragraph does the JTB guidebook explain that Tokyo is the center of Japanese government. In both the 1975 and 1991 editions, on the other hand, much attention is devoted to a description of the international status of Tokyo, while its historical background is relegated to a separate section.

This change suggests a departure from the strategy of defining Tokyo: the city moves from being defined in relation to the past to being defined in relation to the present. History is no longer a part of Tokyo; it is now a separate issue which can be neglected if the potential visitor chooses to do so. This distinctive way of orienting potential visitors, this distancing of Tokyo from its past, is further established in the 1991 edition's general division between the "traditional" and "modern" aspects of Japan. As one can imagine, while Tokyo still possesses its traditional character, the city is nevertheless defined as a modern metropolis.

This fashioning of distance from Tokyo's historical background is closely tied to the evolution of Tokyo into a center of international activity, as treated in the three editions. Although references to the international status of Tokyo are made in all three editions, in 1955, Tokyo ". . . is now considered the fourth largest city in the world, next to Paris, as far as population is concerned" (p. 269). In this description, one can see a significant amount of uncertainty: JTB did not itself assert that Tokyo is an

international city; rather, it "is considered" to possess this quality by someone else. Moreover, this international status is defined in relation to population rather than culture, technology, or power. The relatively weak political position of Japan and its urge to catch up with other nations in the world can be clearly seen in this seemingly insignificant passage.

In the 1975 edition, one sees an important change in the depiction: "As an international city, it ranks topmost in Asia and most nations of the world have their diplomatic delegations here" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1975, p. 318). Similar statements are found in the 1991 edition. By the time these passages are written, Tokyo does not have "to be considered" an international city; rather, its status is taken for granted. The linguistic expression, which takes no initiative to declare Tokyo's status in the 1955 edition, stands in sharp contrast to the later editions of the JTB guidebook. Moreover, to enhance Tokyo's international status, references are also made to foreign business establishments, international conferences, and international tourism. Tokyo's "internationalness" has by this time gone far beyond simply a quality to be measured by "population." This sense of assertiveness, of making a declaration without relying on a contrast with others, is reflected even when population is referred to: in 1955, the total population is said to be "next to Paris" and in 1975, "second to Shanghai," whereas in the 1991 edition, there is no reference to other cities in the world. With Japan's increasing power in the world, and Tokyo's increasing importance in the world economy, JTB need not compare itself to others, but rather to offer itself as a standard to which others can compare themselves. By the time of the latter passages, Tokyo depicts itself as an international city which deserves recognition, not based on its past, but upon its own demonstrated accomplishments.

The 1955 edition reveals a strong need to justify Japan's current situation. In most cases, references to history are phrased relative to situations as they "now" are, as compared to earlier times during or before World War II; the following phrases show

the various ways in which this description is accomplished: “. . . in former days the guest was expected to give a maximum per day of one-half of the daily rate per person . . .” (p. 26); “. . . in former days the means of communication between one point and another in Japan were primitive” (p. 31); “. . . except in large cities and their suburbs, Japanese roads are not yet in a good state of repair . . . new roads, however, are being constructed all over the country . . .” (p. 39); and so on. One notes in these passages the effort made to assure the potential visitor that Japan has progressed in providing important services to tourists. To do so, the author(s) of the text must make “before-and-after” comparisons, referring explicitly to the sociohistorical grounding on which the comparison is based.

Increasing recognition of international tourism. Another important change in the perspective of the 1991 JTB guidebook, as compared to the earlier editions, can be seen in the increasing recognition of international tourism as an economic force. In both the 1975 and 1991 editions, topics relating to “Tourist Facilities and Available Services” are collected under an independent category called “General Information,” while in the 1955 edition, this information is included as a topic under the category, “Preparatory Remarks” in the chapter, “General Information.” This change in organization is consistent with the amount of information provided: in the 1955 edition, the topic of tourist facilities is concerned only with various kinds of tourist organizations in Japan; in the 1975 edition, however, this new category also includes topics such as accommodation services, domestic traffic facilities, dining, shopping, and so on, formerly under the subcategory, “Preparatory Remarks.” The “independence” of the category, “Tourist Facilities and Available Services,” as well as the incorporation of other information, evolving from the 1955 through the 1975 editions, and continuing to the 1991 edition, charts the increasing importance of tourism in Japan.

Tourism’s importance to Japan can also be measured by the ways in which touristic information is presented in the “Travel Information” section. In the 1955

edition, there are two broad classifications only, Northeastern Japan and Southwestern Japan, whereas in both the 1975 and 1991 editions, there are eight different sections of tourist attractions under "Travel Information."

In the 1991 edition, two new categories are included under "General Information": "Traditional Japan" and "Modern Japan." Previously (in the 1955 and 1975 editions) these two categories were subsumed under various independent sections in the section, "General Information." In other words, categories such as food, drink, fine arts, tea ceremony, entertainment, and so on, are in the 1991 edition assigned either to "traditional Japan" or "modern Japan."

Why is it necessary to portray Japan as embracing both "traditional" and "modern" elements? The 1991 edition of the JTB guide, in the first paragraph of the chapter on "Modern Japan," offers a possible explanation: "Shattered by the defeat in World War II, Japan managed to achieve a miraculous economic recovery and growth after the war. In particular, the nation's plan to double its national income in the 1960s led Japan to become one of the world's economic superpowers, although business experienced several ups and downs along the way" (p. 231). For Japan, modernity is to be defined in relation to World War II. Although Japan lost the war, it was the recovery after the war that led Japan to become a "modern" nation.

The movement toward modernity, however, has not been without its ideological underpinning, inscribed by the dynamism of international politics. Modernity is an index seen to signify the progress of a nation, commonly used to rank-order the development of a nation in regard to other nations. According to The Social Science Encyclopedia (Kuper & Kuper, 1985),

The concept of development, like its kindred notions of growth and modernization, has its historical and intellectual roots in the period of major social changes associated with Industrial Revolution, or what Kumer (1978) has called the "Great Transformation", when industrial and social change in Europe became synonymous with social progress.

Throughout the century that follows, and often in the face of strong countercurrents challenging this simple orthodoxy . . . , development in the eyes of most people (experts and laymen alike) came to be identified with some kind of stage-by-stage movement toward more “modern”, technologically and economically “advanced” forms of society such as the industrial nations.

By the mid-twentieth century the dominant image of social change was modernization, the process by which so-called traditional social structures are transformed into those of a more modern type, along the lines of what happened at an earlier stage in Europe. . . . (p. 198)

The information presented in the JTB guidebook, as well as the organization of that information, emphasizes this sociohistorical inscription of the meanings of “being modern.” This broader context is further complicated by the “touristic context,” in which “tradition,” although it may not be desirable, is provided for the purpose of entertaining tourists, particularly those from so-called “modern and developed” nations and those who demand the timelessness of a “traditional society” to represent their nostalgic past (MacCannell, 1976).

As Japan has developed into “modernity,” the government has taken an increasingly active role in the promotion of Japan as a touristic site. This aspect of sociohistorical specificity can hardly be overemphasized. Since JTB is a government body, it not only reflects changes in Japan as a touristic site, but indeed is a primary factor in engineering such changes. The role of the government in Japanese tourism is significant: the government classifies facilities and artifacts, maintains standards of cleanliness and hygiene, protects the traditional resources of the nation, and performs countless other tasks related to the overall status of Japan as touristic site. Thus, JTB is far more than merely a chronicler of the specific sociohistorical circumstances of Japanese tourism; it is a major force in engineering these circumstances. When one reads the JTB guidebook, then, one senses a far greater sense of confidence that expresses JTB’s specific role in the business of international tourism.

Change in depiction of key sites and locations. There is also a noticeable change in the 1991 JTB description of key sites and locations. In some of these, the dimension of specificity is utilized to fashion extremely general statements to build up the attractiveness and romance of certain locales (such as Kyoto). This is accomplished by touristic clichés which seem ubiquitous regardless of form of touristic writing or the country being described, as in this description of Kyoto: “. . . [N]estled picturesquely among the surrounding mountains, it still exudes an old-world atmosphere.” This phrase is clearly more form than substance; it could have been written about a location in the Colorado Rockies, the Swiss Alps, or a host of other mountainous areas of the world. Nevertheless, the author must resort to the imprecision of clichés because the specificity of reality would be damaging to making the case for seeing Kyoto as traditional. The author admits as much in the subsequent sentence: “In spite of the signs of material progress, this ancient Buddhist center seems a place apart from the busy world, where the spirit of old Japan still prevails.” Here the author betrays that the reason for phrasing the description in this way is to counter the “signs of material progress.”

As we have seen, a useful technique for probing the specificity dimension is to examine texts for objectionably broad assertions or extravagant claims without detail which attempt to create an ideal picture. Particularly in touristic texts, the reason for such stylistic preferences often lies in the attempt—for reasons connected to the author’s architectonics—to create a discursive fantasy and thereby to move farther from the dimension of specificity.

Moreover, it bears repeating that there is nothing intrinsically wrong with this strategy. However, such tactics reveal how uncomfortable the subject of modernity may be for the host country. More often than not, the country which plays host in the touristic encounter is classified by the world as “less developed.” As the country becomes “more developed,” however, the mantle of being classified as a “modern”

nation can sometimes be difficult to become accustomed to. When there exists little or no experience by the host country in being labeled “developed,” authors must sometimes resort to the fanciful to allay the fears of potential visitors that the place they intend to visit is “just like home.” Thus, one must not be too harsh in criticizing guidebook authors who are also members of the host culture for resorting to standard, overworked touristic clichés. On occasion, such devices may be the only way of extricating the host culture from the sometimes unreasonable demands of the guest culture that the described site be both “modern” and “traditional.”

Another example illustrating the change in JTB’s perspective occurs in the following description of Kyoto. As has already been shown, Kyoto is famous both as a modern city and as a historical site which possesses enormous reserves of cultural artifacts. For some reason, both the Fodor’s and JTB’s guidebook authors seem to have some difficulty in accounting for the coexistence of both the modern and traditional elements of Kyoto. In the passage quoted below (this is the full passage from which the brief references quoted above were taken), the JTB author counterposes specific and general descriptors of the city to give the impression that Kyoto has something to offer everyone.

Naturally, it [Kyoto] is an important objective for the visitor to Japan. Brimming with historical and religious traditions and being the birthplace of the traditional arts and crafts that have won the admiration of the world, Kyoto retains a unique position among the great cities of the world. Nestled picturesquely among the surrounding mountains, it still exudes an old-world atmosphere. In spite of the signs of material progress, this ancient Buddhist center seems a place apart from the busy world, where the spirit of old Japan still prevails. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 655)

One is cued to the intention of the author by the first word of the passage: “naturally,” Kyoto must an important stop for any visitor to Japan. Why should “the visitor” to Japan consider Kyoto an “important objective”? One presumes that Kyoto’s

fame as a repository of valuable cultural sites and artifacts makes it a “must-see” location; this is confirmed by the subsequent phrase, “brimming with historical and religious traditions and being the birthplace of the traditional arts and crafts that have won the admiration of the world. . .” This means that the JTB author, in writing the passage, is faced with the problem of counterposing what is known (specific factors) with what is unknown (vague “tourist”-style writing which employs phrases such as “old-world charm,” “nestled picturesquely,” “a place apart,” and so on).

Thus, to a degree, the author must appeal to specificity, at least to the extent that the fame of Kyoto is acknowledged. It would hardly do to pretend that Kyoto, given its popularity as a site to visit, could be “passed by” or ignored. There exists, then, a body of specific knowledge about Kyoto that must be acknowledged and addressed by any tour guidebook.

However, the specificity of knowledge about Kyoto by the JTB guidebook’s author is likely to be limited, leading readers to have unrealistic expectations about the “culture” that is available for visitors to the city. Indeed, there is reason to believe that Kyoto has fallen victim to an exaggerated image of itself. Moreover, in each description of Kyoto, in both tour guidebooks and in all editions, there is invariably some remark to suggest that the city has elements of both modernity and traditionality, suggesting that, regardless of Kyoto’s reputation for traditionality, there is some need for each author to at least acknowledge the fact that Kyoto is also a modern, industrialized metropolis.

Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Specificity in Fodor’s and JTB’s Descriptions

Because of their backgrounds in studies of literature, Bakhtin and his associates were primarily concerned with methods for discerning authorial intention through close analysis of the literary text. Members of the Bakhtin circle were dissatisfied with the prevailing literary theories of their time, principally because these theories tended

to take psychoanalytic approaches to discovering authorial intention. Bakhtin and his associates challenged the ability of the critic to probe authorial intention by means of universalistic theories; rather, they argued that authorial voice cannot be judged without the knowledge of sociohistorical circumstances in which the author's words are written. Whether the overall tone of the authorial voice in tour guidebooks is due to similarity in viewpoint among the various authors or to control exercised by editors is largely a moot question when one applies the principle of specificity. A more important consideration is how the authorial voice fits to the specifics of the sociohistorical environment.

Fodor's—Stylistic mechanisms. In this section, I want to consider some of the specific methods used by the authors of the Fodor's guidebook to persuade readers of the positions they take. Despite the presence of many different voices—attributed or anonymous—in the Fodor's text, there are several devices which tend to recur often enough that they can be said to characterize a "Fodor's style." Stylistic mechanisms relating to specificity include the following: (1) omniscient authorial voice; (2) strategic use of specificity; (3) imaginary narrators and scenarios; and (4) excess specificity to redirect reader attention.

Omniscient authorial voice. In guidebook discussions of culture, one often finds the dimension of specificity indicated when the guidebook author writes about "traditions." For example, in discussions of the arts as an object of touristic consumption, one finds statements in which the author takes an almost omniscient role as the summarizer of not simply one, but a large number of aesthetic issues in many different cultures. In the earlier editions of Fodor's (1962 through 1982), there are very few exceptions to the omniscient authorial voice; while some attempts are made to change the authorial voice in the 1990 edition, there still remains a significant use of omniscient and declaratory phrasing. Some examples of this style are discussed in detail below.

The first example of omniscience occurs in the discussion of the most famous of Japanese novels, The Tale of Genji. Notice how the stylistic subtleties of this book, described by some (including, at another point, the Fodor's author) as the "world's first novel," are glossed:

At first The Tale of Genji, which is about the amorous affairs of a prince named Genji and of his descendants unto the third generation, may seem to be discursive and rambling enough . . . [Emphasis added]
(Fodor's, 1962, p. 85)

Without explaining what is meant by the descriptor, "discursive and rambling," the guidebook author manages to cast into doubt the stylistic quality of The Tale of Genji. But what is meant by the negative descriptor, "rambling"? Consider the opinion of noted Japanese historian Edwin O. Reischauer:

[The Tale of Genji] portrays in brilliant detail and psychological subtlety a court life that could hardly have been more different from that of China—or for that matter from the roughness of life in Europe at that time. All that seemed to matter for these lady diarists and novelists was the sensitivity of esthetic feelings and the style in which the participants in this life conducted themselves, dressed, and wrote down their poems.
(Reischauer, 1977, p. 49)

The style that is rendered by the Fodor's author (Edward Seidensticker, though he is not explicitly identified in the 1962 edition) as "rambling" is depicted by Reischauer as "brilliant detail and psychological subtlety." Moreover, it is not a question of which of the two descriptions is the more "correct," but rather of what the author offers as justification for either approaching specificity (as Reischauer seems to do) or departing from it (as Seidensticker seems to do). Although to some readers, Reischauer, an ambassador to Japan and scholar with many books on the country, might claim more legitimacy because of his known expertise and reputation, even the unidentified author of a "common" touristic book is permitted to frame a well-known literary work

in a way that will make an impact on the audience toward whom he or she is directing the description. Indeed, it is plausible to assume that the level of detail which is expected of the "historian" Reischauer might well work against Seidensticker. Readers of guidebooks may prefer the briefer, "glossed" explanation. Be this as it may, it is clear that these two commentators are differentially exploiting the specificity dimension of language, and in so doing, open a window for constructing their differing goals and motivations.

Another instance of omniscience through authorial voice is provided by the description of daily life from Seidensticker's introductory chapter (Fodor's editions 1962 and 1969). In the passage below, Seidensticker takes aim at two of Japan's largest cities, echoing a complaint familiar to the readers of tour guidebooks, concerning big-city traffic:¹⁴

Tokyo and Yokohama are not beautiful cities, nor are they well-planned. In neither is the proportion of streets to total area anything like that in any major American or European city, and particularly in Tokyo, what streets there are follow no discernible plan. Tokyo has six major traffic jams a day, or did back in 1960, when the Metropolitan Police last exposed the facts to the garish light of the press. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 56)

The dimension of specificity shows up in the form of objectionably broad assertions which attempt to place a given description in some non-existent abstract space, frequently in contradiction to known or easily deduced specific data. Here, the passage given emphasis states a "statistic" which cannot, on the face of it, be true. Seidensticker does not say "an average of six traffic jams," or "up to six traffic jams," but states unequivocally that the number, every day, is exactly six. In fact, Seidensticker admits in the next phrase that he is uncertain about the number ("or did back in 1960 . . ."), which calls into question why he should have stated the "fact" in

¹⁴ Portions of this passage are analyzed earlier in this chapter (pp. 80-81).

the first place. The interesting thing about the modification (that the statistic was true in 1960) is that it is not in fact supportive of the original statement, even though it appears to be. The original statement was that Tokyo has “six traffic jams” per day, at the present time, not that it was true in 1960 and might be true today. Seidensticker, as an established expert on Japan, makes many such omniscient statements;¹⁵ the one cited above is something of an exception to the rule for this author, in that he makes an immediate modification. In most cases, Seidensticker’s extreme statements stand unmodified.

This is not nit-picking. Again, let us use the technique of rephrasing to illustrate why the dimension of specificity must be instantiated in this way for Seidensticker to make his point. Suppose one rephrased the statement as follows: “In 1960, police reported that Tokyo had on average six traffic jams a day, and at the present time there may be at least that many.” What is the difference between the original phrasing and the rewritten statement? One difference is that the latter is less dramatic, less convincing, and less persuasive, because Seidensticker’s phrasing in the original quotation is more sure of itself. While Seidensticker is capable of circumlocution when it suits his purpose, the statement in the above passage is noteworthy for its lack of vagueness: “Tokyo has six major traffic jams a day.” Thus, it is not that

¹⁵ Several other examples of Seidensticker’s omniscient voice, taken from the 1962 edition, are the following: (1) “All Japanese live within sight of mountains, except when they have chosen to obstruct the view, and the Japanese who would escape mountains must flee his country.” (p. 60); (2) “The Tokugawa system required absolute discipline and conformity, and the father of the family and the head of the state were its effective gods.” (p. 64); (3) “[Buddhism] has left behind a rich physical heritage in its temples and paintings and sculptures, but the Tokugawa Shogunate came upon it weary and faltering and effectively killed it as a vital religious force. Today it has little to say to thinking people and exists largely for purposes of burying the dead and keeping up their graves.” (pp. 64–65); (4) “Above all, the Japanese are a nation of workers, and if much of their activity seems purposeless, the energy devoted to labor has made their economy one of the half dozen most powerful in the world.” (p. 67); and so on. Micro-analysis of passages aside, the present-day reader accustomed to more sensitive descriptions of foreign countries may be shocked at the overwhelming tone of omniscience in Seidensticker’s authorial voice.

Seidensticker's passage contains both specific data and dramatic generalization in conjunction, but that he chooses to give priority to the generalization.

The potential for addressing the specificity dimension in different ways makes it possible for the unwary reader to conclude that the author has carefully researched a particular point when in fact he or she may be unable to support a questionable statement. To the casual reader of the guidebook, the generalization can be taken as fact. Moreover, since (as will be seen in analyses of other passages) the objectionable generalization is frequently the preferred style for the tour guidebook, the reader may become accustomed to the devices of touristic literature, so that, lulled into a sense of familiarity, the objectionable generalization becomes so commonplace that it is no longer objectionable. If one adds to these difficulties the awareness that the author is a "renowned expert," then the danger of overlooking ungrounded generalizations is increased.

In another example showing how the dimension of specificity can be used to suggest omniscience, the Fodor's author (again, Seidensticker, although he is not explicitly identified as the author in the 1962 edition) talks about artistic traditions which survive into current forms that (in the author's opinion)¹⁶ are outdated:

Today the well-finished young lady is expected to be able to strum out an old tune and to perform a passable dance. The number of schools is infinite, and almost nothing is allowed to die, largely because of a venerable institution known as "the house." Every school or faction is organized as if it were a clan, with a succession of heads and with family-

¹⁶ In this chapter, too, Seidensticker frequently indulges in the omniscient authorial voice, as shown by the following examples: (1) "The story of the arts in modern Japan has been a mixed one. In such matters the Japanese has a way of being simultaneously a revolutionary and a conservative." (p. 86); (2) "The West came flooding in on Japan when its own [architectural] taste was not perhaps at its best, and left a scum of General Grant buildings over the country." (p. 86); (3) "The Japanese do everything Western for themselves, ballet and symphony and dixieland, and, perhaps aware that though competent they are not the best in the world, they are very hospitable toward people whom they recognize to be superior artists." (p. 88); (4) "The Japanese may not have excelled at everything, but they deserve a citation for having tried almost everything, and kept on trying, and so made their big cities among the places in the world where a visitor has least excuse for being bored." (p. 90); and so on.

like relationships prevailing under them. Since it is most honorable to head a school (and frequently lucrative as well), the succession is preserved even when the art form is a very esoteric one. Tokyo is therefore a veritable museum of songs and dances that in most places would have had their day and gone. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 87)

Here the timelessness of the descriptors of the artistic climate is established first, by implying that the forms are necessarily outmoded (they have not been "allowed to die," that is, they should have "died" but were not permitted to), and second, by stating overtly that these artistic forms and practices belong in a "museum" and indeed, probably would have been so consigned in any place other than Tokyo.

Again, the broad application of these general descriptors operate to remove the passage from the realm of precise and detailed evaluation of Japanese artistic practices. According to the notion of specificity, all referents are sociohistorically specific, so that an overworked abstraction yields a description which is removed from what is known to be the case. While it may be true that all representations are in some sense falsehoods, it is also true that some representations are more suspect than others, usually because—as here—they make objectionably general evaluations. Applying the dimension of specificity, one is alerted to the potential for the author of a text to smuggle in questionable assumptions under the guise of making an authoritative, though unsubstantiated, pronouncement.

In the next example of authorial omniscience, Seidensticker takes up Japanese history in a chapter titled, "From Clan to Chaos: The 'Japanese Spirit' Through Thick and Thin."

References to history play an interesting role in the composition of touristic discourse. Historical accounts, for example, are common to virtually every type of site description, from "historical markers" to brochures or booklets sold at a given site. Typically, material on historical matters is one of the first types of information

encountered in the tour guidebook, either immediately at the front (as in the Fodor's guidebook) or following information related to "daily life" (as in the JTB's guidebook). This is perhaps due to the notion of the "site" itself: it is a place that is noteworthy for some specific reason, usually a reason related to past events. Even if the site is noteworthy for some other reason (its scenery, for example), tourists usually expect that some information will be given to tell them how the site came to be renowned as a touristic locale.

History allows the tourist a framework within which to situate new information; it provides an explanation which allows the tourist to process an overwhelming amount of data about the site or location. The inclusion of historical material may even be something which tourists have come to expect: in most cases, one's learning about a new country in the classroom is begun by recounting the country's history. Regardless of the reason or reasons for history's central role in cultural descriptions, it remains an inescapable facet of touristic discourse.

In the passage quoted below, Edward Seidensticker¹⁷ discusses the specifics of the Meiji Era, a time of great growth and progress in Japan. In the emphasized portion of the quoted passage, one can see how a selected series of specific historical facts are used by the author to build a broad and somewhat derogatory depiction of the modern Japanese attitude toward the period:

The long reign of Meiji, 1867 to 1912, was a remarkable time.
A rejuvenation of the people took place, and, with the affections and
loyalties of the nation concentrated upon the young emperor,

¹⁷ In this chapter, too, Seidensticker makes extensive use of the omniscient authorial voice: (1) "Such was the nature of the Chinese that they assumed their superiority to be self-evident, and saw no need to emphasize it by shows of military strength." (p. 69); (2) "From the struggle [in the Heian period], which has excited the Japanese imagination as has no other episode in Japanese history . . ." (p. 71); (3) "In the thirties, Japan attracted the attention of the world for assassinations and invasions." (p. 75); (4) "Japan quite lacks the unity of a country like the United States or Great Britain, where the fundamental need to resist totalitarianism is generally accepted, and differences are on questions of how the need can best be met." (p. 78); and so on.

modernization of the country rushed ahead. The Meiji Period is one for which the Japanese have great affection, and yet they tend to forget what an astonishing amount was accomplished in the course of it. If China seems to be building vigorously today, Japan built just as vigorously and with much less cruelty a century ago. The miracles of which the Communist Chinese boast rather pale beside the feats accomplished by the Meiji Japanese. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 73-74)

The dimension of specificity has proven useful in analyzing statements for clues as to how the specificity/generality continuum is exploited to manipulate perceptions of a culture. In the emphasized portion above, consider the various sweeping generalizations involved: "The Meiji Period is one for which the Japanese have great affection, and yet they tend to forget what an astonishing amount was accomplished in the course of it." In this passage, not only is the Japanese "attitude" toward an entire period of their history summarized in three words, but Seidensticker also apparently knows enough to specify what the Japanese have forgotten.

Moreover, there is an important line drawn here, illustrative of the distinction between Seidensticker and the Japanese he is describing. By saying that the Japanese have "forgotten" (and in fact the assertion is not even that strong: they only "tend" to forget) the significance of the Meiji period, Seidensticker attempts to enhance the believability of the subsequent narrative: immediately following this passage in the 1962 edition, one finds, "If China seems to be building vigorously today, Japan built just as vigorously and with much less cruelty a century ago. The miracles of which the Communist Chinese boast rather pale beside the feats accomplished by the Meiji Japanese." Building upon one generalization about the people of an Asian country, the author feels obliged to over-generalize about those of another ("the Chinese").

The sequence of these passages demonstrates a tendency on Seidensticker's part to divide the responsibility for making generalizations about Japanese history between the describer and the described. This division occurs between the depictions of the author's culture (a culture in which a travel writer, hardly the most reliable source on

political and social issues, is granted authority to make broad generalizations on precisely these issues and many others as well) and the other culture (whose members are depicted as unable even to know the value of an important period of their own history). Differing degrees of specificity are here used as tools to limit access to historical description to the author and to deny to the Japanese the right to perceive their own culture.

Such “framing” of the cultural Other’s history is unsurprising, and indeed may even be expected of the tour guidebook author. As will become apparent, the limiting of the other culture is one of the most common devices used by touristic writers to establish their authority. Nevertheless, it is only the connection to the specific sociohistorical circumstances of the participating parties that allows such framing to be effective. The author of the guidebook must anticipate that his or her readers will be likely to find limitations of the cultural Other’s history persuasive, while at the same time readers must possess meaning systems which will permit them to read the narrative without being surprised at sweeping general descriptions of history.

Strategic use of specificity. The specificity dimension is frequently expected in touristic literature as a means of framing reader attention to the elements considered most important by the author. This strategic use of specificity is illustrated in the example below, which describes the site, or rather collection of sites, referred to by the name Fuji-Hakone-Izu. This well-known section of Honshu is centered around the majestic Mount Fuji, one of Japan’s most popular tourist sites. Also in the area is Lake Hakone (which the Japanese call Ashino-ko) and south of the lake lies the Izu peninsula.

In the example passage, the author provides a summary description of the area around Mount Fuji. Notice the use of highly generalized descriptors: “This is no Garden of Eden, but rather a richly rewarding district of vivid colors, of imaginative

scenery and incredible landscapes bathed by warm sunshine, sometimes swept by lowlying clouds and misty veils” [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 238).

We have already seen some of the problems which accompany the process of over-idealizing aspects of a culture through the use of generalized descriptors. Such depictions tend to remove the site from specific sociohistorical circumstances and to place it into a realm of abstraction, perhaps causing readers to expect something which they are unlikely to encounter.

In the quoted passage, the process of idealization begins with reference to a location which has come to be synonymous with paradise, “the Garden of Eden.” Although the author does not equate the Fuji area with the Garden of Eden, it is interesting that this Biblical locale is chosen as the point for comparison. By introducing the notion of paradise, the author prepares the reader for a subsequent series of extremely vague and idealistic characterizations: a “richly rewarding district of vivid colors,” “imaginative scenery,” and “incredible landscapes.” It is difficult to discern what the author could have meant by these descriptions. However, coming immediately after the reference to the Garden of Eden, their use suggests that the author, while not claiming that the Fuji area is entirely a paradise, still possesses elements which make it an ideal locale.

The idea of specificity tells the critical reader that such descriptions function at some distance from the actuality that may be experienced by the traveler. While it is true that increasing the perceived attractiveness of an area is the expected function of promotional writing, one needs to examine such discourse for indications that the author is not deliberately utilizing descriptions for the purpose of creating an impression that runs counter to reality. It may be true that Mount Fuji is scenically impressive, but one must suspect a narrative which employs puzzling metaphors such as “imaginative scenery” (as if the scenery were somehow arranged to provoke the

tourist's imagination). In any case, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the author is employing specificity deliberately, selectively, and strategically.

In another example of strategic use of specificity, the dimension of specificity is exploited by the selection of details from widely-known history to make a point about Japan's accomplishments. In this passage, Oliver Statler (author of the highly personalized introductory chapter in the 1990 edition) paints a bleak picture of Japan in the aftermath of World War II.

I first came to Japan when it was an occupied country after World War II. My most vivid memory is of the industrial area between Yokohama and Tokyo. As far as the eye could see on both sides of the highway, the flat earth was black. The only structures standing were the chimneys of factories the firebombs had consumed.

Like everyone else in the occupying force, I was comfortably housed and amply fed. But for the Japanese, food and clothing were scarce, and housing was at a premium. Faces were gray, and foreign correspondents reported an air of hopelessness. Those close to Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida have told how, after a day of coping with Japan's problems and occupation officials, he sometimes smoked his postprandial cigar while pacing the garden of his official residence, looking out over ruined Tokyo, and muttering, "Will it ever rebuilt? Will it ever be rebuilt?" (Fodor's, 1990, p. xxiv)

These are interesting images for Statler to have chosen to begin his chapter—indeed, since Statler's chapter is first in the book, these images have been chosen to begin the entire volume. Why would Statler have chosen such bleak pictures as the initial images to be encountered by the reader of the 1990 Fodor's guidebook? They tell the critical reader a number of things about the specific sociohistorical circumstances surrounding Statler's composition of the passage. First, as noted previously, Statler is unapologetically personal in his description. No attempts are made to construct opinions as shared by others. At the same time, one of the most critical pieces of information—the recounting of Prime Minister Yoshida's questioning whether Tokyo would ever be rebuilt—is attributed to anonymous reporters. This is a

clear manipulation of specificity: because the portion of the passage which deals with Yoshida's remark is not within the specific realm of the author's experience, it must be placed following the highly personal narrative recounting the author's visual impressions of blackened earth and other images of devastation. In other words, the author (like so many touristic writers) utilizes personal experience to establish his credentials; once established, such credentials then permit further assertions not based upon first-hand experience.

However, there is still the question of the choice of these particular images. Elsewhere in the chapter, Statler is quite forthcoming about his degree of sensitivity to the integrity of Japanese culture. It was Statler who wrote, "I do not put much faith in analyses that attempt to explain the Japanese character and personality" (p. xxiv). At these and other junctures, Statler demonstrates a high degree of awareness of cultural stereotypes and why they should be avoided. On the other hand, the opening words of the quoted passage can be read as reinforcing precisely the stereotypic images we saw in the earlier editions of Fodor's: the Japanese as a conquered people; privileges accorded to the victorious Occupation forces; marked contrast between the conquered and conqueror style of living; and so on.

Given the sociohistorical context, it is not difficult to see why Statler might have felt it useful to arrange specific details in the manner he did. By 1990, it is considered essential to demonstrate that the author is not promoting cultural stereotypes. This choice has been dictated by the change in Japan's status, including both its increased economic power and its increasing popularity as a touristic site. At the same time, Statler's discourse begins with a relatively standard reading of the results of World War II, playing largely to American preconceptions about the War's aftermath. Again, it is up to Statler to choose which details he wants to emphasize by their placement in the primary position in the chapter. As has been emphasized repeatedly specificity is a highly flexible dimension of discourse. Statler's traveling in post-War Japan must have

included areas that were not “flattened” or “blackened”; in fact, he acknowledges as much later in the chapter when he points to a number of positive cultural features he encountered in roughly the same period of time. The choice of these images of hopelessness and destruction function to set up the later passages in which Statler adopts a more kindly tone toward Japan. Nevertheless, this does not change the fact that the initial image of Japan presented in the 1990 Fodor’s guidebook is of a nation brought to its knees by an occupying army which is accorded a high standard of living, while most Japanese found “food and clothing were scarce, and housing was at a premium.” Thus, even while acknowledging Japanese cultural integrity, Statler’s narrative places Japan into a lower status. By this particular exploitation of specificity, Statler is able to reinforce a number of well-worn stereotypes about Japan and World War II, even while being forced to acknowledge circumstances which do not permit him to make such images the sole substance of his observations.

Another example demonstrating the strategic exploitation of specificity is Nigel Fisher’s highly selective treatment of the city of Kyoto. Reading the passage, one is struck with the limitations imposed on Fisher’s description even before he begins a detailed account of the city proper.

Steeped in history and tradition, Kyoto has in many ways been the cradle of Japanese culture, especially with its courtly aesthetic pastimes, such as moon-viewing parties, and tea ceremonies. A stroll through Kyoto today is a walk through 11 centuries of Japanese history. Yet this city has been swept into the modern industrialized world with the rest of Japan. Glassplate windows, held in place by girders and ferro-concrete, dominate Central Kyoto. Elderly women, however, continue to wear kimonos as they make their way slowly along the canal walkways. Geishas still entertain, albeit at prices out of reach for most of us. Sixteen hundred temples and several hundred shrines surround Central Kyoto. Rather a lot to see, to say the least. Our exploration of Kyoto will be selective. Also, because Kyoto is a Buddhist city, most of the exploring sections will concentrate on the temples and not on the Shinto shrines. Shintoism reached its peak just before Kyoto became the capital and, while the Shinto faith was still maintained, it did not return to official acceptance until the end of the Edo period. (Fodor’s, 1990, p. 321)

Given the more culturally sensitive tone of the remainder of the 1990 Fodor's edition, Fisher's restriction of the scope of details about Kyoto is particularly interesting. Again, Fisher exploits specificity to craft an image of Kyoto, just as Francis King did in the earlier editions of Fodor's. King's narrative, it may be recalled, relied on selective metaphors such as the "harmonious blending" of "East and West" to establish both the modernity and traditionality of Kyoto's culture. Fisher's description, on the other hand, attempts to avoid clichéd expressions such as "East and West," perhaps to be more in tune with the modern requirements that Japan no longer be portrayed as dependent on Western features for its status in the world arena.

Instead of masking his selectivity in metaphor, as King did, Fisher unabashedly declares that his description of the city will be limited: "Our exploration of Kyoto will be selective." Whereas King, in the earlier Fodor's guidebooks, seemed constrained to admit that he was being selective in describing Kyoto, it is important to note that, by 1990, Fisher (and others, including Diana Durston, author of the chapter on Japanese cuisine) permit themselves to adopt a highly personalized style based on great specificity.

The problem with this style, as noted in the previous discussion of Japanese food vendors, lies in the appearance of specificity without actually engaging real, empirical descriptions. This can result in very problematic images; recall that, in the description of Japanese food vendors, specific details about "bleary-eyed," overworked Japanese businesspeople created a particularly unpleasant impression. In a similar way, Fisher's description of Kyoto works to prohibitively narrow the representation of the city, Japanese culture, and the Japanese people.

First, notice how Fisher shifts from a discussion of the city as a general tourist site to the cultural products he clearly considers to be the chief attraction: the Buddhist shrines and artifacts. By making this application of the dimension of specificity—by

connecting through the text, that is, to one of a number of specific alternative possibilities for describing Kyoto—Fisher does not simply elevate Buddhist culture, but continues the narrative to explain why he will not write about Shinto shrines. To justify making this decision, Fisher offers a puzzling rationale: that Shintoism “reached its peak just before Kyoto became the capital and . . . [did] not return to official acceptance until the end of the Edo period.” If Fisher’s purpose is to describe the culture of Kyoto, the exclusion of Shintoism as being less officially sanctioned than Buddhism seems unnecessary, since it suggests that official sanction is a prerequisite for considering a site as interesting to the potential tourist. Moreover, notice that Fisher makes his point by means of a historical argument; it is not simply claimed that Shintoism is a less important religion than Buddhism, but that it was less important during a certain historical period. Fisher makes use of sociohistorical specificity in fashioning his message and giving it persuasive power.

In so doing, however, Fisher limits depiction of the cultural meaning and significance of Shintoism. Shinto “shrines,” without having been explained for their religious significance, are dismissed as irrelevant to Fisher’s discussion. However, Shintoism is a much more “purely Japanese” religion than Buddhism, which was imported from India and later China; for the visitor interested in being exposed to Japanese culture, surely Shintoism is as legitimate a subject for consideration as Buddhism.

There could be a number of reasons for Fisher to have excluded Shintoism given the sociohistorical context and goals of tour guidebooks to serve a particular industry of its embedded interests. To begin with, Shintoism is a less elevated form of religion than Buddhism, and lacks the dramatically interesting, frequently convoluted cosmogony and variations of Buddhism. Another reason may be that Shintoism offered the chief justification for deifying the Emperor, leading to perceptions of Japanese savagery during World War II; in other words, the memory of the War may

be too recent in the minds of Western tourists for them to be comfortable with Shinto concepts such as worship of the Sun Goddess, with whom the Emperor was identified in the minds of Japanese citizens (the Imperial line is held to have been directly descended from the Sun Goddess). Finally, the artistic creations of Shintoism are simply not as aesthetically impressive as the Buddhist treasures of Kyoto and hence they serve less well the demands of tourism. However, if one considers that Kyoto is much more famous for its Buddhist treasures than for its Shinto shrines, this question arises: why is it necessary to call attention to the existence of the Shinto shrines at all? Shinto shrines are hardly mentioned in earlier Fodor's descriptions of Kyoto, presumably because a traditional Japanese religion such as Shintoism would have been considered less worthy of mentioning, given the wealth of impressive Buddhist treasures in Kyoto. By 1990, however, increasing sensitivity toward traditional Japanese culture makes the reference to Shintoism necessary, even if it is introduced only for the purpose of saying it will not be a primary focus of the description. The level of specificity points toward such interpretations generated by the assumption that such changes will reflect accompanying changes in sociohistorical circumstances.

Imaginary narrators and scenarios. One of the most fascinating, and most frequent, stylistic mechanisms exhibited by the Fodor's series is the use of imaginary narrators and scenes to persuade readers of the legitimacy of the author's claims. In the first example of this mechanism, Edward Seidensticker presumes to generalize about both the countryside and city in Japan. Notice how Seidensticker uses pseudo-specificity, pretending to locate the viewer in a specific space (first from a railroad car, then in regard to "ubiquitous loudspeakers"), in order to generalize about the entire country:

So it is that, viewed from a train window, the countryside seem quiet almost to the point of sadness. To the ear it may be as clamorous as the cities, for the loudspeaker is ubiquitous, and a person sometimes suspects

that noise is to the Japanese what water is to a fish. [Emphasis added]
(Fodor's, 1962, p. 57)

Here one sees phrases which suggest specificity combined with broad generalizations (that is, two distinct orientations toward the specificity dimension are conjoined) so that it appears as if the author is basing the generalization upon firm evidence. In the first underlined passage, the reader is placed in a specific location, a train car, and asked to judge the countryside as being "quiet almost to the point of sadness." This latter generalization is so vague as to be virtually meaningless: it makes no definite claim, nor does it even define what the key terms of its claim encompass. However, the conjunction of the specific locale appears to lend support to the generalization, based upon the author's reputation: after all, Seidensticker is familiar with Japanese life, and perhaps the reader is supposed to presume that if Seidensticker states that this is how the Japanese countryside "seems" then his experience should count as support for that statement.¹⁸

But here one encounters another divergence from specificity: in fact, Seidensticker is not speaking from his own experience, but making a statement about the generalized experience of others. He does not say, "It seems to me that the countryside is quiet almost to the point of sadness . . ." Instead, he adopts the omniscient editorial voice in order to make a general statement which apparently encompasses anyone who might happen to be looking out a train window at the countryside. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with Seidensticker's making such a statement—in fact, virtually everyone who writes descriptions of culture must at times make totalizing statements. The point here is that we note analytically that more is

¹⁸ This conclusion is confirmed by Seidensticker's habit of making omniscient, declaratory evaluations of Japan, as detailed earlier in this chapter. Seidensticker's voice exhibits strong traces of his own authority; as the Bakhtin group noted, authoritativeness in the narrative voice is often indicated by the exclusion of other "voices" from a given description. In effect, Seidensticker seems to rely on his own knowledge to the extent that other opinions are considered unnecessary.

being accomplished by the author than is immediately visible on surface examination of the discourse.

The above analysis is confirmed on examination of the second underlined portion of the quoted passage, which also couples the pseudo-specific with the generalized to give an impression of an opinion grounded firmly in fact. Notice the precise stylistic parallel with the first underlined phrase: the general statement that noise is common all over Japan is verified by conjoining the general statement to a purportedly specific fact (the “ubiquitousness” of loudspeakers). Yet, surely the loudspeaker cannot possibly be ubiquitous (present everywhere), particularly in the countryside. However, once again, one is apparently presumed to accept the word of the authority, Edward Seidensticker, that such is the case. He has been writing about the country since 1948, and surely his observations must count for something.

Indeed, they do count for something. The point here is that we appreciate what it is that the theories of the Bakhtin group relevant to the dimension of specificity reveal about such an abstraction. In the quoted passage, Seidensticker has managed to manufacture an abstraction about Japan, and by stylistic maneuvering, to place that abstraction into the guidebook’s discourse as if it were describing the country itself. As noted previously, every general statement about a culture to some extent violates the specific nature of that culture. Thus, Seidensticker’s use of the generalization is no more wrong than mine, or anyone else’s. However, the interpretive lens of the dimension of specificity permits us to see how the stylistic choices made are constructing the culture, and we may then render value judgments about the quality of the cultural description.

In another example, Seidensticker appear to avoid specificity in creating an ideal setting for the Japanese tea ceremony:

The rustic, softly lighted cottage, the young lady making tea, her kimono picking up patterns from the hushed garden outside, and the flowers and

painting in the alcove crystallizing for a moment the flow of nature—all of these can, if the moment is right fuse into a unity that seems more real than any of its varied elements. Even though the world of the undisciplined taxi driver may lie beyond the garden, one is prepared to accept, for the moment, the strongest claims that the Japanese spirit has made for itself. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 84)

Here, the author seems to be trying to create a world which does not exist; the style of writing, moreover, tells us that the author is aware that this world is imaginary (“... one is prepared to accept, for the moment . . .”). And yet, this wholly manufactured context, removed from reality (metaphorically expressed as the “undisciplined taxi driver . . . beyond the garden”) is given the place of primary representation of the Japanese tea ceremony. The author uses this passage in counterpoint to an earlier criticism of the modern ceremony, described as “. . . a rather debased commercial affair and an occasion for conspicuous display” (Fodor's, 1962, p. 84). Thus, the ideal is elevated over the actual ceremony, as if the latter were too crude to be worthy of description; the latter is shown as existing on a level, in fact, with the notorious Japanese taxi-drivers. Clearly, Seidensticker reserves his “best” language for the ideal, ethereal ceremony, and declines to offer any details of the “debased commercial” reality. One is compelled to ask, then, if the “real” version is so “debased” and yet that is what the tourist will find, how responsible is it for Seidensticker to attempt to transcend this expected activity with one that probably does not exist?

It is also important to note the discursive mechanism at work in this passage. As the Bakhtin group saw it, all general descriptions remain at war with historical specificity. However, not all descriptions so deliberately appropriate the real and try to transform it into the unreal. The guidebook's production of this particular transformation is highly suspect. After all, there are few activities that rival international tourism for being legitimately described as a “debased commercial

affair." Why should the tourist, then, be prepared for anything other than debasement or commerciality? Obviously, sustaining the illusion of the traditional ideal is the stuff of tourism as an industry.

In another example illustrating the use of the imaginary scenario, the Fodor's author uses a conjunction of highly specific and highly general elements to fashion a description, purportedly of an ideal room in an ideal Japanese house, but which in fact evolves into a commentary on the Japanese way of life:

Yet the Japanese style of living makes such close quarters less trying than they would be for most people. The scantily furnished, straw-matted room is an all-purpose affair, bedroom and dining room, its ephemeral walls removed to admit breezes in the summer, its chief piece of furniture, the table, made over into a foot-warmer in the winter. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 81)

The author's purpose in this passage seems to be to draw general conclusions about the Japanese "lifestyle," but to do so by using highly specific details to describe the "typical" Japanese home: "Yet the Japanese style of living makes such close quarters less trying than they would be for most people." One wonders how this simple sentence could make such broad claims and still be accepted as authoritative. Apart from the almost certain unsupportability of the assertion that there is a "Japanese style of living," the twin assertions that Japanese live in cramped surroundings and that they don't mind being cramped, are highly suspect. Here again, we encounter the use of what might be called the "quasi-detail," a detail which seems specific on its face, but, because it describes an abstraction (the "typical Japanese home") is in fact itself an abstraction, not a detail.

Moreover, the generality of this description is further extended to include the perceptions of "most other people." By thus appearing to enlist the majority of others in support of these claims, the author is employing generality to limit "the Japanese"

by suggesting that their “style of living” is somehow deviant, that “most people” would object to the “cramped” style of living, but that the Japanese manage to get by.

This passage, though unusual, nevertheless has counterparts in the descriptions of sites and locations. However, in describing specific locales, guidebook authors are at least referring to a place which can be visited. Authors may rearrange details about the site to suit their persuasive strategies, but (perhaps because site details can be easily checked) they tend to make their points by interpretation rather than by describing hypothetical scenarios.

In the previously quoted passage, the author’s purpose appears to be somewhat different from the describers of the sites: here, the author (again, Edward Seidensticker) is using specific linguistic markers, such as the definite article “the” (“the table,” “the winter,” “the scantily-furnished . . . room”) to imply that the details of the description are related to a “real” room which exists in time and space. Moreover, this “quasi-specificity” is used to make an implied (though not clearly stated) point about Japanese living. By skillfully manipulating specificity, the author manages to fashion a very broad sweep of generalization which permits assertions not just about the nature of Japanese life as a whole, but also about how “Japanese life” compares to the lives of “other people.” The danger is that the visitor will come to the conclusions, first, that Japanese are different from “other people,” and second, that Japanese are to be evaluated in comparison to these “other people.”

In another example of how touristic authors employ the imaginary, we turn to a Fodor’s description of Kyoto, which in 1962 was the fifth largest city in Japan. Kyoto is a former capital of the nation and has generally been considered Japan’s “cultural center.” The author of the chapter on Kyoto is author Francis King, best known for his novel The Custom House, set in Japan. King, according to the biographical notes, lived in Kyoto for three years as “Regional Director for the British Council.”

In this example, King is describing the vast array of cultural artifacts housed in Kyoto. In the underlined portion of the passage, he summarizes the importance of Kyoto's cultural heritage by recourse to an idealized descriptor which is apparently intended to encompass a number of specific individuals:

Kyoto contains over 2,200 old temples and shrines, most of which remain in their original state, the former Imperial Palace, and several royal villas. It is from these ancient institutions, in which are preserved manuscripts, ceremonial robes, furniture, paintings, and works of sculpture, old musical instruments, swords, and armor that Japanese scholars trace the history of the country; and for that reason every Japanese school-boy visits Kyoto at least once during his school life to learn something of the heritage left here by his ancestors. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 275)

Granted, King is perhaps using hyperbole to make the point that Kyoto is important to all Japanese; however, it is difficult to see how the underlined statement could possibly be true, or indeed, that King could demonstrate that it could be substantially true. King uses a technique which we have encountered before: in order to make a general statement, one does not simply make a declaration about a subject, but rather masks the declaration in a referent that summarizes the whole class of things of which one's subject is a member. Here, King places all individual "Japanese school-boys" in the general descriptor "every Japanese school-boy." Having done so, he is allowed to assign a characteristic (that they have all visited Kyoto) to the general descriptor.

Thus, on the continuum of generality-to-specificity, King definitely tends toward generality. However, by instantiating the dimension of specificity in this way, there is a danger that the Japanese, once again, can be summarized in terms which deny the richness of their cultural experience. Nor does there seem to be any compelling reason for King's having phrased the statement in just this way: he could

just as easily have written, “Many Japanese school children visit Kyoto to learn about their cultural heritage.”

By retreating to the abstract covering term, in fact, King manages to reinforce a number of stereotypical views of Japanese. First, by referring only to “school-boy,” he shuts girls out of the description. Second, by suggesting that the pilgrimage to Kyoto is experienced by “every” school-boy, he reinforces the stereotype that Japanese are compliant and obedient to authority. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, by suggesting that the school-boy goes to Kyoto for the purpose of learning about his cultural heritage, King gives the mistaken impression that Japanese are culturally homogeneous. All three of these outcomes give credence to stereotypical images of the Japanese which are bound to affect tourists in their first encounters with the country.

As a final example of the imaginary as an expression of the dimension of specificity, consider the sample passage (from the 1990 Fodor’s edition) quoted below. Notice how painstakingly the author (Oliver Statler) frames the description of Osaka as a personal evaluation included in the narration of an imaginary journey from city to city:

But if we dock at Osaka—second only to Tokyo as a center of commerce and industry—I will hurry to that virile city’s lively entertainment district, Dotonbori. I can amuse myself for hours wandering through a kaleidoscope of theaters, bars, coffeehouses, restaurants, and other temptations. If I am lucky, the Bunraku puppet troupe will be at home in its handsome National Theater, and I will delight in one of Japan’s great theatrical arts. (Fodor’s, 1990, p. xxxiv)

This is stylistically very interesting. First, the narrative is written in the present tense, which suggests immediacy, as well as the fact that the observations are true at the time of reading. Second, the narrative is framed as an immediate declaration of intention: the author, Oliver Statler, states what he would do on arriving in Osaka. Third, Statler is quite forthcoming about his personal preferences as to what to see in

Osaka (“ . . . if I am lucky, the [puppet show] will be at home”). These three stylistic features make it clear that Statler is deliberately refusing to adopt the omniscient narrative style characteristic of the earlier Fodor’s editions.

In one way, this narrative style seems to more closely approximate the ideal of specificity. Statler (note that this is a specifically identified author, in contrast to a number of anonymously-authored descriptions in some of the earlier editions) is careful to frame his description of Osaka in ways that make objections unreasonable and even impossible. After all, Statler is clearly describing a fantasy based on his past experience: if he were in Osaka, this is what he might do. To this extent, then, it is clear that he is being specific and forthcoming to the reader regarding his intentions. Unlike many of the authors in the earlier editions, there is no attempt by Statler to smuggle general assertions in under the guise of an omniscient authorial voice. To put it another way, Statler is almost excruciatingly tentative about his assertions, perhaps over-careful about specifying the circumstances underlying the narrative.

In another way, however, Statler’s narrative is even further removed from the circumstances of sociohistorical specificity. In the quoted passage, and at many other points in his chapter, Statler sets the description in a timeless framework. Even while specifying the circumstances surrounding the writing of the narrative, Statler takes refuge in a largely imaginary description of Osaka. One is cued to the scenario by hypothetical qualifiers: “if I am lucky . . .”, then a certain outcome is likely to occur. At another point, Statler refuses to be pinned to specific experiences: instead, he says, “I can amuse myself for hours . . .” by wandering in certain sections of the city, implying that this is an activity which could occur at any time he is in Osaka.

One is tempted to say that the creation of an unspecified time and place is virtually required in touristic discourse; if it does not occur in one way (as, for example, through the covering generalizations contained in the earlier Fodor’s editions) then it will occur in another way (through the creation of an imaginary

scenario). While one cannot be certain that this is true in all instances, it does seem to be proven over a wide variety of touristic discourse. It may be that one of the recognized benefits of tourism is the living out of one's fantasies (that is, one reads about the country, imagines what traveling there would be like, and often comes to vicariously indulge in this imagined experience). If this is a need for many travelers, then a straightforward description of the host country, no matter how thorough or exhaustive, would hardly be enough to make the potential visitor want to go there. It may be that generalization, of one sort or another, is a prerequisite for engaging the imagination of the potential tourist, and hence is both desirable and unavoidable.

Excess specificity—Redirecting reader attention. While the Fodor's authors have frequently been guilty of using too little specific information to make their points, there are also occasions on which they present too much information as a way of establishing "proof" for claims. This is achieved by redirecting attention. An example of this phenomenon is taken from the description of Nara, which many historians feel can be considered the first capital city of Japan, but which today is famous primarily for its Buddhist temples, and particularly as the site of an impressive statue of the Buddha, reputed to be the largest bronze statue in the world. Here, the specificity dimension is explained by an over-reliance on specific data: however, it is precisely the surfeit of numerical data which allows the author to depict the described site in limited fashion.

It dates originally from the middle of the 8th century, and took five years to cast. Since then, it has suffered in two fires, so that much of it has been recast and only a few sections—parts of the garment, some leaves of the lotus flowers which surround the figure—can now be truthfully called original. Since the statue is famed more for its size than its beauty, a few figures may not be amiss. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 322)

Following the underlined portion of the passage are nearly a dozen specific measurements (for example: height, seventy-one feet, six inches; weight, five-hundred

and fifty-one tons; number of curled locks in hair [!], nine-hundred and ninety-six; and so on).

In this example, the use of the specific data serves, not to expand reader perception of the described object, but to restrict it. One is cued to the author's purpose by the first portion of the underlined utterance—"Since the statue is famed more for its size than its beauty . . ." This involves taking the perspectives of many people; by phrasing the description in this way, the author makes two broad assumptions, the first about beauty and the second about size, the former being less highly regarded than the latter. Having ruled out "beauty" as the more important factor, however, the author then proceeds with elaboration of the dimensions, assuming that specificity will increase the believability of his or her analysis; in fact, it could increase the author's credibility only if one accepts that size is the more important factor (or that for which the statue is "famed"). In fact, the author may be discomfited by the provision of such sensationalistic details as the number of curls in the statue's hair, while at the same time aware that tourists often want such details in order to enhance their own credibility when recounting their visit to others. This would account for the tentative tone of the phrase just before the statistics: ". . . a few figures may not be amiss," implying that in ordinary circumstances (if, for example, the statue were more famed for its "beauty" than its "size"), dimensional details would be less appropriate.

It thus seems that the provision of "touristic" data serves here, as it does in many site descriptions, as a means of directing the attention of the reader prior to encountering the location described. However, there is a further level to this channeling of reader thought: ignoring for the moment the question of whether the statue is more famed for "size" than "beauty," one wonders whether the author has, in his or her haste to specify reader attention, forgotten the fact that the statue was originally (and still is) primarily an object of worship. By prematurely closing the

perception of the statue to a question of whether it is more regarded for size than beauty, by then declaring for the quality of size, and finally by providing specific data to reinforce that conclusion, the Fodor's author seems to rule out the religious qualities of the statue. This, of course, is the problem encountered when an object which originates primarily in one meaning system is appropriated for the purposes of another meaning system: the original meaning system is obscured and hidden. The Buddha, in short, is removed from its status as an object of reverence and placed into a realm where even specific data cannot broaden the reader perception of its importance.

JTB—Stylistic mechanisms. Like the Fodor's guidebook series, JTB's guidebooks are also consistently marked by a number of stylistic idiosyncrasies. Stylistic mechanisms in the JTB's series relating to specificity include the following: (1) use of detail to enhance credibility; (2) use of "inside" information; (3) inadequate specificity; (4) excess specificity; and (5) selective specificity. As will be clear, despite the fact that the Fodor's series also employs inadequate specificity and excess specificity, the JTB's use of these mechanisms is related to sociohistorical circumstance in ways distinctly different from the Fodor's series.

Use of detail to enhance credibility. In the Fodor's guidebook, I analyzed a number of examples showing how broad assertions about Japanese daily life are created by exploiting various stylistic devices that shape the cultural description in often unjustified directions. In the JTB guidebook, however, one frequently encounters the reverse: broad assertions are often lost in the welter of detail. There is virtually no subject in the Fodor's series that is not covered in more detail in the JTB guidebook; in addition, there are dozens of subjects in the JTB guidebook which are ignored in Fodor's.

One should note, however, that the difference between the two guidebook series is more than simply a matter of amount of detail. In the Fodor's guidebook, there is a tendency to ignore specificity when it might be seen as interfering with the fluency of the text, written as it is for the busy traveler. In the JTB guidebook, on the

other hand, specificity and detail are employed to make the text more credible, not just as a tour guidebook, but as a standard work of reference on Japan. Thus, the level of detail is best explained by reference to specific sociohistorical circumstances (in this case, primarily awareness of audience needs), not by assuming that it is a general decision that more or less detailed information is to be preferred. As we examine specific discourse examples according to the specificity dimension, we will see that the JTB guidebook employs greater detail to actualize its own agenda just as the Fodor's guide often employs less detail to achieve its agenda.

Use of "inside" information. In the previous discussion, I noted that the Fodor's authors often use excessively general statements to avoid the burden of dealing with cultural practices in their sometimes troublesome specificity. One example of this tendency was the construction by Seidensticker of what amounted to an imaginary tea ceremony which was then compared unfavorably to the "debased commercial affair" which the author held to be characteristic of modern Japan.¹⁹ As will be shown by comparing the Fodor's account with the JTB account, much of the ceremony's significance may have been lost on the Fodor's authors, simply because full understanding may be possible only if one is a "cultural insider."

As it turns out, the tea ceremony is a far more complex affair than the Fodor's author suggests. Indeed, given the brief treatment of the subject in the Fodor's guidebook, one wonders whether the JTB guidebook and Fodor's are even describing the same cultural practice. In the JTB's guidebook, the description runs about four pages, going into the different schools of tea ceremony, describing in detail the various individually lengthy stages of the ceremony, and commenting on the subtle social gestures of politeness and consideration which accompany the ceremony's performance. In the passage quoted below, the JTB guidebook is describing the

¹⁹ See this chapter, pp. 133-135.

interaction among the participants; this interaction has been the result of host and guests having spent an extended period of time with each other. By this point in the ceremony, a sense of camaraderie has been created, a fact which is emphasized in the JTB account by the use of detail:

Hours have elapsed since the guests first assembled in the waiting room, but they are neither tired nor bored. The guests are not strangers to each other, for the host has been careful in his selection with a view to creating an atmosphere of warm congeniality. Topics of conversation are many and varied since chanoyu is practically related to every aspect of art, including garden landscaping and flower arrangement. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 212)

Here, the JTB guidebook suggests a level of humane and civilized enjoyment that is not even hinted at in the Fodor's guidebook. And yet, exploitation of specificity is incorporated in both guidebook series, though in entirely different ways, for different purposes, and in recognition of different potential audiences. Clearly, the JTB guidebook's aim is to link the tea ceremony (nearly always referred to by its Japanese name, chanoyu) to a complex of cultural meanings shared by Japanese people. Indeed, that link is even made explicit when the JTB guidebook talks about how the tea ceremony is interlinked with other "peculiarly Japanese" practices, such as landscaping and flower arrangement. For the Fodor's guidebook, on the other hand, the fashioning of an ideal, nonexistent tea ceremony, together with the contrast to the "debased commercial affair," clearly indicates the goal of the Fodor's author is to warn or alert the Western visitor to the possibly insincere practices of Japanese to ensnare and take advantage of unwary tourists.

In fact, it is possible and indeed even likely, that the two tea ceremonies—the elevated and civilized practice of chanoyu and the "debased commercial affair"—both exist in Japan. But that is not the point of this discussion of the dimension of specificity: the important point for our analysis is to understand how the use of

specific details in the narratives function to make cases that serve the interest of each guidebook given the sets of sociocultural circumstances and audiences of each.²⁰ Perhaps it would be too glib to say that the Japanese would not want to acknowledge “debased commercial” versions of the tea ceremony, and that Americans would be too insensitive to the subtlety of chanoyu to understand its finer points, but the Bakhtinian analysis shows that there is at least some merit to such an explanation. As we have seen, there are important differences between the tour guidebooks in their exploitation of specificity and generality to promote their respective agendas.

Inadequate specificity—Link to the past. The JTB, like Fodor’s, sometimes describes Japanese culture by leaving out key elements of the explanation. An example can be found in the following passage, in which the JTB guidebook describes the impact of the Tale of Genji (Genji Monogatari). In an earlier analysis, I focused upon a passage from the Fodor’s guidebook in which the narrative style of the Tale of Genji was described as “discursive and rambling,”²¹ though the Fodor’s author declined to specify what might be meant by these descriptors. In the passage below, note that the JTB guidebook utilizes the dimension of specificity in a somewhat similar manner to cast aspersions on the quality of the classic Japanese literary work:

On the other hand, as a comprehensive narrative the “Genji Monogatari” remains unsurpassed in this country. Not only was the Japanese novel unable to shake itself free from the influence of “Genji Monogatari” for several centuries, but even today it is regarded as a classic example of the Japanese novel. It was translated into English by Arthur Waley and Edward Seidensticker, among others, and has been favorably received in other European countries as well. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 155)

²⁰ In fact, like the Fodor’s description, the JTB description also makes extensive use of imaginary details. Notice how often the JTB guidebook relies on “quasi-specificity,” referring to “the guests,” “the host,” and the fact that “topics of conversation are many and varied.” Indeed, the “civilized” tea ceremony described in JTB’s guidebook is no more “real” than the ceremony “in the quiet garden” described in the Fodor’s guidebook.

²¹ See this chapter, p. 117-118.

In the earlier passage from the Fodor's guidebook, I criticized the author for failing to adequately explain the meaning of the terms "discursive and rambling," whose use cast unsupported aspersions upon the Lady Murasaki's narrative style. However, in the passage from the JTB guidebook, the author pursues a similar strategy, stating that the "Japanese novel" spent several centuries trying to "shake itself free" from the influence of Genji Monogatari.

In this passage, the JTB author also employs what might be called "pseudo-specificity": referents (such as "the Japanese novel" and "several centuries") seem to have specific connections to real historical data, but upon examination prove not to be specific at all. One remains uninformed as to precisely what is meant by "the Japanese novel," nor is one certain about how many centuries are encompassed by the qualifier "several." In both the Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks, then, the authors distance themselves from specificity in order to make a point about Genji Monogatari, but at the same time do so by linguistic mechanisms which ensure that they will not have to deal with the specifics of Murasaki's narrative.

There are a couple of interesting points to note about this instantiation of the dimension of specificity. First, it is the JTB's depiction which is the more damaging to the reputation of Genji Monogatari, not the Fodor's depiction. In the Fodor's guide, the non-specific descriptor "discursive and rambling" might easily be passed off as designating the work as anachronistic, part of the historical charm of a narrative composed such a long time ago. Moreover, one must not overlook the obvious point that both authors imply that the narrative is lengthy and dense (the JTB guidebook refers to the style by the more neutral term "comprehensive"). But the description in the JTB guidebook is far more seriously derogatory. By stating that Genji Monogatari exerted a powerful influence on Japanese novels considered as a whole, and moreover that this influence had to be "shaken," the author suggests that the reception of the book has had a deleterious effect on the development of the novel in Japan.

With this idea in mind, and recalling that the dimension of specificity clarifies the linkage between written language and the specific elements it engages when introduced into social discourse, one can also comment on the use of specific detail by both authors. Again, it is JTB which is presuming the right to situate Genji Monogatari in the broader sweep of the development of Japanese literature. While the Fodor's author is confined to making general dismissive comments (though, it must be acknowledged, also fairly complimentary to the novel as a "classic" of Japanese literature), the JTB guidebook is confident enough of its grasp of the novel's impact to comment upon the negative effect it is said to have had on the development of the novel in Japan. Here again, one is virtually compelled to the conclusion that such exploitation of specificity arises from a presumed superior knowledge of Genji Monogatari on the part of the authors of the JTB guidebook. At the very least, the authors of the JTB guidebook are more likely to be able to judge other Japanese novels, written in Japanese, as having been influenced by the success of the Genji Monogatari.²² Moreover, it is probably the novel's wide visibility in Western circles that leads the JTB guidebook to feel compelled to reassess its importance for potential Western visitors. It is relatively easy to designate a work as a "classic," particularly if many people already believe it is, but it takes a more confident voice, grounded in sociohistorical certitude, to state that what most Westerners believe is a "classic" is an influence which must be "shaken." To make the latter assessment requires a Japanese voice. At the same time, one should note that neither assessment is the more accurate,

²² Ironically, one is able to discover by inference that the author of the earlier Fodor's description is Edward Seidensticker, cited in the JTB quotation as one of the leading translators of Genji Monogatari. Hence, while it can hardly be said that Seidensticker is unfamiliar with Japanese literature, the JTB's reframing of the received view on the novel expressed by Seidensticker even more strongly confirms the Bakhtin group's views on specificity: drawing on the unique circumstances permitted it by its position as official spokesman for the country of Japan, the JTB puts the propounders of the received view of Genji Monogatari "in their place."

but that both demonstrate management of the dimension of specificity for the promotion of the authorial agenda.

In another example illustrating the strategic use of linkages to sociohistorical specificity, the author of the JTB guidebook discusses the appropriation of “Western ideas” about government and politics that were taken up by Japanese as being of potential value to Japan. In this passage, notice how a strategic vagueness permits the author to imply that Japanese have a use for Western political ideals, but not to specify precisely how these ideas made their way into Japanese consciousness.

Things Western were introduced into the country by those Japanese who had studied abroad and also by foreigners who came to Japan. One outcome was the spread among the people of the ideas of liberty, equality and civil rights. Thoughtful Japanese began to entertain a craving for the adoption of a parliamentary system. For this purpose, all sorts of practical movements were started. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 99)

First of all, the author manages very skillfully to evade the perception that Japanese were in any sense strongly influenced by Western ideas. Rather, by concentrating only upon certain specific aspects of the relationships through which cultural ideas are transferred, the author suggests that it is the Japanese themselves who ventured from their country to the West to obtain these new ideas. That the point could have been made differently is easily seen by rephrasing the utterance: “Impressed with the political ideals of the West, the Japanese returned to their own country to try out these new beliefs about democracy and freedom.” But note that such a rephrasing places the Japanese in a much more subservient light, implying that there may have been something inherently wrong with Japanese political systems, and that this could be remedied by importation of “Western” ideas.

The manipulation of the specificity dimension aids the author in achieving the goal of enhancing the image of Japan as progressive and forward-looking. Notice that by being selective about which elements of the Western-Japanese interaction are

emphasized, the author implies that the transfer is a matter of Japanese choice. Indeed, one cannot escape the impression that the Japanese may even be boasting about their ability to get an education in Western countries, while at the same time paying a backhanded compliment to Western education. Yet it is interesting that at no point does the narrative suggest that the Japanese are in any way in the debt of “Westerners,” but rather that Japanese adoption of the ideals is a favor paid to Westerners. (Notice, too, that the identity of these “Western countries” is conveniently left unspecified, thus permitting any “Western” reader to assume that it is his or her country that has been honored by Japan in this way.) Again, given the fact that any discourse must inevitably be situated in a specific time and place, it is of interest to the critical reader to determine precisely how the specific elements of the discourse are managed. It is through the text that language is connected to lived experience. It is only when the text departs noticeably from specific sociohistorical circumstances—when, for example, objectionably broad generalizations are employed, or when obvious specific facts are passed over—that one becomes aware that the text may be trying to manipulate specific sociohistorical circumstances in the service of the persuasive goals of the author. Indeed, given the fact that no utterance may describe fully its connection to sociohistorical circumstances, limitation of specificity is inevitable. As we have seen, however, the author’s attempt to gloss over specific circumstances, or to expand and make such circumstances more complex, reveals a great deal about the author’s perspective and informs the critical reader about the effort to connect with an audience’s architectonics.

Excess specificity—Soothing tourist fears. On the other hand, there are many noteworthy instances in which the JTB employs what appears to be an excess of detail to reassure its readers about some particular point. In the first example, the JTB guidebook is offered its opportunity to reply to the preconception about the notorious

taxi drivers in Tokyo. In the passage quoted below, notice the wealth of detail given to the tourist who might be interested in taking a Tokyo taxi.

There are many taxis found cruising the streets and lined up in front of hotels and main stations waiting for customers. Most taxis in Tokyo are medium-sized, four-to-five passengers cars, and the rear doors are opened automatically by the driver. The fare meter is attached to the front of the dashboard where the customer can see it. Since fares are calculated by both time and distance, if one asks the cab to wait, it can be quite expensive. After 11 p.m., the fares increase by 30%. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, pp. 366-367)

In this passage, the specificity dimension is used to connect the description of Tokyo taxis with known facts about riding in taxis in the city. The great detail in this passage reassures the visitor that every possible objection to taking a taxi in a foreign country has been thought through and answered. One will, according to the JTB, avoid getting cheated by outrageous fares, be admitted and allowed to exit by automatic controls, and know precisely which fares apply to which times of the day. Thus, the use of detail permits the JTB guidebook to make a broader point; the unspoken message from the JTB guidebook is not simply that one should have the information one needs, but that the government (under whose direction the guidebook is written) has looked at the situation and has done something to make the tourist's stay safer and more comfortable.

It is also useful to note that these same facts, for any given guidebook edition, are available to anyone who wants to make the effort to find them. Nevertheless, facts are selected and marshaled in the service of the author's agenda; the JTB seeks to reassure the visitor, while the Fodor's author, Edward Seidensticker, as was demonstrated in the previous analysis, portrays Japan as problematic for the tourist. Seidensticker does not need the level of specific detail included in the JTB's description of the taxi ride to make his point, whereas these details are highly important if the JTB is to be successful in reassuring potential visitors.

Since the 1991 edition of the JTB guide is being used here as the base for comparison, one should also note that Seidensticker's account, substantially unchanged from 1962 through 1982, has been entirely excised from the 1990 Fodor's edition. Indeed, the 1990 Fodor's guidebook, both in terms of specificity and refusal to cling to outdated stereotypes, more closely resembles the JTB guidebook than do earlier editions of Fodor's. Clearly, by 1990, Fodor's has caught the winds of consumer change and responds to the demand on tour guidebooks to be information sources. It is interesting, however, that these changes in content and format do not come until the 1990 revision.

A second example, illustrating some of the same principles of employing specific data in ways that allay the fears of potential tourists, is to be found in the description of public and private hot-springs baths in the traditional Japanese inn, or ryokan.

One of the major charms of ryokan at hot-springs resorts is their rotemburo (outdoor hot-springs baths). There is nothing better to relieve stress and fatigue than gazing at a beautifully natural setting while relaxing in a hot, soothing bath. Visitors can bathe in the privacy of their own room since many ryokan provide rooms with a private bath, but they are welcome to try the public bath, generally used by all guests in common. Ryokan base their image on and take great pride in their hot springs and baths. Travelers often select a ryokan based on its hot-springs and bathing facilities. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 50)

Since bathing is such an intimate activity, the JTB in this passage seems to feel that some reassurance is in order; the author utilizes specificity to provide that reassurance. Specific information is used to suggest not only that the visitor's privacy is protected, but that there is a reason for bathing beyond physical cleansing. Indeed, sitting in the hot-spring in a "natural setting" is soothing to the traveler, and constitutes an experience which borders on the metaphysical. Thus, specific connections to sociohistorical circumstance are used not only to tell travelers that they

can indulge in hot-springs bathing in the “privacy” of their own rooms, but to suggest that the goal of the activity is to acquire a calmer, more contemplative frame of mind. The implied message is that, given such a desirable spiritual outcome, how much can one’s immediate misgivings matter?

Specificity is also used to suggest that the overarching plan of the Japanese ryokan system involves some sort of guarantee of excellence. The ryokan, the JTB guidebook states, “. . . base their image on and take great pride in their hot springs and baths,” so that the visitor is reassured that a competitive standard of excellence is adhered to. Here, however, the JTB guidebook steps back, controlling the dimension of specificity, not to provide information to the tourist, but to gloss, much in the same manner as was so frequently encountered in the Fodor’s guidebook. Surely it cannot be true that the ryokan “base their image” on their baths: a number of other factors (price, locale, food, and so on) must also be a part of their reputation. Yet the quoted passage suggests—in an unusual way, as I will point out momentarily—that baths and/or hot springs are the primary criteria for the success of ryokan. There are two important issues to address concerning the passage: first, how the rank ordering of criteria is implied, and second, what it accomplishes.

To answer the first question, the technique employed by the JTB author is to insert the conjunction “and” to link two segments of the sentence whose relationship to each other is tenuous: the first segment reads, “base their image on,” while the second segment (after the conjunction “and”) reads, “take great pride in” hot springs and baths. The Bakhtin group calls this a hybrid construction, that is, an utterance in which two disparate segments are joined together linguistically.²³ In the present example, segments which are different in evidential support are joined in the hybrid construction. The first segment (that ryokan base their reputation on baths and

²³ The hybrid construction is also used to analyze touristic text in Chapter Five, pp. 332-334.

springs), as noted, can hardly be true, whereas the second segment (that ryokan take “pride” in the baths and springs) could easily be true, particularly in a competitive tourist market. However, the conjoining of the two segments with the problematic conjunction “and” suggests that the face value of the two assertions should be about equal. Thus the weaker assertion is “smuggled” into the discourse on the stronger assertion. In so doing the discourse’s persuasiveness comes from the fact that the support for the stronger claim (in this case, self-evident logic which tells the reader that a successful business concern must remain competitive) may also be applied to the weaker, more controversial, claim. Unless one recognizes that the two claims instantiate the dimension of specificity in different ways and to differing degrees, one might assume that the statement must be evaluated as a whole, rather than as separate components.

Selective specificity—Targeting reader architectonics. In the descriptions of various aspects of Japanese customs and culture, the JTB guidebook frequently provides historical reference points for cultural events, thus infusing each description with the flavor of sociohistorical circumstances: history literally provides the basis for interpreting each event. Examples can be found in the description of “Restaurants and Theaters” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1955, pp. 28-31), and in the description of “Public Holidays and Annual Functions” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1955, pp. 50-59). The performance of kabuki theater is tied to the roles of actors and audiences in the feudal period of Japanese history (p. 29). The cherry-blossom trees which attract so many in Washington, D.C., each spring are said to have been given to the United States in 1912, and to have been taken from the cherry grove along the Arakawa Canal in Tokyo (p. 15). Similar information can be found in both the 1975 and 1991 editions.

Among the many holidays and annual events identified by the JTB guidebook, several examples—though by no means all—refer to the history of the special occasion being described. For example, in the description of the New Year’s holiday, it is stated

that at one time Tokyo firemen would perform acrobatic stunts on the tops of ladders to demonstrate their agility. Typically, these stunts were performed on the sixth day of ganjitsu (New Year's holiday). However, the practice, in effect even after the Restoration in 1868, was abolished in 1939 due, the author claims, to the fact that the "old system of fire brigades became obsolete and its reorganization was imperative to cope with modern requirements," only to be revived again "recently" (p. 53). A second example concerns Go-Sekku ("Five Seasons' Offerings"), which was abolished by the Imperial Court in 1873, only to be reinstated as part of a general public enthusiasm for the old practices (p. 54). A third example is that of Hoshi Matsuri ("Star Festival"). The custom of praying to the Cowherd Star for good harvests and the Weaver Star for skill in weaving has been observed in Japan since 755 (p. 56). Still a fourth example is the importation of the Bon festival some 1400 years ago from China, contemporaneous with the institution of Buddhism (p. 57). With different organizational structures, similar statements are made in both the 1975 edition ("National Holidays and Annual Functions," pp. 29-39) and the 1991 edition ("National Holidays and Events," pp. 28-30, and "How the Japanese Spend Their Holidays," pp. 30-37).

Despite the intent of the chapter to provide the most up-to-date and current information on Japanese cultural life, such information is nearly always situated with respect to history. Why is it necessary to describe the history of cultural events and festivals? Are tourists interested in the long historical evolution of these distinctive and strange events? For whom is history written? The Bakhtin circle's analytical framework reveals reference to the historical background of theatrical performances or various holidays to be far more complex than simply an attempt to enable readers of the JTB guidebook to acquire understanding of Japanese culture.

First, the insistence on taking the pulse of history is deeply ingrained in touristic discourse, even when the writing is not about history, *per se*.²⁴ Filling in the historical background for a cultural event can be seen as a means for the JTB guidebook to give more credibility to such events. Regardless of whether Japan's potential tourists will remember the detailed information, a cultural event which is laden with a mysterious and intriguing historical past serves the curiosity of tourists. The tourists are assured that, not only will they visit a site which is different and special, but that this "uniqueness" has evolved through a long and rich historical process. The cultural character of the Japanese, thus defined, is accorded depth, and made more intriguing, more mysterious, and more entertaining.

Second, these passages also situate Japan as a long-lived culture. This strategy is particularly useful in the description of cultural events. Of course, in the JTB guidebook there is a specific section reserved for a general account of Japanese history. However, such sections may be ignored by tourists, particularly when the section bears no direct connection to the cultural events they are going to visit or attend. But descriptions of history related to cultural events are different: even if the tourist ignores the historical background of the country as a whole, the atmosphere of history as a framework for understanding the sights and sounds of a noteworthy event cannot so easily be denied.

Third, many descriptions of historical background dating back a considerable period are often situated in a nostalgic past that cannot be judged by modern standards. For the JTB guidebook—written on behalf of the Japanese government—this remote past is thus protected from criticism and made an object of appreciation. For example, consider the Tokyo firemen's performance of acrobatic stunts on the tops of ladders to demonstrate their agility during the New Year's holiday. This cultural

²⁴ The importance of history as an essential category of touristic discourse is discussed in Chapter Two, pp. 31-32.

celebration was abolished in 1939 due to the fact that the old system was required to update itself to modern standards. Although the practice has subsequently been revived, the JTB guidebook describes the revival in a relatively neutral tone: "Recently, to the people's delight, the old custom was revived" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1955, p. 53; similar statement appears on page 32 of the 1975 edition). Whether the revived performance is in line with "modern requirements" is made of no concern through its performance for "the people's delight."

History is part of the genre of touristic discourse. One almost always finds descriptions of a nation's history in tour guidebooks (though the length, degree of detail, and position taken by the author in analyzing historical issues will differ from one tour guidebook to another). Moreover, the "history" section is often separated from "travel information." This organizational structure provides tourists, if they so choose, a chance to ignore the description of the history of the place they intend to visit.

Hence, there appear to be two goals accomplished at the same time. On the one hand, visitors are assured that they are going to visit a location which exists not only in the here-and-now but also in the past. The place becomes, not simply a site of amusement, but a locale laden with human history. On the other hand, tourists are given ways easily to avoid connection between the present and the past in a modern, comfortable, and predictable environment. To incorporate the history in the JTB guidebook, then, is a response to the sociohistorical grounding of touristic discourse. This mission is particularly important to the JTB guidebook, since, as noted earlier, the JTB guidebook attempts to provide information on "every aspect" of Japanese life, a goal in which the depiction of history plays an important part.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE DIMENSION OF OWNERSHIP AND THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION

General Overview

The dimension of ownership states, "All communication is jointly owned by all social actors; it can never be held privately or limited to a subunit of society." This principle is derived from the Bakhtin group's belief that merely introducing discourse into the social realm is to necessarily engage controversy over its meaning. If one makes a statement about Japan, and then publishes that statement in a book which can then be read by a number of people, one will certainly engage all potential readers on their terms, that is, from their viewpoints, based on their own necessarily unique architectonic¹ systems. Given that no two architectonic systems are alike, some difference of opinion about the representation is inevitable. Since the author of cultural description can never know who is going to be reading his or her words, nor be able to predict the reactions of readers as they filter the author's words through their own architectonic systems, representers of culture must fashion their representations with care. As we examine, through the lens of ownership, the attempts of the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series to establish claim to their representations, we will see how the effort to claim representational authority leaves its traces in the text of the cultural description.

Yield of Comparative Analysis of Ownership—An Overview

Comparing the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series, one can see a number of differences when analyzed through the lens of ownership. First, in the Fodor's series, emphasis is placed upon retaining the authority to represent Japan. Fodor's appears to

¹ A detailed explanation of architectonics can be found on pp. 561-566 of the Appendix.

grant itself some latitude in depicting Japan, based in part on the historical context of East-West contact (in which the East is viewed as inferior to the West) and in part on Fodor's history as the oldest continuously published annual Western guidebook to Japan. The JTB series, on the other hand, consistently tries to challenge the right claimed by Fodor's and other Western guidebooks to represent Japan from a Western perspective, while at the same time utilizing its superior knowledge of Japanese culture to fashion a more favorable image of Japan and to claim this image as more legitimate than alternative representations.

Second, in the Fodor's series, there are a number of attempts to inscribe Japanese culture, including the following: (1) restricted readings of Japanese life; (2) selective readings of history; (3) claims to Western ownership of representations; (4) claiming dependence of Japanese culture on Western nations; and (5) claiming independence of Japanese culture from other Asian nations. The JTB guidebook, on the other hand, attempts to recast the image of Japan through its resistance to Western cultural inscription in a number of ways, including the following: (1) fuller, richer descriptions of Japanese cultural life; (2) selective readings of history; (3) claims to Japanese superiority; and (4) claims to independent development of Japanese culture.

Third, analysis reveals several important temporal changes in ownership of the Fodor's descriptions over the period since its inception. Three of these are examined in detail: (1) rephrasing of stereotypes; (2) shift to more subtle expressions of ownership; and (3) shift to more overtly consumeristic aims. Several important temporal changes in the JTB series are also examined, including the following: (1) reformulation of claims about cultural transmission; and (2) consistent overloading of detail throughout the series.

Finally, each series contains a number of idiosyncratic stylistic mechanisms useful in establishing claims to ownership. In the Fodor's series, the following stylistic mechanisms are identified and discussed: (1) claims based on questionable evidence;

(2) taking refuge in the genre of touristic writing; and (3) excessive attribution. In the JTB series, ownership is also claimed through a number of characteristic stylistic mechanisms, including the following: (1) crowding out other representations; and (2) deletion of problematic details.

Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Ownership—An Overview

In general, claims to ownership of cultural representation of Japan in the Fodor's series can be characterized as a tenacious clinging to representational authority in the earlier editions (1962 through 1982), followed by a marked effort to acknowledge alternative representations in the 1990 edition. At the same time, as will be evident through examination of key passages in the 1990 edition, despite surface attempts to bring more "voices" into the conversation about Japan, even the later editions of Fodor's attempt to control ownership of representation, although such control is expressed more subtly. On the other hand, apart from some changes in the 1962 through 1982 editions (particularly the removal of Seidensticker's introductory chapter from the 1976 edition), I will argue that Fodor's was certain enough of its representational authority to have retained most of its representations of Japan virtually intact for two decades (through 1982).

During the same period, one can see that the JTB's guidebook series exhibits two primary patterns of development. First, JTB's guidebooks begin with some resistance to attempts to inscribe Japanese culture by Western sources (there are some examples of this even in the earliest sampled edition from 1955). Second, however, one can observe a gradual but marked increase in JTB's attempts to contest ownership of representational authority, thereby challenging the established rights of Fodor's and other Western sources to represent Japan in terms consistent with their own agendas. Over the period analyzed, Japan's willingness to contest such representations varies: from seeming reluctance in 1955, to a more confrontational, even belligerent tone in

1975, to a more reasonable, less defensive tone in 1991. As will become evident, this pattern reflects the increasing certainty shown by Japan toward itself as a legitimate owner of the right to represent Japanese culture, as it has moved from uncertainty about its “native” practices, through defensiveness, and finally to a sense of confidence and comfort.

Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to Ownership in Fodor’s and JTB’s Descriptions

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Ownership of Fodor’s Descriptions

This section advances a more detailed and substantive elaboration of the general sketch of issues related to the dimension of ownership in the Fodor’s series. The discussion is organized into three major sections. The first two sections elaborate major themes in Fodor’s descriptions opened up through the lens of the ownership construct. The third section examines changes in approaches taken to ownership by Fodor’s over successive editions.

Fodor’s—Holding to the right to represent. Throughout the Fodor’s series, authors and editors write their descriptions of Japan from a position of superiority. As will be evident, not only do many of the more hierarchical characterizations about the country remain unchanged in the Fodor’s series from 1962 through 1982, but even the extensive revisions of the 1990 edition are often merely reformulations of earlier declarations in less obtrusive language. Each of these characterizations may be viewed as a declaration of the right to represent Japan.

Writing from the position of superiority, the Fodor’s series gives itself a great deal of latitude to depict Japan and Japanese in ways deemed consistent with the goals of the writers and editors. While any tour guidebook writer is constrained by certain facts about the described culture (one must write descriptions which will correspond to the experiences of one’s readers), the dimension of ownership permits the writer to

be very selective about which facts he or she chooses to support a given depiction. One can, and inevitably does, select primarily those facts which support the conclusions one wishes to advance. The selection of certain details which support one's arguments automatically implies the exclusion of other details which not only may not support one's case, but which may even be evidence against it.

Given the inevitability of limiting description through the need of the author to promote a particular view of reality, the issue of power differences between the describer and the described is particularly important in the study of touristic discourse. Relative to the JTB series, Fodor's begins its series in a position of greater power, as shown by the frequency with which declaratory statements about Japan are made in the earlier editions. On the other hand, the tone of the JTB guidebook's 1955 edition is, as we saw in Chapter Three, far more tentative than in its later editions: emerging from the aftermath of its defeat in World War II and the subsequent occupation of its territory by the Allies, Japan was not able to assert itself too strongly in 1955. As the relative power of the West and Japan shifted more to the side of Japan, however, by 1975 one notices the deletion of apologetic and deferential descriptions (coupled with the first appearance of significant revisions in the Fodor's format and content), together with the assertion in the JTB guidebook of more statements establishing Japanese pride in Japan's own cultural integrity (coupled with the beginnings of recognition by Fodor's that its initial characterizations of Japan may have been too strong²). By 1990, the Fodor's series goes to great lengths to demonstrate its cultural sensitivity; at the same time, the 1991 edition of the JTB series seems very sure of itself and refuses to apologize even for its role in World War II, to say nothing of its removal of nearly all apologies about accommodations, health

² The most convincing example of this recognition is the removal of Edward Seidensticker's contentious introductory chapter from the 1976 edition and its replacement with the milder and more tentatively phrased chapter by Douglas Moore Kenrick.

facilities, food, and transportation that were so evident in 1955 and—to a much lesser extent—1975 editions.

This brief comparative overview of the approaches of the Fodor's and JTB's series, and how they have changed over the years, leads one to question why it took so long for Fodor's to indicate that they were adjusting to changing perceptions about Japan. While no simple answer to this question is possible, one reason may have been that Fodor's was reluctant to cede control over the right to represent Japan as they chose. Having begun in the position of superiority with regard to Japan, it may have been difficult for Fodor's to have revised its opinions until the market for tour guidebooks necessitated some changes.³ By the mid- to late-1980s, it was no longer feasible to retain the attitude of superiority so unambiguously expressed in earlier Fodor's discourse. For one thing, there were too many "alternative" guidebooks to Japan available, whereas when the Fodor's series began in 1961, it was one of only a scant handful of guidebooks to Japan.⁴ Another reason for Fodor's abandonment of its earlier characterizations of Japan may have been simply that conditions in Japan had changed to such an extent that Fodor's earlier negative evaluations no longer held true. In the 1990 edition, then, one sees the Fodor's authors and editors more willing to admit that other competing voices have entered the competition for reader attention, accompanied by a corresponding decrease in making declaratory and authoritarian statements about Japan.

Fodor's—Inscription of Japan and the Japanese. The Fodor's series exhibits a number of specific forms of cultural inscription of Japan and the Japanese, including the following: (1) restricted readings of Japanese life; (2) selective readings of history;

³ The authoritative pronouncement, or claim to ownership, of a description has negative as well as positive consequences. While an authoritative tone may initially add credibility to a statement because the author seems sure of him- or herself, retraction of the authoritative statement at some later time is more difficult because readers may question why it is necessary to revise a statement about which the author originally seemed so certain.

⁴ See Chapter Two, pp. 15-18.

(3) claims to Western ownership of representations; (4) claiming dependence of Japanese culture on Western nations; and (5) claiming independence of Japanese culture from other Asian nations.

Restricted readings of Japanese life. One reason for the relatively more favorable image of Japan presented by the 1990 Fodor's edition is that its descriptions are far less restrictive, less declaratory, and less prone to exclude other viewpoints from the guidebook's text, than were the previous editions (1962 through 1982). I want to examine some of the more striking claims to ownership of representations of Japan from the 1962 edition, particularly those from the introductory chapter, "Japan and Its People: A Crowded, Lonely Land," by Edward Seidensticker. This article appears without substantial changes in both the 1962 (pp. 55-68) and 1969 (pp. 55-68) editions. In the 1976 edition, the introductory chapter has the same title but the article is written by a different author (Douglas Moore Kenrick). In other words, Seidensticker's article is removed from the 1976 and 1982 editions, even while other articles, including "From Clan to Chaos," and "Arts and Lesser Pleasures," also written by Seidensticker (though not overtly attributed to him) remain intact through the 1982 edition with very minor revisions. As we examine the extensive claims to ownership found in Seidensticker's 1962 and 1969 chapters, it should become clear why their removal from later editions was considered necessary.

In brief, Seidensticker's introductory chapter presents a negative image of Japan. Two introductory paragraphs say virtually nothing positive about the country. As Seidensticker admits, "What has been said will perhaps not seem a cheery introduction to Japan; but no one can honestly ask a stranger to come and have a look, and expect him to derive much pleasure from his first impressions" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 58). This early declaration excuses the subsequent negative images: the problems of Japan prevent visitors from enjoying themselves at first. Ownership of all representations is thus established, and opinions to the contrary—that Japan might

make a favorable impression on some visitors—are excluded from Seidensticker's description.

The traffic in Tokyo, Seidensticker continues, is highly congested. Seidensticker supports this claim through the following characterization of Tokyo taxi drivers:

The congestion is not helped by the remarkable skill and lawlessness of the Japanese taxi driver, frantically maneuvering his small vehicle from lane to lane and cranny to cranny, and screaming up to an intersection just in time to lock the columns of turning traffic, and start another jam. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 58)

Seidensticker chooses details to offer a frightening picture of Tokyo traffic: taxi drivers are described as skillful but lawless, their driving "frantic," and they are said to weave from "lane to lane and cranny to cranny" as they "scream" up to an intersection. Moreover, even though Seidensticker's claim may have some basis in fact, his use almost exclusively of frightening images creates a one-sided picture. It is evident from his description that Seidensticker has little interest in depicting Japan as appealing or attractive. His strategies to claim ownership of his representations are in line with this purpose. Other, more positive images of Japan—for example, depictions of law-abiding taxi drivers—do not serve Seidensticker's purpose, because their inclusion offers competition to his claim that one will not "derive much pleasure from [one's] first impressions." To support that early claim, Seidensticker has to be selective about the details of his picture, which may be one reason why the chapter seems so unrelentingly critical of Japan.

Seidensticker also states that Japanese are very noisy. In Chapter Three, we examined a passage⁵ in which Seidensticker described Japan from the viewpoint of an imaginary passenger in a passing train, claiming that although the Japanese countryside is quiet "to the point of sadness . . . [t]o the ear it may be as clamorous as

⁵ See Chapter Three, pp. 131-133.

the cities, for the loudspeaker is ubiquitous, and a person sometimes suspects that noise is to the Japanese what water is to a fish" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 57). In this passage, Seidensticker favors another controversial and one-sided picture of Japan. In Chapter Three, I remarked that it is impossible for loudspeakers to be everywhere; one could also add that human existence in constant noise is physically impossible, and moreover, that it is extremely unlikely that the countryside could be "as clamorous as the cities." If so, why is Seidensticker so ready to declare ownership of such problematic representations? One reason may be that, given his initial declaration of ownership of an image of Japan as unattractive, he feels compelled to include only details that will support that initial characterization.

Seidensticker's apparent certainty regarding ownership of his image of Japan sometimes results in unusual textual constructions. For example, consider the following tenuous connection between Japan's population density and the Japanese "psychological makeup": ". . . [Japanese] appear in crowds, and when they move they move in crowds, as if impelled by a terrible fear of being alone . . ." (Fodor's, 1962, p. 67). Two questionable claims to ownership are advanced in this statement: first, Seidensticker claims to represent how Japanese appear ("in crowds"), but second, he also claims to explain why they appear this way. Here, too, Seidensticker cannot reasonably claim that he has perceived all Japanese in crowds, and, even if that were true, it is unlikely that he could offer any insight as to a reason why they should do so. Yet Seidensticker's claim (like other claims in his chapter) is made easily, almost offhandedly. Through the lens of ownership, however, Seidensticker's agenda is made more apparent. By making these statements, Edward Seidensticker is staking a claim to his viewpoint about what Japan should mean to the potential visitor. If the reader of the Fodor's guidebook should form a negative image of Japan, he or she can hardly be blamed, since Seidensticker has already said that no visitor can be expected to respond positively to initial contact with the country.

Seidensticker's critique is wide-ranging, extending to such subjects as architecture. In making judgments about Japan's buildings, he asserts, "Individual buildings can be good (before the rains get at them), but they add up to nothing. Tokyo and other Japanese cities viewed as physical plants completely lack character and integrity" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 58).

Because it is written in such a disdainful tone, this passage forcefully forbids alternative representations from claims to ownership. Do Japanese buildings "completely lack character and dignity?" Does the term "completely" mean that there is not one building in Japan that has "character and dignity"? Moreover, what is meant by the terms "character" and "dignity"? Does it seem reasonable that individual buildings "add up to nothing"? If so, what might that evaluation mean?

Reading this and other passages, one begins to wonder whether Seidensticker has formed any positive opinion about Japan. However, the unrelentingly negative tone of Seidensticker's description makes Fodor's placement of his chapter in the initial position of the guidebook somewhat problematic. The general explanatory chapter is a common point of access for readers of the guidebook; readers are likely to turn first to this chapter to get an impression about "what the country is like." Seidensticker's controversial and one-sided depictions are not likely to leave readers with a very good impression of Japan; moreover, Seidensticker's argumentative claims to ownership leave little room for the opinions of those who might disagree with him.

As one might expect, other aspects of Japanese cultural life are also criticized by Seidensticker. In the passage below, Seidensticker offers his opinion on the Japanese language:

Japanese is an orphan language and an exceedingly difficult one, and now that Japan's imperial schemes have collapsed it does not seem likely that many aliens will make the effort to learn it. The Japanese are far more dependent on translators than are the English, and it might be added that the standard of translation is not high. Hence a stubborn

language barrier operates to keep the Japanese out of the world.
(Fodor's, 1962, p. 61)

In this paragraph, the author makes three assertions. First, he claims that Japanese is an "orphan language." Second, he asserts that Japanese is "exceedingly difficult." Finally, he claims that many "aliens" are unlikely to learn the language because of the reform of the Japanese political structure.

What precisely is an "orphan" language? To my knowledge, this is not a term used by linguists, sociologists, or anthropologists. Rather, Seidensticker has apparently coined the term to convey his sense of disdain at the Japanese language. Moreover, in contrast to his other opinions, Seidensticker can be termed a legitimate expert on the Japanese language who has a number of translations of Japanese literary works into English to his credit. Had he stayed at this level of claiming ownership, his analysis might be more believable (there are certainly a large number of scholars and others who agree with him that Japanese is difficult to learn). However, even in his area of expertise, Seidensticker appears driven to make excessive claims to ownership of representations: he confidently predicts that the difficulty of the Japanese language will prevent Japan from interacting with the world community.⁶ Moreover, Seidensticker also forges a questionable linkage between the problems of learning Japanese and the outcome of World War II (widespread learning of Japanese is less likely, given the "collapse" of Japan's "imperial schemes"). In effect, Seidensticker extends the claim to ownership from areas in which he has credibility to areas where he seems to have little or none.

The cumulative effect of Seidensticker's observations is to severely restrict and limit impressions of Japan. Seidensticker's claims to ownership of the images he advances—based primarily on his reputation as a published commentator on Japan,

⁶ This prediction has proven false: while the Japanese language has changed very little, Japan has significantly increased its interaction with other countries, including the United States.

and not on evidence cited in his Fodor's descriptions—exclude other representations. Were the reader to rely only on images obtained from Seidensticker's descriptions, were Seidensticker to be granted his claims to ownership, the reader would be less likely to seek out other voices which might contradict Seidensticker's.

Limitations of Japan through ownership of representations are found in other chapters authored by Seidensticker in the early editions of the Fodor's guidebook. In the following example, notice how, in the chapter, "Arts and Lesser Pleasures: Traditional Taste for New Vogues" (pp. 83-90), Seidensticker tentatively approaches constituencies who might lay claim to ownership of the definition of the term "geisha":

Questions about this lady are among the most difficult of questions about Japan to answer. She is a most Japanese phenomenon and attracts enormous curiosity from abroad, but it is very hard to say precisely what she is. The word geisha means literally "accomplished person", and it fairly well describes the geisha in her pure, classical form. She was originally an accomplished musician and dancer called in to entertain at stag parties, the only really Japanese sort of party; but so many geisha were available for other services to men with sufficient money that the geisha and the prostitute became hopelessly intertwined. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 88)

In few other places in the 1962 guidebook can one so clearly sense the author's discomfort. Seidensticker, so relaxed about making wide-ranging assertions about other aspects of Japanese culture, seems ill at ease at having to talk about prostitution (which may explain the author's tentative declaration of ownership: Seidensticker seems reluctant even to classify the geisha as a prostitute).

In this passage, the description embodies a conflict over the descriptor "geisha." Is the geisha a prostitute or simply an entertainer? Who, in other words, owns the right to classify the members of this category: writers of guidebooks, those steeped in "Japanese tradition," or simply males with money to spend? According to Seidensticker, the geisha can be a prostitute, because she both entertains and takes money for "other services"; yet, at the same time, she may not be a prostitute, because

the term geisha means “accomplished person” and she is, after all, “a most Japanese phenomenon.”

Given these contradictions, however, if the geisha is a “most Japanese phenomenon,” it would seem that the author could simply cede control over the task of defining her to the Japanese. It would be far simpler for the author simply to say, “There are many opinions on the geisha, and many popular stereotypes, but the position of the geisha has long been a revered tradition in Japan.” That would be an effective approach for resolving the contradictions.

Yet the author apparently has a more intricate purpose in mind. By raising the question of ownership over definition and by trying to make claims in two contradictory directions (the geisha is both a prostitute and not a prostitute), the author perhaps unwittingly reveals the audiences to whom the discourse is addressed. One audience is perhaps more respectful of the Japanese people and might be uncomfortable with the direct assertion that geisha are prostitutes. On the other hand, another audience might want to be told precisely this information. The image of the “exotic Eastern woman” has proven a strong drawing card for those who come into contact with Asian cultures (Johnson, 1988), and the term “geisha” has come to be strongly laden with sexual overtones. Hence, ownership is invested in the term from at least two constituencies: those who want to know information about the sexual activities of geisha, and those for whom such information is somehow a violation of Japanese integrity. Upon the introduction of the passage from Fodor’s, these and many other interests are engaged.

For another example illustrating how perception of Japan is limited by discourse establishing ownership, consider the following discussion of the Japanese film industry from the 1990 Fodor’s. The author, Jared Lubarsky, reveals by his choice of detail the terms on which he intends to base his claims:

The Japanese film industry has been in a slump for over 20 years, and it shows no signs of recovery; it yields, at best, one or two films a year worth seeing, and these are invariably by independent producer/directors. A very small number of theaters will offer one showing a week, with English subtitles, of films that seem to have some international appeal. . . . (Fodor's, 1990, p. 208)

Compared to the generally greater cultural sensitivity of the 1990 edition,⁷ the tone of Lubarsky's description is more like that of earlier editions: depressing (the film industry is "in a slump" from which it shows "no signs of recovery"), contemptuous (there are produced only "one or two films a year worth seeing"), and suggesting that Japanese film is unworthy of touristic attention (theaters have only "one showing a week" of films that "seem to have some international appeal"). Like Edward Seidensticker, Lubarsky offers no evidence regarding which meaning systems are being invoked to provide a rationale for judging Japanese films. By what standard are films judged "worth seeing"? Who is permitted to determine which films have "international appeal"? Why is it permissible to assert, not simply that the Japanese film industry is "in a slump," but that it is unlikely to recover? Because Lubarsky has chosen to make sweeping judgments about Japanese film without establishing either his credentials or his rationale, applying the lens of ownership calls into question the grounds upon which he can claim the representation. Lubarsky cannot wholly own his representation; he must insert it into the social stream where it contacts and enters into dialogue with other representations. When comparison is made to other representations, the tenuous nature of the unsupported criticism becomes evident.

For example, one can compare Lubarsky's assessment with the following passage from the 1991 edition of JTB's guidebook: "An area in which the Japanese film industry demonstrates unique talent and creativity is animation films. The level of

⁷ See Chapter Three, pp. 84-88.

artistic design and direction evidenced in Japanese animations of recent years has earned wide acclaim both in and out of Japan" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 265).

Rather than focusing on filmmaking specialties in which the Japanese perhaps lag behind other nations, the JTB prefers to emphasize an area of filmmaking in which Japanese are probably superior. Again, it is not a question of which of the representations is "correct," but of why specific details are chosen. When Lubarsky declares that his standard for judging superiority in filmmaking is whether or not subtitled films with "international appeal" are available to tourists, he rules out other meaning systems which may be more favorably disposed toward Japanese film achievements. Conversely, by choosing to focus on achievements in animation (a highly specialized area of filmmaking), JTB's guidebook chooses an extremely narrow standard of comparison, possibly because it is a filmmaking specialty in which Japanese are demonstrably superior.

One difference between the Fodor's and JTB's approaches lies in the meaning systems actuated by their standards for judging excellence. The JTB might say the standard should be technological advances in animation; others might claim that this standard is too narrow. On the other hand, Lubarsky's assessment—that the influence of Japanese films is to be measured by the frequency of their appearance in theaters—could be challenged by any reader who believes that films are to be judged by aesthetic standards having little to do with how they are booked. In both cases, authors select facets of filmmaking which make it more likely that their claims to ownership of their respective representations will remain unchallenged. However, due to the fact that every claim to ownership involves a similar selection of supportive detail—and simultaneous exclusion of detail which does not support the claim—conflict over representation is guaranteed.

In another example showing how a described object can be limited by authorial claims to ownership of its representation, an anonymous author in the 1962 Fodor's

paints a negative picture of the town of Shimoda. As noted at other points in this discussion,⁸ Shimoda, site of Townsend Harris's pioneering diplomatic initiatives in the 1850s, is highly significant in Japanese history. In this description, however, Shimoda's historical significance is downplayed and its reputation as the site of an affair between Townsend Harris and a Japanese woman named Okichi is accented:

The traveler might wisely consider Atami, the self-styled capital of Izu, as nothing more than a place to eat lunch or wait for an express train. It is to the south that the small peninsula's charms become evident. Where the coastline is not spoiled by a clutter of tourist shops, lovely views of the sea foaming on rock and sand make any trip down the rough roads here worthwhile. Shimoda, once a sleepy town with somewhat erotic memories is now peddling its lurid past to an influx of tourists arriving on the newly-built rail line, but you will be interested in Townsend Harris' first consulate and the story of Okichi, his alleged mistress. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 251-252)

Beginning with a negative evaluation of Atami (characterized as "nothing more than a place to eat lunch or wait for an express train"), this anonymously authored narrative continues its generally negative tone to the discussion of Shimoda. In staking this claim to ownership of Atami and Shimoda, the author limits reader perception of the towns by a selective appropriation of history in the emphasized portion of the passage. The author wants to be frank, but not offensive; s/he wants relay to the reader what s/he takes to be important information, but not to describe the Harris-Okichi affair in too much detail. One is left with the vague impression that Okichi was Harris' concubine, though this is expressed only euphemistically by reference to Shimoda's "erotic memories" and "lurid past." Moreover, as I noted in Chapter Three,⁹ Shimoda is discussed at length in the 1991 JTB's guidebook with no

⁸ See Chapter Three, pp. 75-78.

⁹ See Chapter Three, pp. 77-78.

reference to Okichi, but considerable detail on the historical implications of Harris's work.

While it is true that there certainly may have been some local attempt to profit from Shimoda's "lurid past," and that this information may be known to the author of the 1962 Fodor's guide, it is unusual that one would choose that detail, virtually to the exclusion of all others, as a way of characterizing the town. As in the previous examples, the author appears to be staking a claim to ownership of his/her representation, first, by being highly selective about descriptive details, and second, by excluding other details from the discussion. Knowing only the Fodor's description, without benefit of the details in JTB's guidebook or a knowledge of Japanese or American history, the reader might never know the enormous significance of Harris's work for Japan and the rest of the world. The reader might only see that promoters of tourism in Shimoda are trying to capitalize on a salacious historical rumor.

Applying the lens of ownership often reveals the effort that must be exerted to make a claim to a particular representation; such is the case with the euphemistic reference to "lurid past," above. Humans, naturally curious, immediately want to know what such a description means. If no supportive evidence is offered, then one becomes even more curious. The effort necessary to divert the reader's attention is precisely what makes the objectionable claim noticeable to the critic applying the lens of ownership.

Notice that there is nothing in the passage to state directly that terms like "lurid past" have anything to do with Harris's private life—for all the reader knows, "lurid past" may have to do with another event entirely unrelated to Harris and Okichi. Given these facts, why does the author try to bring sexual activities into a general description of a geographical location? One explanation may be found in an earlier claim to ownership of representations of culture in the Izu Peninsula as a whole.

The author first questions the integrity of Izu's culture in the initial words of the passage: "The traveler might wisely consider Atami, the self-styled capital of Izu, as nothing more than a place to eat lunch or wait for an express train . . ." This exclusionary phrasing can hardly be considered accidental. Rather, the fact that other voices are so firmly shut out in the first part of the passage sets up the exclusionary phrasing that occurs when the author describes Shimoda.

The author has taken a very selective view of history, thereby contesting ownership of history by excluding significant events and concentrating on a single incident which—even by the author's admission—is only an unproved rumor. The contribution of Townsend Harris, on the other hand, is well-verified by other descriptions; however, the Fodor's author refuses to discuss Harris's diplomatic work, nor even to refer to the Black Ship Festival celebrated every year in Shimoda to commemorate the opening of relations between Japan and the United States (this latter omission seems particularly problematic in a tour guidebook whose purpose should be to give readers information about such festivals). In summary, the author has had to exert considerable effort to select among various past and current pieces of information to attain this questionable evaluation.

Other Japanese locations are also limited by Fodor's claims to ownership of descriptions. In the next example, Francis King, former British official and author of the chapter on Kyoto, compares several specific Kyoto sites. Notice how ownership is established by summarizing broad domains of knowledge which elaborate on the idea of "perfection":

Katsura Rikyu is the outstanding example of Japanese architecture in Kyoto, perhaps in the country; Shugakuin Rikyu is noteworthy chiefly for its extensive gardens. The Imperial Palace is less impressive. Katsura is in marked contrast to Nijo Castle: as simple, restrained and unpretentious as a small Georgian country house. Between them the two buildings represent the extremes of Japanese architecture; yet each, in its separate way, is perfect. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 294)

In Chapter Three, I analyzed King's description of Kyoto as a "perfect" blend of East and West;¹⁰ in that passage, I noted King's tendency to begin with a broad claim of ownership of the domain of description and then to end with assertions about some ill-defined notion of perfection.

King appears to be following the same strategy in this passage. He begins by making a broad and potentially disputable claim: that Katsura Rikyu is "the outstanding example of Japanese architecture in Kyoto, perhaps in the country." Having committed himself to the excellence of the Katsura Rikyu in the first phrases of the passage, he can hardly raise his evaluation of other buildings to the level of "the best in Kyoto." Therefore, he chooses to depict the Imperial Palace in terms as far removed as possible from the Katsura Rikyu: where the latter is ornate, the former is simple; where the latter is "outstanding," the former is "unpretentious"; and so on. King closes the passages by acknowledging that each style of architecture is, in its own way, "perfect."

In some of his descriptions, King exhibits a pattern that places him in the position of having to resort to some variation of the descriptor "perfect" when he declines to offer support for his claims. Had he begun with a less contestable claim, he would not have needed to exert such effort to justify the appearance of the Imperial Palace, based on its less impressive qualities of simplicity or unpretentiousness.

Selective readings of history. Because historical circumstance encompasses such a wide range of facts, descriptions of history, both in tour guidebooks and elsewhere, are particularly susceptible to selective reading. Authors with particular agendas choose historical facts with care, arranging and presenting history in ways favorable to the positions they advance.

¹⁰ See Chapter Three, pp. 67-69.

In the following example, Edward Seidensticker describes the nineteenth century Meiji Restoration. This period, one of the most important in Japanese history, is considered by many a great success, leading Japan to be one of the most modern nations in the world. The Fodor's author assigns credit for the Meiji Restoration, not to the Emperor, but to his subordinates:

It is rather to his cabinet ministers, chiefly from the southwestern clans that had engineered the Meiji Restoration, that the major credit is due, however. They were an extraordinary band of men, comparable to the remarkable band that made of the United States a nation and not just a collection of petty warring states. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 74)

Some accounts of the period give most of the credit to the Emperor; others (i.e., Reischauer, 1977) credit the inherent qualities of Japanese culture. However, the Fodor's guidebook claims that the credit should be given to Meiji's cabinet ministers. To substantiate this claim, Seidensticker resorts to analogy, comparing Meiji Japan with the United States, a nation made successful by a "remarkable band" who turned a group of "petty warring states" into a great, coherent nation. This claim of similarity to the United States could be challenged on a number of fronts: that Japan was not originally a colony of another nation, that the "extraordinary band of men" was drawn from the samurai class of warriors and not aristocracy, that Japan was emerging from centuries of isolation and not recently arrived to foreign shores—the list of potential dissimilarities to the United States is endless. The decision of the Fodor's author to make this comparison restricts reading of the Meiji Period, limiting it only to those few details in which Meiji Japan is similar to the United States following the Revolutionary War.

In later years, the Meiji Imperial government became increasingly more belligerent toward other nations. To explain this development, the Fodor's guidebook

performs another restriction through claim to ownership, suggesting that Japanese are “innately aggressive”:

The energies of Meiji had gone astray, and invited disaster. Perhaps there was something innately aggressive about the Japanese, although their relatively peaceful pre-modern history does little to support the suspicion. It may be, again, that the emperor cult was responsible for the disaster, although all countries have similar patriotic symbols, and the existence of the emperor tells little about the forces that set Japan to expanding. Most likely the culprits were industrialization and urbanization, and Japan’s transgressions were therefore not unique. Compelled by similar forces, other countries have behaved and are behaving in a like fashion. (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 75)

Is there truth to the common stereotype that Japanese are “innately aggressive”?

The Fodor’s passage takes a strong position, which perhaps explains why Seidensticker uses a somewhat uncertain tone of narrative voice to convey his opinion, and then immediately challenges the position by incorporating three other voices. First, the author introduces discourse about Japan’s premodern history, which is viewed as “peaceful.” Second, he introduces the discourse about the emperor cult, which serves as a patriotic symbol among many nations. Third, he introduces the discourse concerning industrialization and urbanization. The author concludes that the third discourse provides the most convincing explanation, and that Japan’s transgressions were not unique, but a common phenomenon among nations which become industrialized and urbanized.

In advancing the idea that Japanese are “innately aggressive,” the Fodor’s guidebook attempts to monopolize a description concerning Japan’s invasions of other countries. The need to own this particular version of Japan’s history is different from the need espoused by, for example, the JTB’s guidebook. Since Fodor’s neither officially represents Japan, nor has sufficient credibility to claim authority with regard to Japanese history, the Fodor’s account must rely upon other discourses to gain its

power. At the same time, the Fodor's description cannot be privately held; rather, it is jointly owned with other descriptions of the Meiji Restoration's successes and failures.

In another example of the limitation of history through establishing ownership of representation, an anonymous 1962 Fodor's author describes the Japanese government. In this passage, the author situates current political events in historical context:

Despite the frequent outbreaks of violence, the behavior of the Japanese electorate is calm almost to the point of being phlegmatic. Conservatives regularly take close to two-thirds of the seats in the House of Representatives, which has the ultimate authority to name prime ministers, and, after the British pattern, can force either the resignation of the prime minister or call for new elections. The non-conservative vote has grown steadily over the past decade, roughly as the electorate itself has grown, a fact which seems to mean that the young vote can eventually be counted upon to vote the conservatives out of power; but the time is probably still far in the future. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 78-79)

This example foregrounds the contradictions involved in claims to ownership of a particular interpretation of history. The author begins with this assertion: "Despite the frequent outbreaks of violence, the behavior of the Japanese electorate is calm almost to the point of being phlegmatic." In addition to reinforcing the stereotypes that Japanese are quiet and passive, this depiction also constrains "the Japanese" as "phlegmatic." However, material which contradicts this characterization is presented later in the passage: although "the Japanese" (as a whole) are "phlegmatic," they also participate in "frequent outbreaks of violence."

A troubling picture of the Japanese emerges from this description. By listing specific sociohistorical data later in the passage, the author makes it appear as if a number of general negative stereotypes about Japanese are valid: Japanese are belligerent (prone to "outbreaks of violence"), yet at the same time docile and passive ("phlegmatic"), yet at the same time hierarchical ("conservatives regularly take close to

two-thirds of the seats"). The problem is that these characteristics are in some sense contradictory to each other. However, by constructing a general concept (the "Japanese electorate") the author formulates an abstraction which can encompass these contradictory qualities; by placing this abstraction at the head of a series of supporting arguments, the author establishes a claim to ownership of the representation. Evidence to the contrary is excluded from the realm of supporting "facts."

As a subject area, sections on history may be given more leeway by readers because it is assumed that if something is "historical fact," then it has validity beyond mere opinion. Unfortunately, as is evident in the above passage, it is easy for an author to selectively attend to or ignore historical "facts," as it suits the author's purpose. Moreover, by establishing ownership in the form of a general statement at the outset of the passage, historical "facts" are framed in ways that invite disagreement with other constituencies who may have a different perspective on the significance or insignificance of "historical facts."

In another attempt to frame historical circumstances, Edward Seidensticker uses claims to ownership of meaning as a warrant for an unusual interpretation of the Japanese Constitution. Notice that, despite the large number of historical facts about the Constitution which might have been raised, the author (in the emphasized portion of the quotations) chooses one fact which will both serve the purposes of his/her persuasive strategy and at the same time appeal to the stereotype of Japanese as warlike.

A reform that is equally basic, and one that from time to time provokes a far livelier debate, is the rewriting of the Japanese Constitution. The new Constitution, drafted during the Occupation and put into effect in 1947, shifts the theoretical basis of Japanese law from duties to rights. It also demotes the Emperor to "the symbol of the State", thereby arousing dire forebodings in the hearts of conservatives who were deeply disturbed by the disappearance of the old sanction for power. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 77)

The references to “livelier debates” from “time to time,” together with the reference to “dire forebodings,” seem to imply that there persists in Japan a conservative and warlike minority who still hold enough political power to make it impossible for Japan to completely rid itself of the stigma of its reputation for militaristic adventurism. This is a puzzling position to take concerning this topic; it suggests that, even in 1962, seventeen years after the end of World War II, remnants of devotion to the Emperor remained in Japan. Notice that this is another example of narrowing through selection of detail by early authorial declaration: after discussion of the Constitution as a general topic, the first specific item of data the reader encounters is the reference to the disappointment of “conservatives” that the Emperor has had to shed his Shinto religious mantle and assume the role of merely being the “symbol of the State.”

The author chooses—deliberately, one suspects—a fact that will worry Western audiences: that there are still people in Japan who not only still hold religious reverence for the Emperor, but who, by implication, would not mind engaging the Allies again. Another fact overlooked (at least in this passage) is that this same Constitution specifically forbids Japan to possess the capacity to make war. Why then would the author begin the passage with a veiled reference to Japanese aggression, rather than a reference to Article 9 of the Constitution, which specifically limits Japanese armed forces to functions of self-defense?

In fact, Seidensticker eventually discusses Article 9, but does so by limiting its depiction and placing it in the context of a narrow reading of history. In the quotation below, Seidensticker uses one key term that needs a definition but does not receive one: “embarrassment.”

The crystallization of early Occupation philosophy, when Japan was thought to be the chief threat to a peaceful Orient, Article 9 has been a source of considerable embarrassment since American policy shifted to the building of a strong Japan. Today, although the Japanese government

has interpreted Article 9 to allow defense forces and is in fact busy building such forces, the controversial provision is the rallying point for those elements in Japanese society who oppose defenses of any kind, including those provided by the American alliance. The embarrassing article promises to be with us for a good while, since the conservatives who favor rearmament are not strong enough to push through constitutional amendment. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 77-78)

In both of the emphasized portions of the above passage, the author refers to Article 9 as "embarrassing." What does the author mean by "embarrassing": "embarrassing" to the Allies (who perhaps later regretted the severity of Article 9), or "embarrassing" to the Japanese (whose rebuilding is marred by the absence of a military force), or perhaps generally "embarrassing" to all parties concerned? Here, Seidensticker claims a representation or reading of history by intentional use of an vague or ill-defined referent. One senses that the term "embarrassing" is pejorative (some party or parties are discomfited), but one is unable to tell which parties are embarrassed or for what reason. The author's selective reading of history invites criticism from readers who might wish to focus on other issues concerning Japan's postwar Constitution. For example, to some, Japan's steadfast resistance to the use of military force has become a cultural practice to be praised and held up to the world as an example (Warshaw, 1990). Introduction of the Fodor's author's selective reading of history engages these and other available readings of history, revealed to the critical reader through the application of the lens of ownership.

Claims to Western ownership of representations. Although tourism is often seen primarily as a leisure activity, writers of tour guidebooks nevertheless frequently establish claims to ownership of the cultures they describe. In the Fodor's series, claims to ownership frequently take the form of implicitly or explicitly declaring the superiority of the Western framework for viewing Japanese culture. The Fodor's series announces this from the outset: on the title page of the 1962, 1969, and 1976 editions,

one finds the statement that this tour guidebook is, "A definitive handbook of the Far East and Southeast Asia."

This "definitive handbook," unlike JTB's official guide, is written by many identified authors, rather than being presented as a single unified voice. As noted in Chapter Three, the Fodor's guidebook presents information on various nations in East Asia (in the 1962 and 1969 editions) or on Japan and Korea (in the 1976 and 1982 editions). The contents are divided into three major sections: (1) "Prelude to Your Trip"; (2) "Facts at your Fingertips"; and (3) a section dealing with each nation in detail. While the authors of the first two sections are not identified and hence can be assumed as representing the opinions of the editors, the third section is written by several different, identified, authors. The "voice" of the third section can be characterized as multiple, rather than unified. Discussion of Japan in the third section is divided into two subsections: (1) "The Japanese Scene," containing five articles addressing Japan's lifestyle, history, arts, food, and shopping; and (2) a section dealing with various tourist sites and locations (there are chapters on Tokyo, Nara, Kyoto, the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area, and so on). Roughly half of the articles about Japan in the early editions (1962 through 1982) are written by identified authors. This pattern holds for all four editions of the Fodor's guide.

An important issue to consider is how the dimension of ownership is played out in this organizational scheme. Why, for example, is there a need to have different authors contribute? The Fodor's guidebook presents a Western view about Japan; on the other hand, JTB's Japan, the Official Guide aims at establishing authority concerning Japan through the eyes of Japanese. Hence, the kind of authority established by the Fodor's guidebook is not the same as the authority of JTB's guidebook; in the latter, authority is based upon presenting a good image of Japan. The Fodor's guidebook, on the other hand, can claim authority by inviting contributions from Western experts on various aspects of Japanese life. In other

words, Fodor's authority is established, not only by the assertions of Fodor's editors, but by inclusion of Western "experts."

Why is it necessary for the Fodor's editors to structure the guidebook in this way? One reason may be that, since the Fodor's guide is written by Westerners rather than Japanese officials, the Fodor's guidebook cannot rely on having its authority taken for granted. This is consistent with the perspective set up by the Fodor's guidebook (examined in Chapter Three) when it suggests that to travel to the East is to discover the "mysterious Orient." Since the Orient is so "mysterious," no Westerner can claim uncontested authority to represent Japan. Thus, contributions from various writers who understand different aspects of the "mysterious Orient" become necessary. Likewise, it is necessary for the Fodor's guidebook to declare itself to be a "definitive handbook." These two strategies permit Fodor's to establish ownership of its particular representations of Japan. Clearly, however, Fodor's ownership is not a monopoly, but is jointly owned by all other representers of Japan. To respond to the expectations of its Western readers, the Fodor's guidebook must fashion messages which get the attention of tourists (for example, through its provocative references to the "mysterious Orient"), while at the same time claiming the authority to describe what Japan is like (through the contribution of several specialists and experts).

The approach taken by Fodor's is formulated in relation to other descriptions of Japan. Although the Fodor's guidebook is not written for Japanese, it is nevertheless written about Japan, a subject with which its audience is likely to be unfamiliar (particularly during the period 1962 through 1982). Hence, Fodor's descriptions must be situated in relation to other representations of life in Japan. Discourse in tour guidebooks concerns more than simply travel information. If the only goal were to convey information about travel, there would be no need to discuss various aspects of Japanese life.

Moreover, within each individually authored article, one finds responses to various discourses conceived through the individual author's perspective. Each author writes about a specific topic concerning Japan by taking into account other discourses addressing the same topic, situating the discussion in relation to these alternative discourses. Moreover, these authors write, not only for the readers, but also for the Fodor's editors; hence, while a unique perspective is assumed by the author him- or herself, the description is at the same time in line with, and constitutive of, the overall Fodor's discourse about Japan. The orchestration and coordination among these various discourses demonstrates the Bakhtinian dimension of ownership: communication is always jointly owned and can never be held privately or limited to a subunit of society.

In the 1962, 1969, and 1976 editions, Fodor's calls its guidebook "a definitive handbook of the Far East and Southeast Asia" (for 1976, it is described as "a definitive handbook of Japan and Korea"). This description, however, is absent from the 1982 edition. To characterize a guidebook as "definitive" is to justify having written it and to assert editorial authority. On the other hand, if Fodor's does not make such a claim, the judgment would be left to its readers. In 1962, with international tourism in its relative infancy and Asia still seen as a mystery to the West, perhaps Fodor's needed to assert its authority. With the passing of time, the East became less "mysterious," while at the same time other touristic discourses developed, so that the Fodor's guidebook acquired a status similar to that of many other descriptions, and no longer needed to justify its position or to assert its authority.

The Fodor's guidebook is owned by many social actors. The discourses about international tourism, the "mysterious" Orient, the contact between the West and the East, various aspects of Japanese life, backgrounds of various authors in relation to their readers, and so on, together and jointly define what constitutes the Fodor's guidebook.

Claims to Western superiority. The Fodor's guidebook is remarkably consistent in its use of claims to ownership to establish the superiority of the Western perspective. Throughout the Fodor's guide, references to the West are nearly without exception positive. References to Japan, on the other hand, are frequently disparaging. For example, I have noted Seidensticker's characterization of Japanese as an "orphan" language.¹¹ Seidensticker assumes that the "difficulty" in learning Japanese is not due to lack of learner ability, but to the difficulty of the language itself. Seidensticker also suggests that people will not want to make the effort to learn Japanese. Clearly, to Seidensticker, Westerners are among those most unlikely to want to learn Japanese. Seidensticker refuses to blame the potential learner's lack of ambition or knowledge, but instead suggests that Japanese is not widely spoken outside Japan because of the "collapse" of Japan's "Imperial schemes." Moreover, he implies that Japan maintains a "stubborn" language barrier that keeps the Japanese "out of the world." Characterizations such as these simultaneously elevate Westerners and disparage Japanese by implying that Japan's cultural practices must be easily accessible to Westerners or else be unworthy of the Westerner's attention. Seidensticker's claims to ownership function on two levels: he grants elevated status to the Western viewpoint, while simultaneously excluding from the discourse alternative explanations (such as those that might be advanced by the Japanese themselves).

For another example of how strategic claims to ownership of representations constrain Japanese to a position inferior to the West, consider the quotation below. In this example, notice how the claims about ownership of the interpretation (concerning both Japan and Asian countries in general) reframe specific evidence which is widely known to readers.¹²

¹¹ See this chapter, pp. 166-167.

¹² This passage is also analyzed in the discussion of the dimension of specificity in Chapter Three, pp. 69-71.

Japanese consumer habits fall somewhere between the bare subsistence level of continental Asia and the luxury of North America and western Europe. Indeed Japan is perhaps the one Asian country that has a standard of living, if by that is meant a level which permits of some luxury and which everyone deems it within his rights and powers to strive for. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 82)

The claims to ownership in this passage are delivered by the author (again, Edward Seidensticker) as a coup de grace to Japanese consumeristic ambitions: "Japanese consumer habits fall somewhere between the bare subsistence level of continental Asia and the luxury of North America and western Europe." There is often an ungovernable inertial quality to touristic writing: the author begins a passage with questionable reasoning or evidence and continues to increasingly contentious claims over ownership of the description.

Seidensticker initiates his strategy for claiming ownership by positioning the Japanese standard of living "somewhere between" two extremes, the high (Western nations) and the low (mainland Asia). However, this ranking is arbitrary; in fact, it constitutes another claim to ownership, the ownership of the standard of ranking. Given that Japanese economic progress cannot be challenged, Seidensticker is not permitted to portray Japanese with quite the same lack of restraint as in other parts of the chapter.

Hence, in the first emphasized portion of the quoted passage, the author situates Japanese in more vaguely defined terms, in a gray area "somewhere between" the lowest and the highest economic classes. Japanese are not quite up to Western standards, but they are not in as dire straits as are those in other Asian countries. But are Japanese nearer to the upper than the lower limit? The Fodor's author does not address this point, allowing the text to claim a level of ownership over the interpretation to reflect both the superiority of the author (and, more importantly, the author's culture) and the undeniable evidence from other meaning systems which

assert that the Japanese have made remarkable social and economic progress. Confirming this analysis is the fact that this passage, originally written for the 1962 edition, remains precisely the same through the 1982 edition, two decades later. Perhaps the Fodor's editors perceived that the passage served their purposes very well, fashioning a believable portrayal of the Japanese as lagging behind the rest of the world, clearly ignoring evidence with each passing year that this portrayal became increasingly untenable.

Claiming dependence of Japanese culture on Western nations. Apart from Fodor's clear attempts to elevate Western over Japanese culture, there are also numerous instances in which Fodor's depicts Japanese culture as dependent upon Western culture. These depictions make extensive claims to ownership, suggesting not only that Japanese culture is inferior but that even those cultural aspects that can be considered "modern" or "advanced" originate in Western cultures, not in Japan. In the first example, the Fodor's author is discussing what he or she takes to be the contradictory tendencies of Japanese art, depicted as being both reliant on tradition and rebelliously experimental. In the emphasized phrases, observe the way in which the description attempts to identify and account for the various parties who might have a stake in the representation of the Japanese artistic climate.

The story of the arts in modern Japan has been a mixed one. In such matters the Japanese has a way of being simultaneously a revolutionary and a conservative. Even when he seems blindly in pursuit of the new and the imported, a strong conservatism preserves much that is left from the past and transforms the imported into something that could only be Japanese. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 85)

The problem confronting the author, Edward Seidensticker, is to account for the presence of "traditional" (that is, older) influences on current Japanese art, while at the same time admitting to a force of innovation which has led the Japanese to invent new art forms. However, one should point out that the author's claim to ownership hardly

grants Japanese artistic autonomy; instead, Japanese art, while acknowledged by the author to have some innovative qualities, appears to invent by improving on what is imported. The assumption of “cultural borrowing” is based upon the stereotype that Japanese show little originality, but are able to improve on what has been invented by people of other cultures.

This representation of the Japanese is strongly related to the dimension of ownership. The cultural representation is a description in which various constituencies have a stake; the Fodor’s assessment makes definite claims about the comparative weight or strength of the forces which are said to comprise the Japanese approach to art. Though conservatism and experimentation are both present in the makeup of the Japanese attitude toward the arts, Seidensticker seems to be saying, their invention is strongly reliant on “borrowing and reinventing” other artistic concepts.

This leads naturally to the question of whose interests are served by this particular depiction. One suspects that the Japanese themselves would not view their artistic activity as “cultural borrowing.”¹³ Yet the view of the Fodor’s author is that Japanese—as a general rule—take what is “owned” by others and make it into something “that could only be Japanese”—that could only, in other words, be

¹³ This appears to be confirmed by various references in JTB’s 1991 guidebook, including the following: (1) “While the influence of the Chinese fine arts was considerable and cannot be overlooked in any discussion of the subject, as time went on the Japanese fine arts began to develop their own unique characteristics. At the beginning of the Heian period, these peculiarities may be said to have combined to the point where Japanese fine arts could be distinguished from the fine arts of other nations.” (p. 179); (2) “From the point of view of art or technique, there is a striking difference between Oriental and Occidental painting. Whereas in the West the artist uses a model in his studio, painting from nature is unusual in the East, both in figure and landscape painting.” (p. 182); (3) “Japanese sculpture made fair growth in the Nara and Heian periods, but attained its highest technical development in the Kamakura period when it freed itself from Chinese influences.” (p. 188); (4) “Compromises between Japanese and Western [architectural] styles, or what might be called quasi-Western structures, marked the beginning of Western architecture in post-Restoration Japan.” (p. 201); and so on. Despite some passages in which the influence of China is clearly identified (for example, in the discussion of Buddhist architecture), the 1991 JTB’s guidebook frequently begins its discussion of a given topic by emphasizing Japan’s independence from the cultural influences of other countries.

possessed by the Japanese people. Hence, the Fodor's guidebook is not hesitant to assign ownership to the constituencies most favorable to the position it advances.

In another example illustrating how claims to ownership can make elements of Japanese culture seem as if they are dependent on Western culture, I turn to a passage in which Seidensticker makes a connection between the "open" style of Japanese houses and a style of architecture found in Japan and elsewhere:

The essentially wall-free Japanese house has a great deal in common with the glassed-in framework that is the modern skyscraper. With this realization has come a recovery of architectural confidence, and today Japanese architects, combining old principles with new techniques, are among the leaders of the world. In places like Honolulu, where the climate invites throwing away walls, the tide of Japanese influence is as irresistible as that from the West seemed to be on Japan a century ago. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 86)

The domains of ownership encompassed in this description are impressive. In making the connection between the two identified forms of architecture, the anonymous Fodor's author moves from "traditional" to "modern" Japan, and indeed throughout "the world" and across the Pacific Ocean to Hawaii.

Here, the clash over ownership is described as two "invasions": one of Japan by the West, and later, of other countries by Japan. Nevertheless, the implication of disputed ownership is unmistakable: architectural ideas "owned" by "the West" overrun Japan, then later other architectural concepts "owned" by Japan overrun other parts of the world.¹⁴ Because Seidensticker has a stake in presenting the matter in this particular way, he must enter claims to ownership by distinctive writing, bringing inevitable conflict over whether ownership has been appropriately assigned.

¹⁴ For example, in the 1991 JTB's guidebook, Japanese are depicted as the initiators in this process, opening their borders to import architecture: "When Japan opened its doors to foreign countries, Western-style architecture began to be vigorously imported" (p. 200).

Disagreements with the author over this representation could conceivably come from many quarters. Japanese architects, for example, might object to calling the appearance of Western-style buildings an "invasion," preferring instead to call them examples of Japanese "adaptation" or "borrowing." On the other hand, architects, both from Japan and other nations, might disagree with the author over his or her unnecessarily broad generalizations about similarity of architectural design. The comparison between the modern office building and the "open-style" Japanese home seems particularly forced; if legitimate points of comparison exist (or if the author is himself borrowing from other sources), there is no indication of it in the quoted passage. The seemingly controversial position of the author regarding these issues of ownership stand unchallenged in the absence of other "voices" which might contradict the author's assertions.

Another Seidensticker chapter, "Arts and Lesser Pleasures" (1962 edition) offers another example of how ownership of representations is used to depict Japanese culture as dependent on the West. In the passage below, the Fodor's author compares the state of the Japanese theater to its "Western" influences:

And beside all these classical forms is an energetic Westernized theater that is willing to tackle everything from Ibsen-style realism through Moscow-style "realism" down to surrealism and Tennessee Williams. Tokyo theater may not always be as slick as Broadway, but it certainly has more variety. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 87)

In the passage, the Fodor's author is again taking a stand on who owns the "theater," or at least that aspect of the "theater" most influenced by the West. To call theater "Westernized" is to assign control over the character of the theater to a force which has influenced it: to the Fodor's author, ownership, at one time in the hands of the Japanese themselves, changed when the character of the theater became more like theater in West. Moreover, the distinction is clearly drawn: notice the phrase which

precedes the first emphasized passage: "And beside all these classical forms . . ."

Thus, the portion of the theater that is not "classical" (that is, under Japanese ownership) is now assumed to be under control of Western influences.

Consistent with the dimension of ownership, however, the Fodor's characterization invites argument based on other claims to ownership. Why should one assume that experimentation with "Western" forms of drama constitutes "Westernization"? The theater department at the University of Illinois has staged a number of successful, popular, and well-regarded kabuki productions, and yet I would never expect to hear the University of Illinois's theater department described as "Japanized." When it is one's own culture that tries artistic techniques of other cultures, that is referred to as "experimentation," not a yielding of ownership to the other culture. "Experimentation" implies that one will "try" the technique of the other culture, and return after the experiment to the artistic practices of one's "own" culture. Thus, it is never a question of ceding ownership to the cultural Other, but of enhancing one's own claims to ownership, or to control the representations of one's own culture.

This analysis appears to be confirmed by the second emphasized phrase. In using the Broadway theater as the point for comparison, the author places the Japanese theater in the position of having to justify itself in relation to perhaps the most Western form of "Western theater." That comparison could just as easily have been expressed as follows: "In comparison to Japanese theater, Broadway is 'slicker' but has less variety." But this recasting would fail in emphasizing that it is the West which owns the theatrical technique and Japan which is borrowing it. Examined in this light, it seems that the author's intent is to paint a particular portrait of ownership.

In a more recent example of attributing Japanese culture to Western influence, Diane Durston in the 1990 Fodor's refers to a number of popular dishes that have come to be associated with Japan: sukiyaki, tempura, sushi, and soba. Earlier Fodor's depicted Japanese dining as being for the daring and adventurous (the title of the

chapter on food in the earlier Fodor's editions is, "Food and Drink: A Challenge to the Adventurous").¹⁵ Notice the difference in tone in the passage below, and particularly how Durston reframes the experience of eating Japanese food through reformulating claims to ownership.

Ten years ago, sukiyaki and tempura were exotic enough for most Western travelers. Those were the days when raw fish was still something a traveler needed fortitude to try. But, with soba (noodle) shops and sushi bars popping up everywhere from Los Angeles to Paris, it seems that—at long last—the joy of Japanese cooking has found its way westward . . . and it's about time.

There is something special, however, about visiting the tiger in his lair. Something no tame circus could ever match. Although tours to famous temples and scenic places can provide important historical and cultural background material, there is nothing like a meal in a local restaurant—be it under the tarps of the liveliest street stall, or within the quiet recesses of an elegant Japanese inn—for a taste of the real Japan. Approaching a platter of fresh sashimi in Tokyo is like devouring a hot dog smothered in mustard and onions in Yankee Stadium. There's nothing like it in the world. (Fodor's, 1990, pp. 65-66)

While the appeal to adventure is clearly still present, there is a great difference in how Durston tries to establish claims to the ownership of experimentation with Japanese food. Rather than ruling out certain dining experiences as too risky for the more "conservative" traveler, Durston acknowledges the incursion of Japanese food into the common experience of Western visitors. Furthermore, Durston chooses a number of specific images and comparisons designed to heighten and dramatize the experience of eating Japanese food in Japan: there is "nothing like it in the world";

¹⁵ For example, in the 1969 edition, Peter Robinson writes, "The conservative traveler, who is finicky about eating strange foods, will find himself satisfied, if not delighted, in Tokyo and Osaka, but subject to some harrowing experiences outside those two major cities." (p. 92) The anonymously authored chapter, "Prelude to Your Trip," also from the 1969 edition, offers this advice: "As far as down-to-earth pleasures are concerned, your trip to Japan and East Asia can be a gastronomic adventure if you are bold enough. The culinary achievements of this region surpass those of any other in the world—but you have to be willing to drop many of your old ideas about what is edible and what is not." (p. 8)

“it’s about time” that the “joy of Japanese cooking” found “its way westward”; it is like visiting the “tiger in his lair”; and so on. Such images reinforce the special quality of Japanese food, but more importantly, they emphasize the appeal of Japanese food by reference to the uniqueness of Japanese culture. Durston’s narrative elevates Japanese dining to the level of visits to well-known tourist sites, while at the same time emphasizing the significant inroads made by Japanese food into the cultures of Western nations “from Los Angeles to Paris.” Notice that in each instance, Durston’s claim is fashioned from the accumulation of highly specific information. This unique combination of images and ideas stamps Durston’s narrative with her ownership.

Nevertheless, as in other cases illustrating the dimension of ownership, Durston’s declarations cannot be viewed as being owned exclusively by her or by the Fodor’s editors. Instead, the stand taken by Durston immediately highlights other claims to ownership established by other voices. For example, there are the earlier depictions of Japanese dining, not only by Fodor’s but other tour guidebooks as well, which portrayed eating Japanese food as somewhat risky. By 1990, attitudes toward Japanese food having changed, Durston needs to establish a rationale for dramatizing the difference between earlier and later depictions. This perhaps explains the extravagance of Durston’s formulation: it is “about time” that Japanese food became recognized, and once tried in Japan, there is nothing “like it in the world.” Again, Durston’s description implies the recognition that other voices have intervened since the earlier years when Japanese food was more negatively evaluated. Such voices dictate terms under which a guidebook can be considered modern: it must acknowledge the increasing popularity of Japanese cuisine. In earlier editions, writers could describe Japanese food as exotic enough to be threatening; in later representations, this approach is no longer appropriate.

Moreover, to highlight the special character of eating sashimi in Tokyo, Durston must frame the description in terms of what Americans value. Durston’s

representation must take account of what might be called an idealistic voice speaking for American culture. Remember that Durston has a virtually unlimited range of possibilities among which to choose for an American example to compare to the eating of Japanese food in Japan. The example she chooses—"devouring" a hot dog smothered in mustard and onions at Yankee Stadium—is an unusual choice. What position is being advanced by this choice? The effort to claim ownership provides a clue to one possible answer. By making her distinct and definite choice of the hot dog as a point of comparison, Durston may be trying to do a number of things. First, she draws an analogy based on typicality. The hot dog and baseball are two of the most well-known symbols of America; hence, she establishes an analogical comparison (the hot dog is to America as sashimi is to Japan). Second, Durston is fusing the cultural practice to a definite geographical and physical space: just as the hot dog must be enjoyed in its special "lair" (not just a baseball stadium, but Yankee Stadium!), so must sashimi be enjoyed in its special "lair," the streets of Tokyo.¹⁶ Durston's narrative reveals that she recognizes the need of the tourist for authenticity of experience, or to put it another way, she hears the voice of the tourist, the potential response of her reader, and she takes this into account in the formulation of her description. Even while she recognizes the need to acknowledge this potential response, the fact that she does so confirms that she does not own the description. It could be disputed by any reader who simply disagrees that the hot dog is "typically American" food. Third and finally, there is an undertone of contempt revealed by the choice of a point of comparison. Certainly, many Japanese would consider Tokyo sashimi (or at least

¹⁶ Notice, however, that Durston also uses the dimension of specificity to suggest that Japanese food is basically the same regardless of the location in which it is eaten: ". . . be it under the tarps of the liveliest street stall, or within the quiet recesses of an elegant Japanese inn. . ." If Durston realizes that the quality of Japanese food eaten at a stall differs from that of food eaten at an "elegant" restaurant, she does not indicate it in this passage. The reader may be left with the impression that Japanese sashimi—like the hot dog—is much the same wherever it is eaten.

some of it) a delicacy,¹⁷ a form of food to which the American hot dog is hardly comparable. Among other potential strategies, these three possible goals could easily engage other points of view simply by being introduced in the stream of public discourse.

On the other hand, for each of these three possible strategies, one must consider that the audience for the Fodor's guidebook is less likely to find anything wrong with Durston's implication that the hot dog is a symbol of American food, or that the best place to enjoy the hot dog is at Yankee Stadium, or that sashimi is similar in quality to the hot dog. These assumed components of the "typical" Fodor's reader's architectonics permit Durston, first, to introduce the stereotypical views of American cuisine, and second, to use these views to imply an analogy to stereotypical views of Japanese cuisine. However, according to the arguments of the Bakhtin group, architectonics are forever in flux, so that even if there were a "typical" architectonic system of the Fodor's reader (there is not), it is Durston's anticipation of the elements of that system which stimulate the critical reader to speculate about what she might have wished to obtain as a response to her narrative. That others who do not share these architectonic assumptions might disagree is beside the point: Durston, unable to claim sole ownership of the representation, in effect forms an alliance with those who do, to a certain extent, share her assumptions (or those she thinks are likely to share her assumptions), gaining the strength to approach the less receptive audience who might disagree with her (comprised of, for example, Japanese who might be horrified that sashimi is compared to a "common" food such as the hot dog). Applying the lens of ownership, a fascinating picture of conflict and persuasive strategy is revealed to the critical analyst of Durston's seemingly straightforward comparison. Durston's picture,

¹⁷ Ideally, Japanese food is considered best if it successfully achieves a delicate blend of taste, nutrition and appearance. As the 1991 edition of the JTB's guidebook puts it, "The dishes are meant to combine subtlety with the food to stimulate the appetite of the viewer."

though ostensibly aimed at establishing the integrity of Japanese culture, in fact explains the significance of Japanese food only by reference to its acceptance by Western diners and its similarity to a relatively low-quality example of American food.

Claiming independence of Japanese culture from other Asian nations. While the Fodor's guidebooks often explain Japanese culture as derived from Western practices, they also sometimes attempt to distance Japanese culture from the cultures of other Asian countries. These attempts are less frequent in the earlier editions; in the 1990 edition, however, there are several noteworthy instances in which the author comes to support Japanese efforts to distinguish their culture from other Asian nations. In the first example, Oliver Statler offers his opinion on the difficulty of the Japanese language. The common belief that Japanese is merely a variant of the Chinese language remains a sensitive issue to Japanese people.¹⁸ Notice how much more delicately Statler broaches the issue.

The art of writing had been imported, bringing at once the boon of literacy and a heavy burden of difficulty. It was bad luck that the only system of writing the Japanese were exposed to was Chinese, with its infinitely complex system of characters—wholly unsuited to the Japanese language, which is very different from Chinese. But there it was, and for centuries Chinese was the language of learned men in Japan, as Latin was in Europe. (Fodor's, 1990, p. xxix)

Here, too, the points of reference taken by Oliver Statler reveal how he prefers to orient his particular claims to ownership of this representation. To begin with, for the first time among Fodor's representations, Statler frankly acknowledges that Chinese is a difficult language and that the shortcomings of Chinese writing perhaps

¹⁸ In the 1991 edition of JTB's guidebook, the Japanese language is given a chapter of its own. In that chapter, the editors state, "There have been many scholastic attempts to find a relationship between the Japanese language and other languages, including the Korean, Chinese, Ural-Altaic and Indo-European languages. However, the most widely accepted theory holds that the spoken Japanese language developed independently of all other languages although the written language is primarily based on Chinese kanji characters" (p. 104).

negatively affected Japanese writing. The opinion of the earlier Fodor's authors was that the Japanese were the "great borrowers" (to use Seidensticker's phrase) of cultural material, whether that of Chinese or other nations.¹⁹ In the 1990 edition, Statler is prepared to assert that the effect of such influence has not been entirely beneficial to Japanese.

There are, however, a number of questionable precepts employed by Statler to make his point, revealing that he has to stretch his credibility in order to establish his claim to ownership of this representation. For one thing, Statler asserts that it was "bad luck" that the "only system of writing the Japanese were exposed to was Chinese." There are at least two things wrong with that statement. First, it is a matter of opinion whether exposure to the Chinese language was "bad luck." Statler himself admits as much twice in the passage, first, by saying that Chinese writing brought the "boon of literacy" and later by claiming that Chinese served as the language of "learned men" for centuries. Culturally, these can hardly be seen as bad luck, particularly since familiarity with the Chinese language also permitted Japanese to have access to other elements of Chinese civilization, including religions such as Buddhism and governmental philosophies such as Confucianism (both of which are widely acknowledged by most commentators—including the Fodor's authors—to have played a significant role in the development of Japanese culture). To link the difficulties of the ancient Chinese language to the modern Japanese language, without also acknowledging the benefits which have accrued to Japan, is to leave the impression that Japan's chief achievement lay simply in overcoming the obstacles bequeathed it by the Chinese. The matter need not be stated in this way. For example, note how Reischauer describes the same situation: "The Japanese were lucky to be

¹⁹ The 1969 Fodor's edition is adamant in its attribution of Chinese influence through all of East Asia: "Chinese influence is felt in every aspect of daily life, in the institutions, the economic life, and the cultural expression of these nations" (p. 6).

able to learn from China, then the most advanced nation in the world, but it was most unfortunate for them that the Chinese had a writing system that was ill-adapted to Japanese needs" (Reischauer, 1977, p. 47). Reischauer, while essentially agreeing with Statler's assessment, frames his opinion so as to foreground, from his very first phrase, the good luck that Japan had to be exposed to Chinese civilization early in their development. This point is also made by Varley (1984):

There is little question that Japanese is the most complex written language in the world today, and the modern man who holds utility to be the ultimate value must sorely lament that the Japanese ever became burdened with the Chinese writing system. Yet, from the aesthetic standpoint, the Chinese characters have been infinitely enriching, and through the centuries have provided an intimate cultural bond between the Chinese and Japanese (as well as the Koreans, who have also utilized Chinese ideographs) that is one of the most significant features of East Asian civilization. (pp. 32-33)

A second problem with Statler's approach to claiming ownership of the representation lies in his assertion that the Chinese written language was "wholly unsuited to the Japanese language." This statement cannot be true, because the Japanese in fact did employ the Chinese written characters as a basis for a written Japanese language; hence, the fact that Japanese were exposed only to the Chinese language (a highly suspect assertion) cannot be considered entirely inappropriate, but only as having a greater or lesser degree of advantageousness. One could argue that Japan's cultural life would have been better served by not having been exposed to the Chinese written language; on the other hand, it is difficult to imagine what their other options might have been. The Bakhtin circle argued that the choice of language and its subvarieties (dialect, argot, idiom, colloquialism) are dictated by a myriad of social necessities. Most historians are in agreement that the Japanese, particularly in their earlier history, obtained a great deal from the more advanced Chinese civilization. To state that it was simply "bad luck" for Japanese to have been exposed to Chinese

culture through the Chinese language is to view language as having arisen as a result of abstract choices among available alternatives. The Japanese learned Chinese for the same reason they now learn English: to have the wherewithal to remain informed about a world with which they want to interact.

Nevertheless, one must ask why there is such a dramatic difference between the earlier editions of the Fodor's guidebook and the 1990 edition. The earlier editions had almost nothing to say about the Japanese language: in the editions from 1962 through 1982, there is only about one-and-one-quarter pages of common phrases. On the other hand, references to Japanese dependence on Chinese influence are numerous and pervasive.²⁰ This is not, however, the message conveyed in the 1990 edition: Statler's negative description of the legacy of Chinese writing is only one of a number of instances in which writers attempt to separate Chinese from Japanese culture.

One possible reason for this change in position is the change in international political status between Japan and China that occurred the late 1980s. By 1990, Japan's economic success had become far greater than China's, and its ability to dictate the terms of how it would be perceived in the world arena is correspondingly enhanced. From the potential array of possible elements of culture, Statler chooses to attack a relatively easy target, the Chinese written language. His reasons for making this choice may be revealed by his analogy: the Chinese written language is to modern

²⁰ References to Chinese superiority in the earlier editions include the following: (1) "China was remote and grand, the source of culture and the center of the world, not an equal to invade and be invaded by as medieval France was to England." (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 61-62); (2) "Unlike the Chinese, the Japanese had little room for the illusion that they were the givers of the law. The tradition of looking to others was too long. When the West arrived in the nineteenth century it could take over where China had left off." (Fodor's, 1962, p. 63); (3) "Such was the nature of the Chinese that they assumed their superiority to be self-evident, and saw no need to emphasize it by shows of military strength. The Japanese for their part borrowed a literate culture from China, at first through Korea, but were in the happy position of being left alone to do what they chose with the borrowings." (Fodor's, 1962, p. 69); (4) "Before the advent of Chinese culture, the Japanese court was a rather insubstantial affair, almost nomadic in its habits." (Fodor's, 1976, p. 55); (5) "The institution of the Shogunate requires a word of explanation, for it is a most Japanese institution, and evidence that something uniquely Japanese was present even during the most uninhibited phases of borrowing from China." (Fodor's, 1982, p. 37); and so on.

Japanese intellectuals as Latin once was to European intellectuals. In other words, despite the contributions made by Chinese to Japan, as well as the contributions made by Latin to Europe, both Chinese and Latin are inappropriate as precursors to modern languages.

But in fact it is Statler's analogy that is inappropriate. By his selection procedure, he makes the connection between Latin and Chinese; while it may be true that Latin is, in the vernacular, a "dead language" (that is, no longer commonly utilized in social life), the same cannot be said of the Chinese written language, which is actively used by millions (including the written variant practiced by modern Japanese). The author who uses the dimension of ownership to claim authority to make this sort of conclusion runs the risk of encountering other aspects of the situation that may contradict his or her goals. Here, for example, Statler's purpose appears to be, not just to elevate the Japanese language and its culture, but to simultaneously denigrate Chinese written language. Statler's listed professional qualifications certainly do not suggest mastery of the Chinese language; therefore, it is puzzling why he should make the pronouncement (that is, to declare his ownership of the representation) without backing up his claim with better forms of proof.

Perhaps Statler is not attempting to try to prove an assertion about the Chinese language and its effect on modern Japanese written language, but rather is stating what has, by 1990, become almost a stereotype about the Japanese language. As the political situation in Asia shifts, there is an increasing dominance, both economically and politically, by Japan over China (the increasing effort by the Chinese to cultivate capitalistic ventures on the Mainland, together with their encouragement of joint economic projects with Japan and with their traditional rivals Taiwan and Hong Kong, as well as other signs of experimentation, seem to indicate a belated recognition by the Chinese that the Japanese have taken appropriate measures to enhance their power and prestige). Since Japan is, by some measures at least, in a position superior to

mainland China, it has become less fashionable for touristic writers to place Japan in the subordinate position. This belated change brings the Fodor's authors and editors more in line with the opinion expressed in the 1991 edition of the JTB's Official Guide to Japan:

There have been many scholastic attempts to find a relationship between the Japanese language and other languages, including the Korean, Chinese, Ural-Altaic and Indo-European languages. However, the most widely accepted theory holds that the spoken Japanese language developed independently of all other languages although the written language is primarily based on Chinese kanji characters. As with many languages, Japanese can be separated into written and spoken language, with the difference between the two lying in verb endings, auxiliary verbs and postpositions. The written language is mainly used for official documents and publications. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 104)

The JTB guidebook takes an almost chauvinistic perspective toward the modern expression of its language, even to the point of insisting that spoken Japanese developed "independently of all other languages." Indeed, the JTB description prefers to situate Japanese as having developed from a number of widely disparate languages, of which Chinese is only one potential influence. Moreover, there is even an interesting coda to the passage which implies that the written language—the form most commonly associated with Chinese—is limited only to certain discursive forms such as "official documents and publications."

In another example using ownership to assert Japan's independence from other Asian nations (also taken from Statler's introductory chapter to the 1990 edition), the origins of the Japanese people are described:

The Japanese are a blend of immigrants who originated in regions all the way from the South Pacific to the frozen steppes and who wore every skin color known to mankind. (Note the variety of facial types on the street or in a subway car.) And while Japanese civilization is heavily indebted to China, it is not just a variation on the Chinese. It contains basic elements—such as the traditional architecture of the home, or the emphasis on the

daily hot bath—that certainly did not come from China. (Fodor’s, 1990, p. xxvii)

Statler’s depiction seems, once again, to distance modern Japanese from their Chinese ancestry. To have moved from discussing race and genetics (skin color and “facial types”) to the discussion of daily activities (such as bathing) is to have covered large domains of cultural life. In earlier editions of Fodor’s guidebooks, I noted the tendency of touristic writers to make broad-scale declarations about history based on highly specific details. This pattern is duplicated in Statler’s passage: again, the problem is not that certain details are selected, but that these details are treated as representative of cultural reality. In Statler’s description, as in many other Fodor’s descriptions, the more extravagant the claim of the author that his or her selected details are representative (assuming that no justification is offered in the text for their selection), the more likely it is that other voices, claiming the right to make alternative representations, will be drawn into conflict with the author’s discourse.

Statler’s representation shows this tendency to engage alternative voices. First, one’s attention is drawn to this unusual sentence: “And while Japanese civilization is heavily indebted to China, it is not just a variation on the Chinese.” This sentence is out of place in relation to the rest of the passage, which begins by describing race and ends by describing culture. I remarked earlier that Statler, in his description of the difficulty of the Japanese written language, seemed more sensitive to the cultural integrity of the Japanese and the need for them to distance themselves from their Chinese heritage, than seemed warranted. The current passage appears to confirm that general conclusion. By counterposing an opinion not solicited by his discourse, Statler indicates that he is answering a common perception that Japanese civilization in fact is “just a variation on the Chinese.” By framing his statement in just this way, Statler reveals how he conceives the audience he intends to address. Moreover, the general goal seems to be the same as in his assertion that it was Japan’s “bad luck” to

have derived its written language from Chinese: it is to elevate Japanese culture by making it appear more autonomous, thus reflecting the more “modern” perception that Japan, with its extensive veneration for Western civilization, cannot be seen as dependent on the ancient and less well-known (at least to Western readers) Chinese civilization.

In many cases illustrating the dimension of ownership, one sees the engagement of voices between the author and excluded others; in certain cases, however, the engagement may occur between the author’s representation and another representation he or she has made at some other point. For example, in an early passage in the introductory chapter, Statler²¹ describes the similarity among Japanese in the following terms:

Still, the Japanese do have their particular hang-ups and idiosyncrasies. They explain many of these by the fact that they are a homogeneous people. Certainly just about everybody has black hair (unless henna or age has intervened), which, as a friend has remarked, makes for a neat-looking crowd—no confusion of sundry variations on blond, red, brown, and black. (p. xxvi)

In this passage, Statler employs the supposed homogeneity of appearance as a rather weak justification for his conclusion that the Japanese people share cultural “quirkiness.”

However, in a subsequent passage, Statler appears to be justifying a similarly broad summary of cultural life by appealing to genetic diversity. In the later passage, Statler clearly feels that since one can observe a wide variety of “facial types” on the subway, Japanese culture can be seen as quite distinct from Chinese culture. Apart from the tenuous nature of either of these two examples of claiming ownership, the selection of both forms in the same chapter seems opportunistic. It is difficult to

²¹ This passage is also analyzed on pp. 206-207 of this chapter.

escape the impression that, when it suits Statler's purpose to distance Japanese from Chinese, he is prepared to assert their racial heterogeneity, but when it suits his purpose to establish their cultural "quirks and hang-ups," he is equally ready to assert their homogeneity. It is not that these are contradictory depictions (indeed, in some ways, they could even be seen as compatible), but it is disturbing to see how the author is so willing to employ them based on immediate demands of the moment, and moreover, to use both to prop up questionable generalizations. As we have seen, authors of touristic discourse are sometimes eager to extend highly specific details to broad general characterizations, often revealing in the process the speciousness of their conclusions. By juxtaposing contradictory assertions from the same chapter, Statler's lack of solid support for some conclusions becomes even more apparent.

Statler's attempt to bring in contradictory representations, apparently either unaware or not caring that they might be noticed, may also explain why he (with the permission of the editors) has chosen a highly personalized style to express himself. By establishing, from the first sentences of the chapter, a very personal style (the chapter begins with the words, "I first came to Japan when it was an occupied country after World War II . . ."), Statler seemingly excuses himself from the standards expected of a more dispassionate voice.

However, the more objectionable features of Statler's discourse do not occur when he makes personal statements, but rather when he tries switch to the impersonal perspective. Consider the passage describing Japan's Chinese heritage: it is surely appropriate for Statler to declare, based on his personal experience, that there seem to be a wide variety of "facial types" on the subway (his "ownership" of that declaration is less likely to be contested). He gets into trouble when he leaves that claim to ownership and tries to conduct an incursion into more controversial territory, declaring that Japanese culture is distinct from its Chinese origins. In both this and the earlier passages, there is an attempt to move from a relatively safe and secure position

of ownership, to a position considerably less stable or justifiable. To phrase this idea in terms of the dimension of ownership, readers are less likely to contest Statler's ownership of the claim to personal observation than to dispute the broader generalizations he attempts to derive from that personal experience.

On the other hand, when one speculates as to the nature of reader architectonics to which Statler may be trying to appeal, his motivation may be less mysterious. It is possible that Statler is trying, in the two separate passages, to appeal to two different stereotypes about Japanese. In the former passage, he attempts to appeal to the stereotype that Japanese are "quirky" or exotic (based on the assumption that they are homogeneous), while in the latter passage, he seems to appeal to the stereotype that Japanese are, in the modern world, not so similar to Chinese (based on the assumption that they are heterogeneous). Statler can wholly own none of these representations and when he places his evaluations into the stream of social discourse, alternative claims to ownership become more evident.

Elements of temporal change relating to ownership in Fodor's descriptions. The years since 1962 have seen a number of significant changes in the content and format of the Fodor's guidebook; although changes were limited and rare in the editions from 1962 through 1982, there is a thoroughgoing overhaul of the guidebook offered in the 1990 edition. In this section, I want to discuss three important changes that occur between the 1982 and 1990 editions: (1) rephrasing of stereotypes; (2) shift to more subtle expressions of ownership; and (3) shift to more overtly consumeristic aims.

Rephrasing of stereotypes. At first glance, the text of the 1990 edition of Fodor's appears to have overcome some of the problems of its predecessors; the authors generally take a more reasonable tone, write in a more personal narrative style, and include fewer blatantly stereotypical views of Japan and the Japanese. At the same time, on closer examination, we will see that some of the stereotypes have not been abandoned at all, but simply rephrased. In the first example (analyzed in part in

earlier discussion²²), the author (Oliver Statler) moves away from one accepted stereotype²³ about Japanese and simultaneously introduces some less well-known stereotypes in fashioning a claim to the right to represent the Japanese people.

Still, the Japanese do have their particular hang-ups and idiosyncrasies. They explain many of these by the fact that they are a homogeneous people. Certainly just about everybody has black hair (unless henna or age has intervened), which, as a friend has remarked, makes for a neat-looking crowd—no confusion of sundry variations on blond, red, brown, and black. (Fodor's, 1990, p. xxvi)

Let me begin by describing how this passage is different from earlier declarations by Fodor's about what the Japanese "are like." For one thing, compared to writers such as Seidensticker, Statler is more deprecating about Western populations: possessing their "sundry variations" in hair color, Westerners are not necessarily a "neat-looking crowd." Moreover, other possibilities are offered as alternatives to the typically black hair most Japanese are said to have ("unless henna or age has intervened"). Finally, Statler demurs from taking direct responsibility for the remark about Japanese being a "neat-looking crowd": instead, he attributes this observation to "a friend." In this way, he both establishes his credibility as a person who discusses such matters with friends while at the same time providing a way out should anyone object that he is making stereotypical judgments (Statler is, after all, merely reporting the remark of another person). These strategies disclaim complete control to ownership of the representation. Had Statler wished to make his assessment in a monolithic tone, he need only have stated that he thinks Japanese are homogeneous and that this contributes to their highly idiosyncratic cultural practices. In the earlier editions of Fodor's, Edward Seidensticker certainly did not hesitate to

²² See p. 203.

²³ It is worth noting that the idea of the stereotype can be expressed in terms of ownership; the stereotype is a declaration of ownership based upon a common perception shared by many people, even when that perception is at variance with observable fact.

make such declarations in describing the entire countryside of Japan. I quote again the passage from Seidensticker examined earlier in this chapter and in Chapter Three:²⁴

So it is that, viewed from a train window, the countryside seems quiet almost to the point of sadness. To the ear it may be as clamorous as the cities, for the loudspeaker is ubiquitous, and a person sometimes suspects that noise is to the Japanese what water is to a fish. [Emphasis added]
(Fodor's, 1962, p. 57)

Seidensticker takes no refuge in attributing his account to the reports of others, nor is he sparing of the feelings of Japanese who might be offended by his assessment. This comparison of the styles of the introductory chapters from the 1962 and 1990 editions demonstrates how the Fodor's perspective toward ownership of representations has changed.

Another difference between Statler's claims to ownership of the description in the 1990 edition and some of the earlier Fodor's declarations about Japanese culture is that the introduction to the 1990 passage specifically sets up the entire passage as the opinion of Japanese people themselves. Notice that Statler says, ". . . they explain many of these [idiosyncrasies and hang-ups]" by attributing them to cultural homogeneity. One assumes that "they" refers to the Japanese people. Considering this attribution, together with the fact that the remark about "neat-looking" crowds was taken from the report of a friend, Statler's statement is revealed as extremely tentative. In fact, there is very little in the statement that can be directly attributed to Statler alone. Ownership is thus specifically ceded, first to the Japanese, and then to Statler's "friend." This style of expression is dramatically different from the omniscient and objectionably ethnocentric pronouncements of the earlier editions.

At the same time, Statler's 1990 passage shows strong similarities to passages from the earlier editions, particularly when one applies the lens of ownership. For

²⁴ See pp. 164-165, this chapter, and Chapter Three, pp. 131-133.

example, notice that Statler relies on unnamed sources to establish his points, in much the same manner as Seidensticker did in an earlier edition. Recall that, in Seidensticker's passage about viewing the Japanese countryside from a passing train window, I remarked that he seemed to take safety in the fact that ownership of the description rests with the unnamed and unidentified imaginary rider placed on the train. In Statler's passage, the same mechanism is used, first with the Japanese (who attribute their idiosyncrasies to homogeneity) and then with the unnamed "friend" who remarks that Japanese are a "neat-looking crowd." These devices permit Statler to say things about the Japanese that would otherwise be less defensible. Moreover, it is the attempt to reassign the question of ownership of the discourse that is of interest here. As we saw in the analysis of the dimension of specificity, by 1990 the expectations of readers of tour guidebooks have changed; it is less acceptable for writers of tour guidebooks to express broad, unsupported statements about entire cultures. However, by disclaiming personal ownership of the discourse, placing the responsibility on an unidentified communicant, Statler is able to place his assertions into the stream of social discourse. Though the final control of any writing rests with the author, in Statler's passage the choice to invite other voices into the narrative seems driven partly by the need to disclaim ownership of controversial positions.

Another similarity between Statler's description and earlier Fodor's representations lies in the selectivity of detail employed to support conclusions. Earlier, I examined several examples of how Fodor's authors tended to focus on very small details, using these details to claim ownership of broader cultural representations. Statler makes a similar move, jumping from the hair color of Japanese to remarks about Japanese cultural homogeneity.

According to the Bakhtin group, once introduced, Statler's observation engages contradiction from other sources; some of these sources are earlier editions of Fodor's. The earlier formulations, characterized by efforts to claim ownership through broader

assertions and a more monologous tone, are challenged by the more tentative style of Statler's narrative. Neither of these forms is the more "correct"; however, the critical analyst applying the lens of ownership can juxtapose the earlier and later representations, emphasizing how each formulation, compared to the other, reveals the attempts to claim ownership. According to the Bakhtin group, no individual may legitimately claim ownership of communication; hence, the introduction of Statler's distinctive style automatically cues the critical reader to look for points of departure from Fodor's earlier formulations.

Other voices are engaged by Statler's assertions; some of these voices are suggested by the style of his narrative. An example is Statler's observation that Japanese themselves explain their idiosyncrasies by reference to their homogeneity. The introduction of Statler's summary of the opinion of Japanese people, without any explanation of how generally this opinion may be shared among Japanese, makes Statler's assertion very problematic. His reading of Japanese opinion begins with a narrow and questionable focus: by asserting that Japanese attribute their quirkiness to cultural homogeneity, Statler assumes both the existence of cultural homogeneity among Japanese and its connection to their alleged "quirkiness" (another assumption). These are obviously controversial stances with which Japanese and others might disagree. Recognition of another contrary voice is shown by the stipulation that everyone has black hair "unless henna or age has intervened." By implying that some people's hair could be silver, white, or dyed reddish, Statler recognizes the self-evident fact that any tourist observing a "crowd" of Japanese could see that everyone's hair is not black.

Shift to more subtle expressions of ownership. In addition to its attempts to rephrase stereotypes, the 1990 Fodor's edition is also characterized by shifts away from more blatant or obvious expressions of ownership of discourse. Illustrating this change is the sample passage below, in which Nigel Fisher discusses the Fuji-Hakone-

Izu area. Since this area is so frequently described in touristic literature, Fisher finds it necessary to establish the uniqueness of his opinion by describing the site and by using the closing sentences of the passage to "sell" the description.

Whereas Hakone is the region south of Mt. Fuji, Fuji-Goko (literally, "Fuji-five-lakes") is the area to the north of Mt. Fuji. Needless to say, the star attractions of this area are the view of the mountain and the base from which one can climb to its summit. However, the area also has five lakes that add to the scenic beauty and offer the chance to see Mt. Fuji reflected in the waters. The Fuji Lakes are a popular resort for families and business seminars. Numerous outdoor activities, ranging from skating and fishing in the winter to boating and hiking in the summer, are organized to accommodate the increasing numbers who visit here each year.

Of the five lakes, Lake Kawaguchi and Lake Yamanaka are the two most developed resort areas. Lake Yamanaka, to the east of Lake Kawaguchi, is the largest lake, but Lake Kawaguchi is considered the focus of Fuji-Goko. The area can be visited in a day trip from Tokyo, but because the main reason for coming to this region is relaxation, more than one day is really necessary unless you want to spend most of the day on buses or trains. Though there are plenty of others who would disagree with us, for the foreign visitor we rank this region as the third most interesting in this chapter, unless you plan to climb Mt. Fuji. (Fodor's, 1990, p. 257)

The first paragraph is a relatively straightforward rendering of the recreational attractions of the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area. As such, it is very similar to the descriptions encountered in the earlier editions. The 1962 and 1969 editions are unrelenting in their praise for the area, but the 1976 and 1982 editions contain disparaging remarks suggesting that site's "uniquely Japanese" qualities had been spoiled somewhat by the influx of Japanese tourists: "For people who have to live and work in the world's largest, most congested urban area, they are a welcome relief. For the Westerner tourist who has come to see East Asia, they have little advantage over Disneyland and can only be a matter of personal taste at best" (Fodor's, 1982, p. 227). This passage suggests that Japanese have somehow spoiled their own national landmark.

Perhaps recognizing that condemnation in the earlier editions (1976 and 1982) had gone too far, Fisher makes no overt reference to congestion in the 1990 edition, phrasing the matter more delicately: “. . . the Fuji-Hakone-Izu National Park offers an escape from the urban pace and congestion of Tokyo” (Fodor’s, 1990, p. 247).

A number of interesting conclusions relating to the dimension of ownership can be drawn based on the marked difference between Fisher’s depiction of the park area and those in earlier editions. First, no blame is assigned to the residents of Tokyo for having spoiled Fuji-Hakone-Izu for foreign visitors. Editors may have been alerted to the presence of objectionable claims to ownership in earlier descriptions, removing from the 1990 edition passages in which foreign writers criticize Japanese for congestion at the Mt. Fuji. The 1962 and 1969 editions of Fodor’s contain no references to Japanese from Tokyo “overrunning” the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area; the discussion changes from no condemnation in 1962 and 1969, to condemnation in 1976 and 1982, to no condemnation in 1990. The lens of ownership may help explain this progression. At each stage, editors must make decisions about how to frame ownership of descriptions to account for the presence of large numbers of Japanese tourists. By 1990, it is less appropriate to describe the site without reference to the number of Japanese visitors (as was the case in 1962 and 1969), nor to object to large numbers of Japanese visitors to the site (as in 1976 and 1982), but simply to note their presence and point it out to tourists while declining to interpret the phenomenon (as in 1990). By 1990, respect for national monuments, together with respect for the rights of the native people to enjoy their own touristic locales, has become an identifiable feature of touristic discourse.

The evolution of Mt. Fuji’s description also reveals a contest waged for ownership of Fuji’s representations. For authors in the earlier editions (1962 and 1969), it was enough to describe the area itself; authors in the middle editions (1976 and 1982) find it necessary both to describe the beauty of the area and to warn the potential

visitor about the congestion; for Nigel Fisher, in the 1990 edition, it is necessary to acknowledge that the area is beautiful and that it is congested and that it makes no difference. At each point in the evolution of the description, the author is seeking to establish ownership of the representation by directing appeals to identifiable elements in reader architectonics. At each point, given the likely architectonics of readers, the author has a certain circumscribed set of conditions that can be exploited, as well as a set of conditions which should not be exploited. Considerations of what to include and what to avoid in one's description are ultimately questions of ownership of the representation: what is the author likely to be able to claim and to persuade readers to accept? Whether or not the claim is likely to be accepted is a primary consideration: as I have noted at several points, sociohistorical circumstances often dictate that a depiction, if not wholly excluded from the touristic narrative, must at least be altered somewhat in order to make it more palatable.

Considering the second paragraph of Fisher's description of the Fuji area, it is clear that condemnation of the congestion in the area has not been completely excluded, but rather has been transformed into a less overt expression. Fisher begins the second paragraph, "Of the five lakes, Lake Kawaguchi and Lake Yamanaka are the two most developed resort areas." By the closing sentences of the paragraph, Fisher makes it clear that he does not consider such "developed" areas as optimal for the "foreign visitor," although he admits that there are others who would "disagree with us."

This is a fascinating passage, replete with interesting turns of phrase to suggest that Fisher and the Fodor's editors (I include the editors here because Fisher has highlighted their presence by using the term "us" in the phrase "others who might disagree with us") are highly attuned to two perhaps contradictory necessities. First, they cannot be too negative in their criticism of the Japanese for enjoying a site in their own country, but second, they must somehow let the tourist know that the congestion

is such that some parts of the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area are less than ideal as potential sites they should visit.

To make the suggestion of overcrowding more surreptitiously, Fisher uses euphemism: he employs the term "developed," singling out two of the lakes as being the "most developed." In Fisher's narrative, the word "developed" appears to mean roughly the same as the term "crowded." By the end of the passage, Fisher has made the "more developed" areas third on his list of places to visit, unless one wishes to climb Mount Fuji (in which case, one presumes, the "developed" areas would be ranked even lower).

Moreover, the phrase, "though plenty of others would disagree with us" conveys the same feeling of disapproval for mass tourist activities in the area as that achieved by the assertions in the 1976 and 1982 editions that Western visitors would find the congested areas about as interesting as Disneyland. The selection of Disneyland as a point of comparison could hardly be more dismissive of Japanese cultural integrity; Disneyland has become a worldwide symbol of entertainment devoid of references to the cultures in which it is located. Fisher's reference to "plenty of others" conveys, in a more courteous way, the idea that although many people might consider the "developed" areas to constitute a vacation, it is the corporate opinion of Fodor's ("us") that the sites need not be prized too highly by the potential Western visitor. Thus, Fisher, in approaching the issue of crowding more delicately, tries to persuade the visitor that the developed areas are less desirable, but to do so without directly criticizing the Japanese people for "overrunning" the Fuji area. By use of the editorial "us," Fisher counterposes Fodor's expertise against common perception, judging common perception as deficient. This explains his final assessment: "We rank this region as the third most interesting in this chapter, unless you plan to climb Mt. Fuji."

Another example of how the dimension of ownership is used in the 1990 edition to more subtly express claims to representations occurs in the discussion of the Nikko pavilion. In earlier Fodor's editions, authors lamented a "maddening jingle" often heard in the tourist trade: "Don't say 'kekko' [magnificent] until you've seen Nikko." Nevertheless, the Fodor's authors, while attempting to dismiss the "jingle" as "tiresome," embraced it both as a phrase the tourist could expect to encounter, and as an accurate statement (as the 1962 edition put it, ". . . there would be no justification for perpetuating this silly jingle here except that it contains a great deal of truth" [p. 253]). Notice how differently Jared Lubarsky reframes the "jingle" and its assessment for the 1990 edition:

Nikko (which means "sunlight") is not simply the site of the Tokugawa shrine, however; it is also a national park of great beauty, about which opinion has never been divided. From above Toshogu, the Irohazaka Driveway coils its way up through maple forests to the park plateau and Chuzenji, a deep lake some 13 miles around. To the north, there are hot springs; at the west end of the lake, the spectacular Kegon Falls tumble more than 300 feet to the Daiya River. Towering above this landscape, at 1,312 feet, is the extinct volcanic cone of Mt. Nantai: "Think nothing splendid," asserts an old proverb, "until you have seen Nikko." Whoever said it first may not even have been thinking of the mausoleum down below. (Fodor's, 1990, p. 217)

Again, however, claims to ownership of the representation of Nikko have not been excluded from the 1990 edition, but have merely been transformed to be less overt. In the earlier editions, the author (protected, one suspects, by anonymity) is more censorious, referring to the "jingle" by the strong terms "tiresome" and "maddening." In the 1990 edition, Lubarsky is more circumspect; nevertheless, as will be evident, he manages to express his condemnation in more sophisticated language.

To begin with, notice how the phrase is reformulated for the 1990 edition: rather than a "jingle" ("Don't say kekko until you've seen Nikko"), it is rendered as, "Think nothing splendid until you have seen Nikko." Moreover, the 1990 version is

referred to as an old proverb, not as a jingle (as indeed it is not: absent the rhyming of “kekko” and Nikko, the later rendition hardly qualifies as a “jingle”). In addition, in the 1990 version, the Japanese term kekko is excised and is replaced with its English translation, “splendid,” a procedure which simultaneously makes the saying less exotic (it contains one fewer Japanese word) and impossible to scan as a rhyming couplet (resembling a “jingle” even less).

Because there are available a number of options for translation of this common saying, one must assume that the choices made—both by the anonymous author of the earlier editions as well as Lubarsky in the 1990 edition—reflect specific agendas. The earlier authors wished to both denigrate and exploit their version of the saying; hence, their purposes are served by rendering it as a “tiresome jingle” which is nevertheless accurate. On the other hand, since by 1990 it is less fashionable for tour guidebooks to overtly criticize native cultural practices, Lubarsky finds his purposes better served by refusing to render the saying as a jingle, but as an old proverb (that is, though not rendered as a “maddening jingle,” the thought is conveyed as a saying which seems more “authentic” as an artifact of “real” Japanese culture).

These various observations can be explained by reference to the Bakhtin group’s dimension of ownership. Neither the earlier nor the later representers of this common saying can be said to own their respective readings of the saying and its significance. Rather, they must introduce it into the stream of social discourse, where it is certain to engage alternative representations. In the earlier statement of the saying rendered as a “maddening jingle,” the Fodor’s authors were forced to acknowledge the widespread use of the saying even as they condemned it; moreover, even after condemning it as a “jingle,” they were forced to admit that it possessed a “great deal of truth.” These strategies reveal a sophisticated awareness of the range of possible perceptions of the saying itself, a tacit acknowledgment that opinions may differ about the saying.

Likewise, in the 1990 edition, Lubarsky declines even to discuss whether the saying is “maddening,” perhaps preferring instead to rephrase it so that it no longer is a jingle.

On the other hand, Lubarsky concludes the 1990 description with a curious sentence: “Whoever said it [the saying] first may not even have been thinking of the mausoleum down below.” Apparently, Lubarsky is unwilling to share the unalloyed admiration shown Nikko by the earlier Fodor’s authors. Early in Lubarsky’s chapter, one begins to realize that he is less impressed with Tokugawa’s shrine (the mausoleum) than with the park which rests on it. This is confirmed later in the chapter when Lubarsky quotes two early travel writers on the subject of the shrine: one writer is awed by the shrine’s splendor, while the other is appalled by its architectural excesses and lack of taste. The author’s reservations about the overall “splendor” of Nikko accounts for the phrase describing the national park, “. . . about which opinion has never been divided.” Apparently, Lubarsky feels that opinion about the mausoleum is divided, so he finds it necessary to make his distinction early in the chapter.

Again, by applying the lens of ownership, one sees in these representations an elevated and sophisticated awareness of the meaning systems (architectonics) of potential readers. These are too numerous to detail completely, but include the following: (1) for the authors of the earlier version (rendered as a “jingle”), there are the people who are certain to hear the saying, the professionals in the travel industry who are compelled either to repeat, ignore, or disclaim the saying, those who are likely to be awed by Nikko’s beauty, and so on; (2) for the author of the 1990 version, there are the audiences likely to possess a more sophisticated taste for touristic description (implying both increased sensitivity to Japanese cultural integrity and less likelihood of being universally awestruck by Nikko’s “splendor”), and other potential readers as well. It is in recognition of the varied systems of architectonics of these readers that

the respective passages have based their distinctive claims to ownership of the representation of Nikko.

Shift to more overtly consumeristic aims. The 1990 Fodor's is also characterized by the use of the dimension of ownership to shift focus from less to more consumeristic depictions. Although the acquisition of consumer goods is frequently addressed in tour guidebooks, there is a marked increase in references to cost and prices in the 1990 edition of Fodor's,²⁵ as compared to the earlier editions. A possible rationale for viewing Japan as a source for consumer goods is offered in Nigel Fisher's description of Kyoto. Here, Fisher provides an exposition of Kyoto which contrasts sharply with Francis King's depiction in the 1962 and 1969 Fodor's, as well as Richard Leavitt's depiction in the 1976 and 1982 editions.²⁶ In fact, the 1990 edition includes for the first time in the Fodor's series an extensive section on shopping in Kyoto; comprised of four pages (pp. 355-359), this section offers detailed information on specific crafts (such as

²⁵ References to prices in the 1990 edition are too numerous to detail completely; however, the following sample of quotations should offer some idea of the 1990 edition's preoccupation with the expense of visiting Japan: (1) "By now you have heard many horror stories about exorbitant prices in Japan. The dollar has dropped more than 50% in value against the yen since 1986. With the continuing strength of the yen, imported goods, in particular, are shockingly expensive." (p. 8); (2) "Tales of horror floating around the world of unsuspecting tourists swallowed up by money-gobbling monsters disguised as quaint little restaurants on the back streets of Japan's major cities abound in these days of the high yen." (p. 71); (3) "Outside Nagoya, most hotels quote prices on a per-person basis with two meals, exclusive of service and tax. If you do not want dinner at your hotel, it is usually possible to renegotiate the price." (p. 282); and (4) "All are intensely proud of their places at the upper end of the retail business, as purveyors of an astonishing range of goods and services. Together, they are but the latest expression of this area's abiding concern with money. Take some of it with you on your exploration: you may find an opportunity here and there to spend it." (p. 137)

²⁶ For example, Francis King's description of Kyoto in the 1962 Fodor's edition contains only one reference to shopping: "You may not wish to shop for bulky items in Kyoto, as the prices and quality of machine-made items are about the same everywhere in Japan and there is no point in having too much baggage during your domestic traveling around the country." (p. 287) Richard Leavitt's chapter on Kyoto in the 1976 edition contains only brief references to "budget eating" in Kyoto (p. 356), the cost of a "real geisha" party (p. 357), and the following assessment of souvenir shopping: "Kyoto is the place to shop for traditional arts and crafts, for works of Oriental art, and for all the beautiful articles of use, decoration and luxury that show Japanese taste at its best, in forms, materials and above all, textures. There is an appalling amount of garish junk on sale, but if you observe, compare, and shop carefully, you will find here things no other nation could produce, things that will always remind you of Japan, and of Kyoto." Notice that Leavitt's assessment of Kyoto souvenirs is more focused upon quality and authenticity than upon price.

dolls, fans, silk, cloisonne, bamboo, and so on), as well as directions on how to shop for more specialized items (for example, "Unusual Shopping," p. 359). In the passage below, notice how forthcoming Fisher is about the underlying reasons for purchasing and showing souvenirs:

Temples, shrines, gardens, and the quintessential elements of Japanese culture are all part of Kyoto's attractions, but none of these can be brought home, except in photographs. What can be taken back, however, are mementos (omiyage)—tangible gifts for which this city is famous. The ancient craftsmen of Kyoto served the imperial court for more than 1,000 years. In Japan, the prefix kyo- before a craft is synonymous with fine craftsmanship. The crafts of Kyoto are known throughout the world for their superb artistry and refinement. (Fodor's, 1990, p. 355)

The rationale for this passage runs throughout touristic literature, though seldom is it expressed so overtly: the process of taking photographs or buying "souvenirs" can be seen as a way of "capturing" the scenes, locations, and even the people of another culture. Photographs and mementos, according to this idea, become a means for "imprisoning" cultural features, making of them objects to be repeatedly consumed by tourists and those to whom they communicate their experiences. Moreover, souvenirs are often literally "bought" specifically for the purpose of claiming a portion of the culture.²⁷

Fisher is unequivocal regarding his position on the touristic consumption of Kyoto. First, he states that the practice of purchasing craftwork collectibles is justified precisely because one cannot physically take "features" of Kyoto back home. He then exempts the taking of photographs from this general description, implying that photography serves as a surrogate for the practice of removing the city by parts. Despite my extensive analysis of touristic materials for countries such as Taiwan,

²⁷ At another point in the chapter, Fisher states, "You need not spend a fortune to bring home a piece of Kyoto" (p. 356).

Japan, the United States, and others, I have never seen this view stated as openly or bluntly as it is in Fisher's description.

Compare the overtly consumeristic tone of the 1990 edition with this passage²⁸ from Francis King's chapter in the 1962 Fodor's guidebook:

Kyoto has sometimes been called the Florence of the East, and the comparison is apt. Both cities were once capitals; both are surrounded by hills which produce a climate at once bitterly cold in winter and intolerably hot in summer; both regard themselves as the cultural centers of their respective countries; and both possess an inexhaustible store of treasures for the visitors. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 274)

Nowhere in the 1962 chapter on Kyoto does Francis King declare that a purpose of tourist activity is to possess parts of the city. Rather, in the 1962 chapter, King implies possessiveness of a different order. Instead of assigning to the tourist the responsibility of claiming ownership of the city (through personal purchase and photographs), King assumes that the image of the city is possessed merely by the fact that the tourist is a Westerner. This is why he can assume so easily that Kyoto is the "Florence of the East" (rather than phrasing it, "Florence is the Kyoto of the West"). In other words, though the possession is more symbolic than physical in the 1962 edition, the results are roughly the same as in the 1990 edition: the city remains an object to be viewed and possessed at the tourist's leisure.

By 1990, the perspective on tourism and consumption in Japan has changed dramatically: writers of touristic discourse, even while not overtly denigrating Japanese cultural practices, nevertheless seem more ready to accept the notion that consuming cultural artifacts is appropriate and acceptable: "It may be a subtle shift in the way the world is viewed, the way pieces of a cultural puzzle are taken apart and fit together in new ways to create an object, or many objects, that can be consumed:

²⁸ This passage is analyzed at length in Chapter Six, pp. 423-424.

purchased, photographed, even eaten, but above all, narrated, understood" (Volkman, 1990, p. 91).

As in previous examples, it is the specific features of architectonic systems which influence the presentation of cultural depictions. In 1962, tourism, particularly in Japan, had not yet acquired its present economic importance as one of the two largest industries in the world. By 1990, however, there is less need to mask what most people realize is the commercial impact of tourism as well as the purchases of native handicrafts that have come to be associated with touristic activity.

One can also note differences in the architectonic systems of the respective authors of the two passages. Francis King is described in the 1962 Fodor's guidebook as a former British governor of Kyoto; as an official of the city, it is possible that King's sense of civic pride might prevent him from depicting "his" city as an object for consumption, even while his architectonic perspective does not preclude directing that Kyoto is to be understood by comparison to Western cities such as Florence. Nigel Fisher, on the other hand, has no such specified ties to Kyoto, but is a very well-qualified and experienced writer of touristic literature. If it is true, as Volkman stated, that consumerism is more prevalent in the practice of tourism today than it once was, it may also be true that Fisher, as a travel and tourism professional, would have been more affected than King by the change in his vocation over his approximately two decades of involvement with tourism in general, and Japanese tourism in particular.

Finally, one can note the change in the architectonics of the readers of these guidebooks. In 1962, Japan is hardly a primary destination for visitors; as noted at several points, there was far too much uncertainty about Japan following the end of the Allied occupation. Hence, it is less likely that a Western writer in 1962 would have portrayed Kyoto as an object of consumption in and of itself, but rather as a city to be perceived in terms of well-known Western cities such as Florence; King admits as much when he states, ". . . both [Kyoto and Florence] possess an inexhaustible store of

treasures for the visitors.” On the other hand, in 1990, given factors such as the growth of international tourism, the development of Kyoto, the elevation of Japan to the status of international trading power, and many other factors, it is easier for Nigel Fisher to talk about the city in terms of commercialism, purchase, and consumption. Perhaps the readers of the 1962 edition would have been horrified at the suggestion that a city in a nation they perceived to have been soundly beaten in a world war could, in a popular guidebook series, be described as offering them objects they would be willing to pay for: that, after all, might somewhat reverse the perceived hierarchical relationship between Western nations and Japan.

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Ownership of JTB’s Descriptions

In this section, I elaborate the general sketch of issues related to the dimension of ownership in the JTB’s series. This discussion is organized into three major sections. The first two sections elaborate major themes in JTB’s descriptions opened up through the lens of the ownership construct. The third section examines changes in approaches taken to ownership by JTB’s over time.

JTB—Reclaiming the right to represent. In its earlier editions, the JTB guidebook refrains from too strongly asserting its ownership of representations about Japan. Particularly in the 1955 edition, one sees very few overt declarations about Japanese culture. As the series evolves, however, the tone of the guidebook changes, becoming more assertive and even argumentative by 1975, and by 1991 the series adopts a more certain tone, removing many of the argumentative positions that characterized the 1975 edition.

As the JTB series has evolved, its certainty in claiming authority to make representations has correspondingly increased. Nevertheless, one should also mention that, in regard to many elements of Japanese life, the JTB began with a tone of certainty regarding some of its representations and these cultural representations have

remained essentially the same throughout the series. For example, all guidebooks are characterized by an overwhelming amount of information. As the guidebook series evolves, claims to ownership of representations more favorable to Japan and Japanese become more frequent. Under the lens of ownership, this gradual increase in the assertion of the right to depict Japanese culture can be seen as an effort to reclaim from non-Japanese representers the authority to fashion an image of Japan. In touristic interactions, it is generally the culture with lesser power (nearly always the host culture) which must contest ownership of how it will be depicted, challenging the culture with greater power.

JTB—Recasting Japan and the Japanese. Representations of Japanese by non-Japanese are placed into the stream of social discourse where they may be challenged by those more knowledgeable about Japanese culture (such as the Japanese themselves). In the JTB's guidebook, this principle is illustrated many times in depictions which seem to be formulated in response to standard descriptions of Japan from non-Japanese sources. Among these are the following: (1) fuller, richer descriptions of Japanese cultural life; (2) selective readings of history; (3) claims to Japanese superiority; and (4) claims to independent development of Japanese culture.

Fuller, richer descriptions of Japanese cultural life. Claims to ownership are used in JTB's guidebooks to more fully "flesh out" the depiction of certain elements of Japanese culture. The depth of JTB's approach is often made clear in comparison to briefer, less detailed treatments of the same subjects in the Fodor's guidebooks. In the first example, a discussion of Japanese and Western painting, the distinction between the richer, in-depth knowledge of the JTB guidebook and the briefer, more perfunctory approach of the Fodor's guidebook are made very clear. However, it is in the summary of Western art that the JTB guidebook proves itself to be capable of the same kind of perfunctory summaries demonstrated by the Fodor's authors in writing about art in Japan.

Japanese landscape painting dates back to the Heian period when many charming scenes were produced on the folding screens of the palaces. This type of art, therefore, may be said to antedate that of Europe where all the great works of landscape painting have been produced within the last two centuries. Oriental landscape painting takes a broader view than that favored by artists in the West where the field of vision is purposely narrowed. For its guiding principle, it has three distant views—"high and distant," "distant and profound" and "flat and distant." Mountains soaring high into the clouds and a mist in the distance as well as scenes characterized by vastness and profundity are favored. This naturally presents a completely different appearance to the paintings. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 182)

It is interesting to see how the JTB author utilizes the dimension of ownership to connect the reader to a world, rich in details about artistic performance, with which he or she is probably unfamiliar. The descriptions of variations of artistic viewpoint, together with the philosophical rationale underlying the distinctive Japanese approach to art, serve as a better grounding for appreciation of Japanese art than one receives from the Fodor's guide. One recalls the Fodor's summation of Japanese art, analyzed earlier in this chapter: "Even when he seems blindly in pursuit of the new and the imported, a strong conservatism preserves much that is left from the past and transforms the imported into something that could only be Japanese" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 85).

In regard to Japanese art, then, the JTB's description is clearly more informative than the Fodor's description. Nevertheless, when the JTB passage turns to discussion of Western art, it utilizes claims to ownership which are on their face controversial, thus inviting contesting alternative views. It is claimed, for instance, that Japanese landscape painting "antedates" European landscape painting, and moreover, that all of the great works of European landscape painting have occurred "in the last two centuries." A number of questions arise. What standard is being used to judge whether a landscape is "great"? In what sense does Japanese landscape art "antedate"

European landscape art (in terms of time, development of technique, philosophical underpinning)? Is there no “great” piece of landscape art in the European tradition which occurred more than two centuries ago?

In this passage, contesting for ownership occurs in two ways: first, by countering the perhaps overly shallow view of Western sources about Japanese art, and second, by inviting argument from competing voices on the subject of European art, which is summarized in what appears to be an overly general fashion by JTB’s guidebook.

It is important to remember that the contest for the right to ownership of discourse space is a battle no single utterance can win. As the Bakhtin circle argues, it is only when the utterance is cut from the social fabric that it becomes an absolute entity, simply because it is no longer utterance (socially bounded speech), but rather an abstraction which can only be analyzed on its own terms. Reading an isolated description from a tour guidebook, and not being aware of its sociohistorically constituted character, one might be tempted to conclude that it is true or false in some absolute sense. However, one must always keep in mind that because no utterance can be isolated, it must be judged in relation to other voices on the same subject. When these voices are invited into dialogue on the subject, the sometimes problematic character of the utterance’s claims to ownership are challenged—not erased, destroyed, or rendered insignificant, but challenged by other discourses whose right to claim discourse space is subject to the same standards of comparison. In this passage, JTB’s guidebook has in effect purchased a higher-quality (that is, richer, fuller) description of Japanese art at the expense of what may be a more opportunistic reading of Western artistic tradition.

For another example showing how the dimension of ownership is employed by JTB to provide a fuller description of a cultural practice, I turn to the following passage in which the JTB author discusses foreign and domestic productions of Broadway

musicals. In reading the passage, one should keep in mind that the Broadway musical is a peculiarly Western cultural tradition, and hence cannot be said to belong to the Japanese. Nevertheless, one can observe the linguistic techniques by which the JTB author manages to encompass the technique of the Broadway musical, suggesting that its modification by Japanese production personnel is both inevitable and desirable. One should also note that at no time is an apology offered for having modified the musical to better suit Japanese audiences.

Recently, there have been many performances of original productions of foreign musicals in Tokyo, including such famous ones as "My Fair Lady" starring Rex Harrison Jr. These performances are given in Japan with the original cast and have been quite popular. Due to the language barrier, however, audiences have shown even greater enthusiasm for the Japanese versions of these productions. In 1987 and 1988, a large-scale production of "Les Miserables" was organized in Japan. The combination of a foreign director working with Japanese singers proved to be a great success. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 256)

While the performances of foreign actors in musical roles is said to be "successful," recasting some musicals for Japanese-speaking players has received more enthusiastic reception in Japan. The author here is establishing a number of discursive claims to ownership, including a claim for the freedom of Japanese people to modify imported cultural forms. Why is it possible for the JTB guidebook to make such claims? One reason may be that, as a "cultural form," the Broadway musical is seldom considered "serious" artistic expression. Notice, for example, that the passage never mentions that the Broadway musical is considered art, but rather that it is "successful" or "enthusiastically received." Here one finds, not the convoluted reasoning necessary to establish Japanese superiority in a "serious" undertaking such as economic growth, but a more casual reference to collaboration and cultural borrowing.

Under the lens of ownership, one can speculate that the author is permitted to make these claims in this way because there is little likelihood they will be contested.

If one expects that there will be little disagreement about an utterance, one is permitted to formulate that utterance less rigorously. For descriptions of more serious undertakings, different forms of support (different resources from the realm of sociohistorical circumstances) are necessary to ensure that claims to ownership of the discourse are properly linked to the elements of the social realm most likely to give them credibility. The passage above may be seen as an example of JTB's staking of a claim about Japanese cultural borrowing which is unlikely to engage disagreement. It can be seen as a less strenuous means of portraying the Japanese culture in a more detailed way.

In another example illustrating how JTB uses the ownership dimension to enrich understanding about a cultural artifact, consider the passage below describing the Kudara-kannon statue in the north storehouse of Horiyujii in Nara. The Fodor's passage describing this statue is analyzed in detail later in this chapter. Briefly, the Fodor's description is noteworthy because of the attempt by the Fodor's author to describe the intention of the sculptor: "Most frequently admired is the famous image of *Kudara-kannon*, carved from a single piece of camphorwood. The shape is tall and slender, the arms unusually long. The garment flows and turns over as though the Kannon were standing in cool, crystal air. The neglect of exact physical proportions is said by Japanese scholars to symbolize infinity and eternity" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 330). Compared with the Fodor's author's sense of awe and wonderment, observe the succinct way the same subject is treated in the following quotation from the 1991 JTB's guidebook:

The North Storehouse holds the Yumetagai-Kannon (a National Treasure), which was believed to have the power of changing bad dreams into good ones; a sandalwood statue of the Kumen-Kannon (Nine-Headed Kannon; a National Treasure); a graceful Roku-Kannon (Six-Bodied Kannon), and the famous wooden statue of Kudara-Kannon (a National Treasure). This last masterpiece is 2.1 m high. Many other

bronze images, swords, small-pagodas, masks and objects used on Buddhist altars are also on display. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 728)

In the JTB account, the only items of data offered regarding the Kudara-kannon are that it is “famous,” 2.1 meters high, and stored in the North Storehouse. This suggests that there are other objects considered to be of equal or greater importance (the Kudara-kannon is designated along with two other National Treasures). Clearly, the JTB wishes to position this particular statue as one of the hundreds of other objects described in the chapter on Nara.

The Fodor’s author, on the other hand, does not choose to describe the statue’s physical dimensions; rather, the author embarks on a fanciful interpretive turn: “The shape is tall and slender, the arms unusually long. The garment flows and turns over as though the Kannon were standing in cool, crystal air.” Moreover, earlier in that 1962 description, the Fodor’s author states that it is “impossible” to describe all the holdings of the storehouses. While that may be true, it does not explain why a significant portion of the discourse space is occupied by the vivid and memorable description of this particular statue, while in the JTB guidebook, it is considered to be adequately dealt in the space of two brief sentences.

The dimension of ownership governs both the JTB’s and the Fodor’s descriptions. The Fodor’s author, by relegating the majority of artistic treasures to the status of being “impossible to describe,” and by concentrating most of his or her creative efforts on describing this particular statue, is attempting to claim ownership of a particular perspective on Japanese aesthetic philosophy (“the neglect of exact physical proportions is said by Japanese scholars to symbolize infinity and eternity”). One is tempted to speculate that the reason for the Fodor’s author to have chosen to describe the Kudara-kannon is that it is one statue which permits the author to make the point he or she has in mind. This is another example of the technique of claiming a general representation on the basis of a narrowing of examples.

The JTB's guidebook, on the other hand, is willing to discuss many of the other artworks in the storehouses and even to designate some of them by markers of status (i.e., "National Treasure"). Moreover, JTB's guidebook apparently considers the Kudara-kannon not necessarily as less important, but at least as one of a number of important pieces of art. The JTB's guidebook claims ownership of the representation by the breadth of its inclusion, suggesting perhaps that it is in a somewhat better position to evaluate the broader context of Japanese art than the author(s) of the Fodor's guidebook. In this way, the JTB's guidebook uses the dimension of ownership to provide a richer, fuller exposition about Japanese artistic productions.

Selective readings of history. The dimension of ownership can also be used to advance certain "readings" of history. In the passage below, JTB's guidebook explains Japan's rail service:

Japan offers probably the most efficient and convenient rail service in the world. The JR Group maintains the world's most tightly scheduled train service. JR trains are safe, speedy, and punctual. Exploring Japan by rail is also a rewarding experience: the scenery viewed through train windows changes practically every minute, thanks to the country's diversified topography. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 54)

Precisely how good is rail service provided by JR (Japanese Railways)?

According to JTB's guidebook, it is the "most efficient and convenient in the world"; moreover, it is "safe, speedy, and punctual." While this may be a relatively accurate characterization, the question remains: why is it necessary for the JTB guidebook to present the image of Japanese Railways in this way?

This issue is complicated by the history of Japanese Railways. According to both the 1955 and 1975 editions, Japanese railways were owned by private companies until 1906 when the Japanese Government took control over the major rail lines. In 1949, Government Railways was reorganized as the Japanese National Railways. In the 1991 edition, this history of Japanese Railways is deleted, although a later history

of Japanese National Railways is added. Japanese National Railways underwent privatization in 1987 and was divided into six companies under the name of Japanese Railways (JR). Among the many factors which led to privatization, and the many effects produced through reorganization, the JTB guidebook has chosen, first, to define the reorganization as successful, and second, to emphasize the efforts of both the government and the private companies in carrying out their missions.

According to the 1991 edition, "The Japanese National Railways (JNR) continued its development until all areas of the country were connected in an extensive network" (p. 54). Moreover, the 1991 guidebook continues, "At present, Japanese Railways operates three types of services in a mutually interlinked network. . . . The entire rail system is organized and operated in a single, extensive network called the JR Group, allowing uninhibited travel on JR lines throughout the nation" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 54). The effort spent in the construction of the newest Shinkansen ("New Trunk Line") is also praised: "In constructing this railway, the most advanced technology, and engineering skills from every industrial field were employed, making it one of the fastest, most reliable and most traveled rail transport systems in the world" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 55; similar statements can be found on p. 76 of 1975 edition). By limiting its discussion to favorable accounts of history, the JTB's guidebook declares ownership of the representation, determining what should be deserving of the visitor's attention.

Immediately, however, one can identify many other voices, both consistent and inconsistent, stimulated by the description contained in the JTB guidebook. There certainly must have been problems which led to the privatization of JNR. However, if JNR did continue its development until all areas of the country were connected, why was it necessary for privatization to take place? What is meant by the statement that "all areas" in Japan were connected? If they were, why was it necessary for lines other than JR railways to exist? If the entire rail system has been organized comparatively

recently and is operating on a single system under the JR group, one suspects that it would have been impossible to travel uninhibitedly throughout Japan on JNR facilities, which stands in contradiction to the earlier claim that one could travel throughout Japan. Moreover, in constructing "The New Trunk Line," there is no way to verify the statement that "engineering skills from every industrial field were employed" [Emphasis added] (p. 55).

Every reader can engage in his or her own reading of JTB's guidebook. Some may agree with the assessment advanced by the guidebook without questioning it, whereas others, whether tourists or not, will have incorporated their own experiences to engage a different reading. One might use other standards, Western or otherwise, to assess the Japanese Railway systems. One might rely on his or her organizational experience to reassess the claims to ownership found in JTB's guidebook. One might inquire about aspects of technology from various sectors of Japanese industry to examine their comparative contribution to Japanese railways. These various voices, each conceived according to its own unique architectonic systems, guarantee that the JTB's description of Japanese railroads is indeed only one of many competing versions. The meanings of these statements made by the JTB guidebook are thus derived from, but are in constant struggle with, other viewpoints. Hence, JTB's guidebook can never own the discourse representation by itself.

Another selective reading of history through use of the ownership dimension is found in the following discussion of the reconstruction of Japan following World War II.

But how did Japan actually reconstruct itself? As the Japanese government declared in its "Economic White Paper" of 1955 when 10 years had passed since the end of the war: "Japan is no longer in the postwar period." It had regained the economic level it had before the war (1935-1936). There is no doubt that Japan was largely helped in the reconstruction of its economy by the increase in demand resulting from

the so-called “Korean special procurement boom” caused by the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 135)

As noted elsewhere, one of Japan’s biggest persuasive challenges is to acknowledge its actions in World War II, but at the same time not appear too contrite in apologizing for the pursuit of the aims Japan thought at the time were justified. JTB adopts a strategy which allows it to establish its claims to ownership of discursive representations of World War II and its aftermath.

In accounting for the reconstruction period, however, JTB faces an equally challenging representational task. To Western readers, any reference to Japan’s individual power could be taken as a premature, illegitimate claim to ownership, because Japan is widely perceived to have provoked American retaliation in World War II.

In the JTB’s account there are a number of unusual specific facts about postwar reconstruction cited in support of the claim that Japanese managed to pull themselves up out of the devastation brought on by the war. First, there is the suggestion that it was Japan itself which declared that the country had emerged from the war’s aftermath: “Japan is no longer in the postwar period.” This assertion is subtle and revealing. Notice that JTB does not claim that the writing of the “White Paper” (thus designating the declaration as official) is the factor which ends the postwar period, but merely that it declared that the country was out of the postwar period. From the JTB’s declaration of ownership to the representation, the reader is left wondering whether the declaration has any force or not.

Second, there is no specific evidence to indicate what JTB means when it says that Japan had regained the economic level it had before the war. Since it is not possible for all economic indicators to have been somehow reset to their prewar levels, one must assume that the judgment represents an overall assessment—by the Japanese government—that the “economic level,” as a whole, was about the same in 1955 as it

had been in 1936. However, one must be cautious about accepting this statement: the author is summarizing a number of measures of the economy without specifically apprising the reader of that fact, and is interpreting this summary in a controversial manner.

Third, JTB acknowledges one specific historical event which helped to shape its reconstruction: the “so-called ‘Korean special procurement boom’” which followed the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950. This reference is most puzzling: why is it necessary for the author to mention—out of hundreds of factors which might conceivably have played a part in the economic recovery—the outbreak of the Korean War? While one cannot be sure of the motivation, it may be that JTB is reminding its readers that the United States was involved in its second Asian conflict in the span of less than a decade. Another motivation may be that, by identifying another Asian country as a major factor in Japan’s recovery, JTB grants some status to the other country and thereby portrays Asians as capable of taking care of themselves, despite Western military aggression.

There is no hint of regret or remorse about the war or its aftermath²⁹ in the JTB account. Instead, JTB has selected a few unusual examples and pieces of evidence and has combined these to fashion a claim to ownership of the contention that the reconstruction is due primarily to the efforts of Japan and other countries. That this is the JTB’s intention is confirmed by the initial question: “But how did Japan actually reconstruct itself?” JTB, despite the selection of its evidence, never answers this question. Instead, the author chooses to convey a message about Japanese

²⁹ In the chapter, “History” (pp. 84-103), the 1991 JTB’s guidebook summarizes World War II and the postwar period in three brief sentences: “This led to opposition from the United States and Great Britain and ultimately to the Pacific War (World War II). Japan was defeated and all Japanese territory was occupied by the Allied powers with the aim of instituting a large-scale reform of Japan and turning it into a truly democratic state. The people in general denounced all that remained of militarism” (p. 101).

industriousness and ability by suggesting that the war and its aftermath constituted challenges to Japanese determination.

Claims to Japanese superiority. JTB's guidebooks also frequently utilize claims to ownership of representations in order to enhance the status of certain elements of Japanese life. In the example passage quoted below, the JTB guidebook attempts to accentuate its economic status. Note the argumentative quality (atypical of the JTB guidebook style) as the author compares Japan's economic prowess with the United States and the United Kingdom:

Although Japan came to rank first in net external assets in 1985, it had been standing behind the United Kingdom and the United States, which had begun their global activities much earlier than Japan, in terms of gross external assets. However, Japan became first with its gross external assets of \$1,469.3 billion at the end of 1988, surpassing those of the U.K., which marked \$1,395.1 billion. As a result, Japan had become No. 1 in the world in terms of assets as well as credit (both net and gross). (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 135)

This is a somewhat confusing passage, made more difficult to understand because the JTB author keeps switching standards of comparison in order to place Japan in the primary position. The passage begins by asserting that, "although" Japan ranked first in net external assets in 1985, it "had been" behind the United States and the United Kingdom. First of all, why should "net external assets" have been chosen as the standard of comparison? Net external assets refers to holdings outside the borders of the country. Not only is this a questionable standard to use as an indication of economic worth, the fact that Japan owns so much property in foreign countries has proved to be a highly sensitive issue in these countries, particularly the United States. However, use of this standard is easier to understand if one considers it through the lens of ownership. JTB's guidebook cites its high ranking in net external assets, implying not only that Japan's economy is strong, but it is strong because Japan owns so many assets in other countries. This is a distinct and challengeable claim to

ownership of representations concerning economic superiority. At the same time, the controversial claim is handled with finesse: JTB's guidebook does not bluntly assert that what some Westerners fear about Japanese is true; instead, the guidebook couches its ownership claims in more neutral language cast in the style of discourse about economics.

However, immediately following JTB's efforts to establish net external assets as the standard of comparison, there is an immediate shift away from that standard: JTB's guidebook states that the reason for the primacy of the United States and the United Kingdom in net external assets is that they started "much earlier." From this designation, it is very difficult to determine how time is being reckoned: Japan "had been" standing behind the other two countries, which "had begun" much earlier. The use of these verb forms indicates that some significant period of time has elapsed, although the reader is unsure about how long ago the United States and United Kingdom began their efforts, or how long Japan had to "stand behind" them.

Finally, the author arrives at the conclusion that Japan reached the number one ranking in 1988, "surpassing the U.K." (the United States is not specifically mentioned). In fact, the author has claimed that Japan was number one in net external assets in 1985, but that something happened between 1985 and 1988 to enable Japan to assume the number one ranking in 1988. It is open to question whether the number one status is bestowed in 1985 or 1988, or even earlier, since the reader does not know how long the United States and the United Kingdom occupied top ranking in this category.

Why would the JTB guidebook choose this convoluted strategy to claim ownership of a description which rank-orders nations according to one particular economic measure? Perhaps it is because Japan is popularly seen as dependent on imports, a depiction which less likely to leave an impression of Japan's superiority. To elevate Japan's image, JTB downplays its weak points (fewer domestic natural

resources) and emphasizes its strengths (net external assets). Nevertheless, the case for Japanese superiority is not so clear, making it necessary for JTB to shift comparison standards in order to give the impression that it is ranked first in the category of “net external assets” and that it would have ranked even higher had Japan been able to start “much earlier.” Through these mechanisms, JTB is permitted to claim ownership of the representation of its status and superiority.

Claims to independent development of Japanese culture. In contrast to the Fodor’s guide, in which Japanese cultural practices were depicted as having been derived from other cultures, JTB’s guidebook frequently exerts considerable effort to portray Japanese culture as wholly or primarily the product of the Japanese people themselves. An example of this type of ownership claim is seen in the following passages, in which JTB describes a cultural practice often seen as “thoroughly Japanese”: flower-arrangement.

JTB’s attempt to “own” its discourse about flower arrangement can be observed in all three editions of its guidebook. In the 1955 edition, flower arrangement is said to be “. . . an aesthetic attainment unique to the Japanese people,” and, “Although historians dispute the origin of the art, it is true that the institution has been developed to its present stage of accomplishment purely as a native cult in this country independent of all outside influences” (p. 214). Similar statements are found in both the 1975 and 1991 editions. JTB evidently wants to claim ownership of the view that Japan originated and developed flower arrangement, independent of the practices of other cultures.

Regardless of the origin of flower arrangement, it is important for JTB to declare that the art in its present form can be attributed only or primarily to Japan. The JTB’s motivation is revealed in the following statements which are found in the 1955 edition but not in the 1975 or 1991 editions:

It is said that the practice of flower arrangement is believed to have originated in India with the worship of Buddha, before whose image it was the custom to offer flowers. Another record says that it was first practiced by Prince Shotoku-Taishi (573-621), who through a vision instructed the art of flower arrangement to Ono-on-Imoko, who is regarded as the founder of the Ikenobo school at the Kokkakudo Temple in Kyoto. (p. 241)

By deleting these statements from later editions, two goals are achieved simultaneously. First, the possible influence of India becomes less relevant, thus foregrounding the uniqueness of the Japanese version. Second, by removing the dispute among historians regarding the origin of flower arrangement, the later JTB's guidebooks are able to establish authority and direct reader attention to the current state of Japanese flower arrangement, rather than to the unknown and remote past. JTB claims responsibility for defining flower arrangement as an art form, fixing its practice in the present time and space, and marking it as uniquely Japanese.

It is likely that JTB's guidebook would not find it necessary to stipulate that the art of flower arrangement is "independent of outside influence" were it not for the widespread perception that Japan has engaged in "borrowing" from other cultures. Japan's cultural borrowing is discussed in venues other than touristic discourse: it is found in discussions of technology, anthropology, art, and political science, to name only a few. It is possible that JTB's guidebook would not find it necessary to assert in such strong terms that flower arrangement is "uniquely Japanese," if there no conflicting representations claiming that flower arrangement is not uniquely Japanese. Indeed, at least of one of these conflicting representations is suggested by JTB itself, in its 1955 edition, where claims that flower arrangement is "uniquely Japanese" must recognize other possible historical origins (these are expressed as the opinion of unspecified others: "it is said" that "it is believed" that flower arrangement originated in India).

In fact, this analysis is verified by the account of historian Edwin Reischauer. Comparing statements about the origins of flower arrangement in the JTB with Reischauer's account, one sees a probable reason for the vigor with which JTB claims ownership of its version of flower arrangement as a "uniquely Japanese" phenomenon: it is because Japan borrowed the practice, not from India, but from China:

The medieval Zen monks also brought from China three other arts which in time became so characteristic of Japanese culture that they are now considered to be typically Japanese. One was flower arrangement, which started with the placing of floral offerings before representations of Buddhist deities, but eventually became a fine art which is now part of the training of every well-bred Japanese girl. (Reischauer, 1970, pp. 71-72)

In this passage, one perceives one possible reason for JTB's unusual phrasing stating that flower arrangement "is believed to have originated in India with the worship of Buddha." While the art may have first appeared in India, it apparently was not from India that the Japanese received it. As noted at other points in this dissertation, so much of Chinese culture was borrowed by the Japanese that JTB's guidebook's discomfiture about attributing flower arrangement to Chinese influence is understandable.

Another example of how JTB uses ownership to establish the independence of Japanese culture is to be found in the attribution of reasons for Japan's improvement in accommodations for tourists and other visitors. Rather than directly attributing improvements to the needs of foreigners, the JTB account suggests that such improvements have been made because they are desired by Japanese:

Japan's dramatic economic growth has given the Japanese people more and more time to spend on leisure activities. People are moving around a great deal, and the need for good accommodations has greatly increased. As a result, almost every town and city offers a range of accommodations that includes fully equipped, first-class luxury hotels such as Tokyo's Hotel Okura, Imperial Hotel and Hotel New Otani as well as business hotels with limited services but reasonably priced accommodations to say

nothing of the resort areas that cater to tourists. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 47)

From this passage, one might get the impression that foreign visitors were not even considered in the improvement of accommodations in Japan. According to JTB, Japan's "dramatic economic growth" necessitated the increase in "leisure" facilities. In contrast to its attempts at other points to acknowledge Japan's successful achievements in living up to Western standards, JTB's guidebook here does not even mention Western countries, except by implication in the final phrases of the paragraph ("resort areas that cater to the tourist").

Why is the JTB guidebook, which so often uses the "Western" standard as a measure of quality in accommodations, seemingly so eager to dismiss Western influence on the development of its leisure facilities? As described by the dimension of ownership, it may be that JTB is somewhat discomfited by the idea that a more balanced depiction of influences (that is, changes to accommodate both Japanese and Western tourists) will lead to the perception that Japan caters to Westerners. While it may be convenient to describe accommodations as satisfying "Western" standards in order to attract the lucrative tourist market (a recognition that foreign guests must be reassured), when it comes to an area where Japan clearly considers itself preeminent (economic growth), the JTB guidebook is no longer comfortable being seen as responding to Western influence. "Ownership" here is used both metaphorically, as well as in the literal sense of financial investment. Beginning the passage with a reference to Japan's "dramatic economic growth" may be JTB's way of declaring the grounds upon which the contest over ownership of the discourse space will be conducted.

Use of ownership to establish claims about the independence of Japanese culture is also shown in the following discussion of the Japanese governmental system:

It is to be noted, however, that no clear distinction is made in Japan between the legislative and the executive branches as is done in United States. The people have the right to elect the members of the National Diet, which is the legislative body and represents the most important source of power among the three in a constitutional state. They also have the right to screen the justices of the Supreme Court. The Prime Minister is designated by the national Diet and must himself be a member of the Diet. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 127)

One interesting feature of this passage is the elements which are chosen to make the comparison. Apparently, the Japanese political system is characterized by the same tripartite division of government as the United States —legislative, executive, and judicial. However, early in the passage we find the phrase, “. . . no clear distinction is made in Japan between the legislative and the executive branches as is done in United States.” After having pointed out the similarity between governments in Japan and the United States, JTB introduces features that make the Japanese governmental form distinctive, thus permitting JTB to register its claim to ownership of the representation. JTB’s description mentions a number of differences between Japanese and American government: that there is no separation between executive and legislative branches, that the members of the judicial and executive branches are “screened” by members of the Diet, that the Prime Minister must be a member of the Diet, and so forth.

Given these differences, however, one could legitimately ask why it is necessary to offer the comparison to the United States at all. JTB’s claims to ownership (recitation of unique features of Japanese government) render Japanese government, not similar to, but considerably different from, United States government. In fact, since there are few points of similarity between the Japanese and American governments, apart from the fact that both countries have three branches of government (a feature hardly unique to Japan and the United States), the introduction

of the United States as a point of comparison seems to serve only to legitimize subsequent claims to ownership.

Elements of temporal change in the ownership of JTB's descriptions. As noted in earlier discussion, the JTB series exhibits a more gradual process of change in the dimension of ownership in its editions from 1955 through 1991 (in contrast to the Fodor's series, which changes little from 1962 through 1982, but dramatically from 1982 to 1990). In this section, I discuss two important elements of temporal change exhibited by the JTB series: (1) reformulation of claims about cultural transmission; and (2) consistent overloading of detail throughout the series.

Reformulation of claims about cultural transmission. To establish Japan's cultural independence, JTB often finds it necessary to give its version of how certain cultural practices came to be influential in Japan. In its discussion of how ancient Japanese were influenced by the cultures of both China and Korea, the 1955 JTB guidebook states,

Together with this inflow of continental culture many people came from Korea and China to live in this island country. They taught the Japanese people the practical arts of sericulture, weaving, metal-casting and brewing, and the cultural arts of writing and literature. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1955, p. 69)

With minor revisions, both the 1975 and 1991 editions make essentially the same statement.

It is interesting to note how cultural exchange with China and Korea is described. One would expect cultural exchange to mean that people of different cultures come to each other's environments to learn. As Chinese and Koreans came to live in Japan, there were also many Japanese who went to China to bring back cultural knowledge. However, the JTB does not characterize the mutual cultural transmission as a dynamic process of exchange, but emphasizes only the fact that "many people

came from Korea and China to live in this island country" in order to teach the Japanese people.

This view of cultural transmission as a unilateral process is an attempt to claim ownership of the discourse about the cultural exchange among Japan, Korea, and China. Through careful choice of phrasing, the subordinate position of Japanese as borrowers from the Chinese through the Koreans is minimized: Japanese did not go to China to seek knowledge, but rather remained in their island country and waited for other people to come voluntarily to teach them. Moreover, by describing both Chinese and Koreans as having come to Japan to teach, China and Korea are placed on an equal footing, even though Korea itself was the recipient of a great deal of Chinese culture.³⁰

This attempt to elevate the status of the Japanese people is reaffirmed in the 1991 edition: the statement "they taught the Japanese people" (appearing in both the 1955 and 1975 editions) is replaced with the phrase, "they taught the local people." Why was it necessary to change "Japanese" to "local"? Since the "Japanese" are the object of teaching, once the term is changed to "local people," the Japanese are in effect distanced from those who are students of Chinese and Korean cultures: "local people" are remote in time and space, while the "Japanese" are associated with the present day and modernity. While Chinese and Koreans may have taught ancient "local people," they were not the teachers of today's sophisticated "Japanese people."

Through these complex claims to ownership, not only is the reader left with the sense that modern Japan is detached from its past, but the impact on Japan from other Asian nations is minimized. This attitude contrasts with JTB's guidebook's eagerness to credit the West in certain key areas: "Things Western were introduced into the country by those Japanese who had studied abroad and also by foreigners who came

³⁰ Notice the structural similarity of this argument to the depiction of Japanese flower arranging, above. In both cases, the role of China is minimized, in the former instance by attributing flower arranging directly to India, and in the latter, by implying that Koreans transmitted culture directly.

to Japan" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 99). As JTB's series evolves, one notices subtle shifts in the description of Japanese culture to downplay Asian influences (associated with the past and traditionality) and to emphasize Western influences (associated with modernity and industrialization).

However, JTB cannot wholly "own" its description. While JTB may promote its own version of "reality," other sources may also promote their own versions of what "actually happened" among these nations in the ancient past. The JTB guidebook's definition of reality, and hence its ownership of its representations, are in struggle against other presentations.³¹ Each version of "reality" is clarified through its inevitable contrast with other versions.

Consistent overloading of detail throughout series. Each form of cultural description has its own characteristic ways of claiming the right to ownership of representations. For example, particularly in its earlier editions, Fodor's claims to ownership are based in part upon an assumed superiority of Western culture (see Chapter Three). JTB, on other hand, bases ownership of its claims in part on the thoroughness with which it, as a Japanese government agency, can describe the country of Japan. A glance at JTB's guidebook may surprise the potential tourist: there is far more information than would normally be considered necessary for a visitor to the country. One is impressed with the thoroughness of the JTB guidebook's descriptions of various aspects of Japanese life. While the guidebook recognizes that there are different kinds of tourists—some are only interested in a short-term, "get-away" holiday, while others

³¹ One such presentation is that of the Fodor's guidebook, which describes the cultural interrelationship among Japan, China, and Korea in the following terms: "The Japanese for their part borrowed a literate culture from China, at first through Korea, but were in the happy position of being left alone to do what they chose with the borrowings. It is therefore possible to treat much Japanese history as an alternation between periods of more or less straight borrowing and periods when there governed 'the Japanese spirit,' an elusive force making over the borrowed material into something different and highly individual" (Fodor's, 1969, pp. 69-70). This passage is essentially the same in examined editions from 1962 through 1982. Notice that Fodor's is less hesitant to depict Japanese as dependent on Chinese culture, although it does acknowledge that Japanese have made the "material" borrowed into "something different and highly individual."

may be interested in participating more fully in Japanese life—it is clear that any tourist would find it difficult to digest all of the JTB guidebook. The 1955 edition contains 1,015 pages, the 1975 enlarged edition has 1,018 pages, and the 1991 edition contains 968 pages. Moreover, most of the pages are visually dense, compact and frequently printed in very small type. Indeed, the JTB guidebook, with its thin paper, multicolored cloth page markers, handsome binding, and impressive foldout maps, looks more like an encyclopedia than a guidebook. The 1991 JTB guidebook sells for \$125.00 and is a repository for a vast amount of reference material about Japan.

Beyond the standard information necessary for the tourist—information about touristic facilities, currency, food, points of interest, and so on—all three JTB editions extensively describe various aspects of Japanese society: history, economy, society, religion, politics, the arts, geography, daily life, and so on. The purpose of this extensive effort at cultural description is stated in the preface to the 1991 edition: “The new volume will also serve as a complete ‘thesaurus’ on things Japanese” (p. 2). Moreover, in the foreword, the president of Japanese National Tourist Organization explains:

The present volume contains a diverse range of the most up-to-date and authentic information on Japan considered to be useful and interesting to the visitor to our land. It deals exclusively with almost every aspect of Japan from one end of the country to the other covering her natural environment, culture, government, economy and the daily life of her people as well as her cities and towns, resorts, means of transport, accommodations and other related facilities. . . . I additionally wish to express my sincere hope that this guidebook will serve not only as the most reliable companion available to the traveler to our shores, but that it will also afford delightful armchair reading for all those with a keen interest or even a sense of curiosity about our country, and thereby contribute to a better understanding in the international community of Japan and her people. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 1)

In the advertisement on the final page of the 1991 edition, one finds the following statement: “Everything you need to see Japan. . . . JTB.” It is obvious that

JTB's purpose is more than simply to provide foreign tourists with quick, easy information for touring in Japan. The JTB's additional task is to provide information for anyone who is interested in Japan, whether that person is a tourist or not. The discourse advanced by JTB in each successive edition of its guidebook clearly attempts to establish some claim to other areas of discourse, such as those traditionally occupied by academic writing.

The circumstances surrounding the writing of the JTB guidebook are intriguing. As a government agency, JTB is assumed to have authority to render an "official version" of Japan. Since JTB's is an official version, it is considered necessary to address as many aspects of Japanese life as possible so that it will be difficult for other discourses to compete for ownership of representations of Japan. By writing about Japan in such exhaustive detail, JTB attempts to monopolize the discourse space. By implicitly or explicitly refusing to acknowledge other discourses dealing with aspects of Japanese life—the JTB guidebook is said to provide the "authentic information" about Japan—JTB is able to assert its authority in presenting the "correct" view of Japan. Moreover, by moving beyond travel-related information, JTB is able to acquire added status because its representations place tourism in a more favorable light. Although scholars seldom take touristic representations seriously, JTB accounts claim legitimacy, first, by the thoroughness of their representations, and second, by virtue of JTB's status as an official Japanese government agency.

Indeed, JTB's exhaustive information is almost certainly not for the purpose of providing visitors with more information, but to specify and monopolize the kind of information available for any interested person. Once an "official version" is presented and endorsed by the government, other accounts can be relegated to the positions of "less authentic," "unreliable," or "incomplete."

Emphasis on the government. Given the extraordinary effort JTB takes to "own" its representation of Japan, it is hardly surprising that the role of the government is

mentioned so often in the series. The government is cited as the regulator of standards over a wide range of matters of interest to tourists: hotels, restaurants, sanitary standards, medical standards, interpreters, tour guides, the home-visit system, and so on. It is highly unlikely that a tour guidebook published by a private concern, particularly a foreign publishing organization, would devote so much attention to every aspect of Japanese life, or be interested in elevating the image of Japan in the eyes of its visitors.

However, as the Bakhtin group points out, any discourse must be jointly owned by all social actors. Although JTB attempts to claim ownership and authority in describing Japanese life, the writing of the JTB guidebook is nevertheless defined in relation to, and in contrast with, potential tourists themselves—this is why the second major section of JTB's guidebook deals only with travel-related information. JTB's representation claims ownership both among other touristic representations (it is portrayed as the "most reliable" guidebook to Japan) and among other kinds of discourse as well (it is described as "delightful armchair reading" for "anyone").

The overwhelming level of detail provided by the JTB guidebook is particularly noticeable in its descriptions of sites and locations. In the discussion of each locale, one finds a general description, history, industries, transportation, travel advice, annual events, places of interest, and so on. While these categories may be found in other guidebooks, the impressive amount of detail in each section of the JTB guide sets it well apart; indeed, the amount of information could even be considered overwhelming to the potential tourist.

As an example, in the 1991 edition, ten city wards are described in the subsection, "Places of Interest" in the section, "Osaka and Vicinity" (pp. 639-647), twenty-three wards in Tokyo, and nine wards in Kobe. Although the text does not discuss each ward separately, but rather introduces places of interest in a given area, one wonders why it is necessary to list the name of each ward in the city. Moreover,

detailed information on the annual events of some places of interest is also provided. In the discussion of "Annual Events," one finds eleven annual events listed under Hokkaido (pp. 274-275), two under Sandei (p. 340), twenty-eight under Tokyo (pp. 369-372), thirteen under Yokohama (pp. 418-419), nine under Kamakura (p. 430), three under Nagoya (pp. 575-576), fourteen under Osaka (pp. 637-639), forty-two under Kyoto (pp. 659-665), six under Kobe (pp. 750-751), four under Nagasaki (pp. 854-855), and four under Okinawa Prefecture and the Ryukyu Islands (pp. 888-889). One would have to stay in Japan for a long period of time to experience all these events.

By providing detailed information on each touristic site, the JTB guidebook skillfully establishes its authority in defining not only which places should be visited, but also what one can expect to see in a given location. Moreover, JTB's guidebook responds to other "owners" of touristic discourse who demand different information concerning the touristic site. Recall the passage quoted from the foreword to the JTB guidebook: ". . . this guidebook will serve not only as the most reliable companion available to the traveler to our shores, but . . . it will also afford delightful armchair reading for all those with a keen interest or even a sense of curiosity about our country . . ." (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 1). The representation is jointly owned by anyone who demands information about Japan, whether that person is a tourist or not.

Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Ownership in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions

In this section, I compare some characteristic stylistic mechanisms employed to establish ownership of cultural representations. First, I will examine stylistic mechanisms in the Fodor's guidebook, and then I turn to the stylistic mechanisms in the JTB's guidebook series.

Fodor's—Stylistic mechanisms. To accomplish its goal of inscribing Japanese culture according to its own agenda, the Fodor's series uses several characteristic

stylistic mechanisms, including the following: (1) claims based on questionable evidence; (2) taking refuge in the genre of touristic writing; and (3) excessive attribution.

Claims based upon questionable evidence. As has been shown previously, the Fodor's guidebooks exhibit a tendency to make draw broad conclusions based upon limited evidence. Stylistically, this is often accomplished by declaring ownership of disparate domains and then establishing a tenuous link to connect the separate claims. In the passage below,³² Edward Seidensticker tries to link claims about the colors of nature and the art of Japanese painting:

The scene is one of garden-like perfection, save where education and progress have marred it with schoolhouses (among the ugliest buildings in Japan), poles, and billboards; and it is one of soft colors, admitting of the bolder colors only vermilion, the mark of the temple or shrine. Perhaps the best argument for continuing to paint in the traditional Japanese styles is that tempera seems far better than oil for capturing the tones of the country. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 60)

In the emphasized portion of the passage, Seidensticker is performing the following activities: first, he is claiming the right to make statements about Japanese painting as a whole; second, he generalizes about the colors of Japanese landscapes as if they comprised a single entity; and third, he is assuming the right to state that these two previous conclusions are causally related. The reader is left with the sense that Seidensticker has fashioned a remarkable and noteworthy conclusion. Applying the lens of ownership, however, one is able to see that the passage excludes important information in successively broader domains of inquiry.

Let us begin with the implications about painting. Obviously, Seidensticker's assertion (that it is a good idea to "continue to paint in the traditional style") raises

³² Portions of this passage are also analyzed in discussion of the dimension of open and closed perception, Chapter Six, pp. 366-368.

more questions than it answers. What is “the traditional style”? Is there only one? Is there a single style that predominates? Does Seidensticker imply that whatever style he chooses to designate as “traditional” employs only one medium (tempera paint)? Moreover, what does Seidensticker mean by “continue”? Is there some identifiable style of painting which has its roots in the “traditions” of the past and is now waning in influence? Or does he mean that the “traditional style” is highly regarded at the present time and should be encouraged? These and many other questions are provoked by the first part of the emphasized passage. In this passage, Seidensticker is staking a claim to ownership of a number of ideas. Moreover—as shown by the number of questions one could reasonably ask of his claim—his ownership is tenuous and easily contested.

But Seidensticker does not stop with this initial assertion: he then extends his claim to the general colors and tones of Japan as a whole. It is unclear what portion of Japan Seidensticker is referring to when he claims that the “tones of the country” are better represented by tempera colors. Ignoring for the moment what is meant by the phrase “better . . . for capturing the tones,” it is relatively easy to raise other objections to this statement. The author cannot be referring to Japan as a whole; indeed, Seidensticker himself remarks on several occasions the vast differences in the appearance of various geographical areas, not to mention the sharp contrast he and others draw between the cities and the countryside. However, in the second portion of the emphasized passage, Seidensticker seems to be saying that the whole of Japan shares certain “tones”—and in fact he says more than that, that Japan shares tones that are best rendered in tempera colors.

Seidensticker uses the two preliminary claims to set up the most important claim, represented in the final segment of the emphasized portion of the passage. It is at this point that Seidensticker links his claim about painting with his claim about “tones” to forge a more controversial claim: that the existence of the “tones” and the

appropriateness of the tempera combine as the “best argument” for continuing to paint in the traditional style.

Seidensticker is not entirely certain about this conclusion: he says that “perhaps” the alleged correspondence between the colors of the countryside and painting in tempera colors is the best reason for continuing to paint in the traditional style. In short, the final portion has the appearance of being an original, if tenuous, conclusion. Introducing this conclusion into public discourse will almost certainly invite dispute over Seidensticker’s ownership of ideas; on the other hand, the dispute over ownership of the ideas undergirding the first two preliminary portions is likely to be even more pronounced, primarily because both are derived from areas in which specialists are likely to have more knowledge than Seidensticker.

The casual reader of this passage might be so struck by the originality of the thought (the clear stamp, that is, of Seidensticker’s “ownership”) that he or she may not think of the questions about ownership that led Seidensticker to make his conclusion. Moreover, it is highly unlikely that the stylistic elements of these three claims to ownership have been chosen at random. Rather, they seem to be indications of Seidensticker’s willingness to extend himself in order to claim ownership of representations.

Taking refuge in the genre of touristic writing. The tour guidebook is a highly distinctive form of cultural representation. Because touristic discourse is typically taken less seriously than more “legitimate” forms of cultural representation (such as ethnographies), authors of tour guidebooks are permitted more latitude in making their claims. Particularly in the earlier editions of Fodor’s guidebooks, authors give themselves a great deal of freedom to make broad assertions about the Japanese. There are at least three reasons for the broader latitude of the Fodor’s guidebook, each reason related to characteristic style of the tour guidebook genre.

First, authors in the Fodor's guide are writing about a part of the "mysterious Orient"; since it is so mysterious, Fodor's writers can expect that their audiences are likely to have few preconceptions about their subjects. Whatever the author says is likely to be taken for granted by Fodor's readers.

Second, since the Fodor's guidebooks are about tourism, and are not considered academic discourse about Japan, authors are less likely to have their statements taken seriously. This stylistic element is particularly significant in the case of an author such as Edward Seidensticker, because he is a well-known scholar who has translated many important Japanese literary works. If he were writing in academic contexts, Seidensticker would probably be less likely to express broad unsupported claims to ownership of his representations. In the context of tour guidebooks, stylistic hyperbole is less likely to arouse reader objection.

Third, in the tour guidebook, writer and subject are placed in an imbalanced power relationship. Any writing serves to inscribe how the writer construes the object of description. Hence, any writing is an expression of power to control the description. However, the situation between describer and described is more complex when sociohistorical relations between West and East are factored into the relationship. The Fodor's guidebooks are consistently less restrained in describing Asian countries which are relatively lacking in political power (particularly in the 1960's and 1970's). Given the stereotypes about the underdeveloped Orient, it is not too much to assume that Fodor's readers expect its writers to adopt a superior position in describing countries such as Japan.

Fodor's writers thus attempt to own the discourse space about Japan, preparing their readers for what to expect when they visit. On the other hand, as we have seen, the discourse space cannot be owned solely by the writers themselves, but jointly by many other interests: the Fodor's guidebook series as a player in the international

tourism market; Western readers' perceptions cultivated through sociohistorical factors; writers of political discourse about the East and the West; and so on.

As we have already seen, the authors of the Fodor's guidebook have not, at least in the 1962 through 1982 editions, hesitated to make broad-based and authoritative pronouncements about Japan. Under the lens of ownership, however, one can see that the more general and assertive the pronouncement, the more likely it is to encounter an architectonic system different from the author's, increasing the likelihood of disagreement. This is why the dimension of ownership is so important to the act of cultural representation. The author of cultural description can never know who is going to be reading his or her words, nor can the author predict the reactions of readers as they filter these words through their own architectonic systems.

The Fodor's guidebook is written for visitors (primarily from Western countries) to Japan: hence, Fodor's authors probably do not value the opinions of Japanese (who hold little say in the author's personal success) as highly as they value the opinions of Western visitors (whose purchase of the book is crucial to the author's well-being). The resultant cultural description becomes, both metaphorically and literally, a question of ownership governed by a marketplace perspective.

The ideal against which "actual" discourse is to be measured—that is, the condition in which all parties share ownership equally and without contention—must be compared to the reality in which constituencies have an unequal say in how the culture is to be represented. Particularly in the touristic transaction, it is generally the tourist, the visitor with money to spend, who is in the more powerful position to dictate the terms of the representation. Thus, it is essential to ask about the degree to which the reader of the tour guidebook considers him- or herself a stakeholder in how the representation is to be fashioned.

In the next example, an anonymous author of the chapter on Nikko from the 1962 edition frames a claim to ownership based upon a common saying heard in the

“tourist trade.” The author uses the saying as point of departure from which to make a general statement both about the saying itself and the touristic site it describes.

Before one has been in Japan for more than about 24 hours, a tiresome cliché will have been drummed into one’s ears with maddening repetition by those in the travel trade: “Don’t say *kekko* until you’ve seen Nikko.” (“*Kekko*”, it might be added, is the Japanese for “magnificent.”). There would be no justification for perpetuating this silly jingle here except that it contains a great deal of truth. Nikko is really a spectacular place, worthy of most of the superlatives that are showered upon it. It has something for everyone: ancient temples and shrines, magnificent forests, lakes and waterfalls, breathtaking scenery in every season, a cool temperature in summer, and skiing in winter. [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 253)

The emphasized portion of this passage makes a number of interesting stylistic turns. First, the author must demonstrate a requisite level of sophistication by letting readers know that they are certain to encounter this “silly jingle” and that they were warned in advance by the Fodor’s author. Second, however, the author also claims that there is a justifiable reason for perpetuating the “jingle,” because it contains a “great deal of truth.” This convoluted phrasing is puzzling. It seems as if the author both wants to claim ownership of the “silly jingle” but then to distance him- or herself from the jingle by implying that no one would want to own it, and finally to claim ownership after all because there really is a reason, based in reality, for claiming possession.

Applying the lens of ownership, one is able to see that the author’s purpose may be less fragmentary than it first appears. The author’s attempt to appropriate ownership is consistent throughout the underlined portion of the passage. By first claiming the right to inform the reader about the “maddening” jingle, then the right to criticize the jingle, then the right to grant that it does, after all, have some validity, the author covers three separate claims to ownership of the representation of the jingle. Moreover, by criticizing the practitioners of the author’s own profession (the “travel

trade”), the author manages to convey the impression that his or her prose is somehow immune from the criticisms that might be applied to those who would use such a “silly jingle.” Nevertheless, one comes to the end of the underlined portion with no clear idea of whether the author actually considers the jingle “silly” or not.

The complex interweaving of claims to ownership permits the author both to condemn and accept what appears to be an unacceptable phrasing of a common saying. At first, the opening sentences merely seem unusual, provoking an uncomfortable feeling that the author is being coy. Applying the lens of ownership, however, one is permitted to speculate about the reasons underlying this general intuitive impression.

Excessive attribution. The Fodor’s guidebooks contain many examples in which ownership is defined through the stylistic device of making excessive attributions. Statements which illustrate this style of representation are often found to engage controversy based simply upon the author’s speculation about who might be likely to read the statement. An example, taken from Seidensticker’s introductory chapter, is quoted below. Notice how the author subsumes the perspective, not only of the reader, but of the generalized “stranger” (anyone who is not a native):

What has been said will perhaps not seem a cheery introduction to Japan; but no one can honestly ask a stranger to come and have a look, and expect him to derive much pleasure from his first impressions. The visitor must rather be asked to stay until he has the feel of the place. It is unlikely that he will ever cease to be annoyed by traffic jams and somewhat repelled by crumbling stucco, but in due course these will come to seem less important, and the riptide currents of bodies, at first a trifle threatening, will become an endless fascination. [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 56)

Here, the emphasis is again placed on suggesting (not defining) a generalized observer of Japanese culture, named in this passage “the stranger.” Even at this early stage, Seidensticker is overstepping himself, investing more information about the

mental processes within the “stranger” than he could possibly know. A second indication of excessive attribution is to be found in Seidensticker’s introduction to the description of the stranger’s viewpoint: “. . . what has been said will perhaps not seem a cheery introduction to Japan . . .” This statement, an indirect admission that Seidensticker has been harsh in his criticism of the country, serves to justify any subsequent criticisms of Japan. By shifting the identity of the observer to the unnamed “stranger,” Seidensticker appears to be trying to distance himself from taking responsibility for having depicted Japan in negative terms.

Who “owns” the description of Japan as a “dreary” place to which the visitor is not likely to be attracted at first? That description is the property of all social actors, which makes Seidensticker’s attempt to shift the burden of proof to the unnamed “stranger” all the more suspect. Seidensticker wants to have it both ways: he wants to make potentially objectionable assertions and generalizations about Japan, but at the same time wants to transfer responsibility for ownership of the ideas to an abstract entity.

The lens of ownership permits the critical reader to probe further into Seidensticker’s claim. In fact, Seidensticker does not make a direct claim about “the stranger,” but rather about another generalized entity’s expectations: “No one can ask a stranger to come and have a look, and expect him to derive much pleasure from his first impressions.” By delving deeper into the stylistic structure of his statement, one can see that Seidensticker has removed himself one step further from direct responsibility for his assertions.

The phrasing of this passage is hardly accidental. Attempts to sidestep responsibility for ownership of the evaluations are carefully planned and executed with stylistic finesse. Given the constraints imposed by the touristic style of writing, Seidensticker’s phrasing serves its purposes admirably. It allows Seidensticker to

place on record opinions which if directly stated as the opinions of the author might be challenged by most readers as specious.

Seidensticker's turns of phrase are appropriate in touristic discourse. Touristic writing is expected to be highly opinionated, to be framed in terms which do not elevate the described country to a status higher than the visitor's country, and to be the product of recognized "experts." In other types of description, Seidensticker might be held more accountable to higher standards of support, evidence and argumentation.

In another example illustrating excessive attribution, an anonymous Fodor's author describes a famous artifact among the collection of statuary contained in the temples of Nara.

Before leaving Horyuji you must be certain to visit the newly built Treasure House, where priceless objects from many of the temples have been gathered together for safety. It is impossible to list everything worthy of note. Most frequently admired is the famous image of Kudara-kannon, carved from a single piece of camphorwood. The shape is tall and slender, the arms unusually long. The garment flows and turns over as though the Kannon were standing in cool, crystal air. The neglect of exact physical proportions is said by Japanese scholars to symbolize infinity and eternity. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 330)

In the underlined portion of the above passage,³³ the author attempts to interpret the artistic and philosophical importance of the image of the Kudara-kannon. The description again shows a clear tension in phrasing as the author struggles to establish a claim to ownership of interpretation of the statue's meaning. For the author to establish such ownership, it is necessary for him or her to make a number of attributions about the sculptor's intentions. The Fodor's author apparently holds some unstated naturalistic standard of artistic expression which stipulates that in normal circumstances arms must be sized proportionately to the rest of the body.

³³ A portion of this passage was analyzed in discussion of JTB's methods for depicting Japanese life in fuller, richer terms, earlier in this chapter.

The author's representation is highly problematic. No justification is offered for applying a standard of naturalistic style to a piece of religious statuary, and then to depict the failure of the sculptor as "neglect." In this passage one again sees that for the author to claim ownership of representation, a certain degree of presumption is necessary. In a subsequent passage, the author even attempts to offer his or her own interpretation of what the statue might mean, based on the opinion of some Japanese scholars. By not specifying which "scholars" are referred to, however, the Fodor's author seems to distance the description from sociohistorical specificity in the service of explaining the author's own view of what constitutes "acceptable" proportions in statuary.

In this passage there is also a second appropriation of the cultural representation, achieved through stylistic mechanisms related to attribution. Earlier I analyzed a Fodor's passage describing the Daibutsu at Nara in which the statue was described as being more famous "for its size than its beauty."³⁴ In that analysis, I suggested that the Fodor's author overlooked the religious significance of the statue. In the present passage, the Fodor's author seems to have made a similar omission: by concentrating on what the author takes to be the artist's intention, any religious meaning of statue is excluded from the claim to ownership of the representation. If the author is prepared to make judgments about art based on the opinion of Japanese "scholars," why could the same references not be made to judgments about the artwork's religious significance? Perhaps the author alludes to religious significance when he or she states that scholars think the "neglect" of physical proportions symbolizes "infinity and eternity." One is unable to tell from the author's text whether these "scholars" speak from a secular or religious viewpoint. This distinction would make a great difference in how such scholarly evaluations are to be interpreted.

³⁴ See Chapter Three, pp. 140-142.

However, these distinctions are seldom to be found in touristic discourse, particularly in the Fodor's series. Reference to general summaries of thought serve the agenda of the Fodor's author very effectively by making points that under other circumstances would be highly questionable.

JTB—Stylistic mechanisms. Despite some stylistic similarities to the Fodor's guidebooks, JTB's guidebook series also exhibits at least two characteristic stylistic mechanisms: (1) crowding out other representations; and (2) deleting problematic details.

Crowding out other representations. Although the use of excessive detail has been examined earlier in this discussion, I have not yet applied the dimension of ownership as a tool to analyze the relationship between JTB's representations and others. Gradually, through the evolution of its guidebook series, the JTB has pursued a consistent strategy oriented toward exclusion of alternative representations. To some extent, of course, all representations exclude alternative representations because authors select some details of sociohistorical circumstance, and exclude others. For the JTB, however, there are several indications that it is the intention of the editors to expel other representations from the discourse space. First, Shunichi Sumita, president of the Japanese National Tourist Organization (a government agency closely affiliated with JTB) declares in the foreword that Japan, the New Official Guide is to be seen as the preeminent authority: "I additionally wish to express my sincere hope that this guidebook will serve not only as the most reliable companion available to the traveler to our shores, but that it will also afford delightful armchair reading for all those with a keen interest or even a sense of curiosity about our country. . ." (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 1). Here, Sumita not only declares his intention that the guidebook will be "the most reliable" guide to Japan, but also his wish that nearly every member of the potential audience, regardless of his or her level of interest in visiting Japan, will turn to the guidebook as a source of information. Such expressions make it clear that

JTB is not simply claiming the right to provide one of several representations of Japan but to be the chief representer. I classify this process as a stylistic mechanism because it requires an ongoing analysis of one's narrative style, leading to the fashioning of descriptions in which alternative representations are not mentioned in the text.

Second, as confirmed by the title of the series, Japan, the New Official Guide, exclusion of less "legitimate" representations is also implied by the JTB's having based ownership of its description in large part on its official status as an agency of the Japanese government. By calling the series Japan, the New Official Guide (use of the article "the" suggests there is only one official guidebook), other "unofficial" representations are rendered less acceptable. The choice of title is often an important stylistic mechanism revealing the perspective taken by a work's author(s) and editor(s).

Third, given the extraordinary level of detail in the JTB guide, it may be difficult for the reader to see how any other descriptions are possible. While in the Fodor's guidebook series, one is often left with the impression that more could have been said on certain subjects (such as history or religion), in the JTB's guidebook, one is often left with the impression that there is perhaps too much information. Stylistically, taking the dense factual content of the JTB narrative, together with the guidebook's visual resemblance to an encyclopedia, dictionary, or reference work, one senses that the JTB editors intend the guidebook to serve as the authoritative source on Japan, not just at present, but for years into the future.

These are merely three examples of many ways in which the JTB uses stylistic mechanisms to establish claims to ownership of its representations and to exclude other representations as less legitimate. On each of these three elements, the Fodor's series differs in its stylistic approach: the series seldom declares its intention to be the foremost guidebook (and never with the strength of the JTB's declaration), nor does Fodor's claim status by means of its connection to the Japanese government, nor is

there a sense that Fodor's often says more than necessary in its description of Japanese culture. By so consistently and pervasively establishing its claims to ownership, the JTB's guidebook overtly and covertly states its intention to be the premier, if not the only, legitimate representer of Japanese culture. As the editors state in the preface to the 1991 edition, Japan, the New Official Guide has been regarded as ". . . the most authoritative and reliable guidebook about Japan over the past half century" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 2).

Deleting problematic details. When describing certain historical incidents, the JTB sometimes adopts a style which excludes details which might prove difficult to explain. In the first example, the JTB describes the diplomatic mission of Townsend Harris in the town of Shimoda. In the Fodor's 1962 edition, Shimoda was described as a town trading on its "lurid past," apparently a reference to a reported affair between Townsend Harris and his Japanese mistress, Okichi. Not only does the JTB guidebook fail to mention this aspect of Harris' tenure, but it substitutes a wealth of detail about Townsend Harris's special place in Japanese history, preempting claims to other descriptions of Shimoda and what occurred there.

Although Harris hoisted the American flag at the port—"the first consular flag ever seen in this Empire," as he records in his diary—he quickly discovered that Shimoda was useless as a trading port. Refusing to deliver his credentials through the local governor, he sought permission to proceed to Edo (now, Tokyo) and present them himself. This was at first refused, but finally after repeated negotiations, the Japanese officials consented. Harris entered Edo on November 30, 1857, to become the first foreign diplomatic representative received by Japan. His diplomatic ability and tact led to the conclusion of a commercial treaty—the first ever made between Japan and a Western nation—on July 29, 1858. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, pp. 481-482)

The description of Harris's role in Japanese history occupies two full pages in the 1991 edition of JTB's guidebook. Apparently, JTB considers Harris's role to have been more significant than did the Fodor's author. By focusing on the broader

spectrum of facts about Harris, the JTB guidebook dismisses Shimoda as a site judged by Harris to be “useless as a trading port.”

The difference between the Fodor’s and JTB’s accounts lies in how the data chosen are situated in the overall persuasive strategies of the respective authors. In the Fodor’s account, little or no reference is made to Townsend Harris’s impact on Japanese history; rather, by innuendo it is suggested that he dallied with a Japanese mistress, perhaps within the consulate building. In the JTB account, there is no reference to the alleged dalliance, but a great deal of information provided about the historical significance of Townsend Harris’s work. Each in their own way, these authors seem to be trying to direct reader attention toward the reading of history to which they claim ownership. Moreover, each is accomplishing his or her task as much by excluding information as by including it.

Once again, it is worth noting that neither of the two accounts can be viewed as the more “correct.” It is possible that the Fodor’s author did indeed observe in Shimoda some attempt to trade on salacious information about Harris and Okichi. But the Fodor’s author (perhaps under constraints imposed by Fodor’s editors) refrains from mentioning history, just as the JTB is restrained from mentioning facts that might tarnish the reputation of Townsend Harris.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE DIMENSION OF TENSION AND THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION

General Overview

The dimension of tension was introduced as the third of five dimensions of cultural description derived from the work of the Bakhtin circle. The dimension of tension states: "All communication simultaneously exhibits two tendencies: one which impels communication toward predictability and standardization, and another which impels it toward unpredictability and uniqueness." This principle manifests itself as an ongoing struggle between the predictable and unpredictable elements of linguistic description as they reflect social context. This idea has proven to be one of the most influential concepts espoused by the Bakhtin group, resulting in perhaps the best-known Bakhtin neologism, "heteroglossia," a synonym for the interaction between these two polarizing forces.

Like all discourse, touristic descriptions exist in a constant condition of tension in which meaning is derived from the interplay between, on the one hand, predictability and standardization, and on the other, unpredictability and uniqueness. In touristic discourse, at least two varieties of tension can be observed. The first variety is tension associated with the genre, "touristic discourse." For example, an important element of predictability is to be found in genres of touristic writing such as "tour guidebooks." Tour guidebook series¹ tend to be comprised of a number of standard components, such as rating systems for accommodations and restaurants, currency conversion information, and histories of sites and locations, to name only a

¹ As noted in Chapter Two, however, with Japan's increasing popularity as a tourist site, the number of "alternative" guidebooks to Japan has risen steadily each year. Such books are often advertised as options to the more standard guidebooks (primarily Fodor's, Frommer's, and JTB's Japan, the Official Guide). Perhaps as a tongue-in-cheek comment on the title of the JTB series, Walt Sheldon chose to title his 1961 book, Enjoy Japan: A Personal and Highly Unofficial Guide.

few. In presenting touristic information, guidebooks must relate to, and situate themselves within, the realm of other touristic discourses. On the other hand, since all discourses are in a process of development, touristic discourses evolve into new relations with the other discourses with which it comes into contact. In this respect, the tour guidebook is unpredictable; since the systems of meaning (architectonics) of readers and writers are necessarily divergent and unique to these individuals alone, descriptions in the guidebook inevitably interact with each writer and reader in unique and idiosyncratic ways.

A second type of tension is closely related to touristic activity. One of the most challenging tasks facing the international tourist is to absorb cultural differences. Appealing to this need, tour guidebooks attempt to attract audiences by delineating what are evidently taken by the authors to be unique aspects of the host country's customs and culture, attempting to create a sense of novelty in the mind of the potential visitor. In touristic description, such uniqueness is frequently offered as "inside" information (that is, information known to the author or editors of the guidebook, but not to others).

However, despite the fact that tourists are looking for unique cultural experiences, they can never become completely immersed in another culture. For one thing, all touristic description (indeed, all descriptions of any sort) must employ elements of predictability (that is, they must be expressed in terms which are to a certain extent already known by their audience(s)). While promising its visitors sufficiently novel experiences, the tour guidebook must also help readers relate such experiences to cultural features with which they are already familiar. Moreover, the novelty involved in a given culture can only be appreciated through comparison to the tourist's own cultural categories. To introduce the host culture, then, the tour guidebook must link its unfamiliar features to what are taken to be the architectonic systems of the guidebook's readership. Just as the host culture's unpredictability

constitutes an inviting challenge to its visitors, visitors will nevertheless attempt to incorporate features of the other culture into their own architectonic systems of understanding.

The task confronting the author of the tour guidebook, then, is to balance the need for the predictable and the unpredictable. This linguistic balancing act, of course, must be carried on by anyone who writes cultural or any other description: one cannot express oneself in terms that are completely unknown to the reader (that is, one must to some extent utilize predictable elements), but at the same time one wishes to avoid simply repeating information already known to the reader (that is, one must to some extent rely on unpredictable elements).

The principle of tension is frequently exemplified in both the Fodor's and JTB's series in their descriptions of Japan. The task of balancing predictable and unpredictable elements, however, may be more difficult for the Fodor's Guide, since the guidebook is about Japan (a nation which is more or less unfamiliar to the Fodor's readership) but is written almost entirely by Westerners² to an audience composed primarily of Westerners. JTB's Japan, the New Official Guide, on the other hand, is written entirely by Japanese,³ to an audience comprised primarily, though not solely, of English-speaking Westerners. The features of Japanese life which might be more opaque to Fodor's authors can be presumed to be somewhat better known to the JTB's authors.

In the Fodor's guide, one often sees the dimension of tension indicated with the inclusion of information or turns of expression which are expected by the readers

² As noted previously, the exception is Kiko Itosaka, author of three chapters in the 1990 edition of Fodor's.

³ I surmise this based on the listing of contributors in each edition of the JTB guidebook. For example, in the 1991 edition, the following contributors are listed: Chuzenji Tokiji, Architect; Furuta Shokin, Theologist; Kawatake Toshio, Dramaturgist Professor, Waseda University; Kishimoto Shigenobu, Economist Professor, Yokohama National University; Miyazawa Juichi, Music Critic; Okada Jo, Art Critic; Hoshida Seiichi, Literary Critic; and Yui Masami, Historian Professor, Waseda University. I assume that these people are all native Japanese.

(often as a result of being written in the standard discourse associated with touristic writing), but coupled with information that is unique or unexpected (generally positioned to make the Fodor's guide more attractive as an alternative among other guidebooks to Japan). On the other hand, touristic discourse written by JTB authors represents the views of cultural "insiders," uniquely connected to architectonics that have been fashioned in the course of lifelong immersion in "Japanese culture." JTB's guidebook is written with respect to unique sociohistorical circumstances, in recognition of JTB's unique conceptions about who their readers are and how these readers should be addressed. As a result, JTB's readers probably expect that they will get a view of Japan from Japanese themselves, but to a greater or lesser extent (depending on their previous familiarity with Japan), they will also gain a considerably greater understanding of Japan through being presented with a significant amount of new information.

In summary, tension is a quality of cultural description which places in dynamic opposition that which is expected by the audience, counterpositioned against that which is unexpected. In both the Fodor's and JTB's series, readers expect certain kinds of information common to the touristic genre; in the Fodor's series, readers expect the views of "outsiders" writing about a country with which they have differing levels of experience (although they always remain external to the culture); and in the JTB's series, readers expect the views of cultural "insiders." However, each guidebook series, building upon these and many other expected elements, chooses to include in its descriptions information which is unique to the architectonic systems of the authors and editors. In the discussion which follows, I explore example passages to illustrate both expected and unexpected elements of the descriptions provided by these two guidebook series.

Yield of Comparative Analysis of Tension—An Overview

In the creation of tension between predictable and unpredictable elements of description, there are two levels of contrast utilized differentially by the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series. The first level of contrast is between Japan (the unpredictable) and the West (the predictable), while the second level of contrast is between the well-known elements of Japan (the predictable) and the lesser-known elements of Japan (the unpredictable).

First, both Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks appeal to the dichotomy "Japan" and "the West," in which Japan is viewed as unpredictable, while the West is viewed as predictable. This strategy is largely successful, due in part to the fact that, for both the Fodor's and the JTB's series, the audience is primarily Westerners while the subject matter is Japan. As I explained earlier, from the Fodor's perspective, Japan, as part of the "mysterious Orient," inherently possesses a significant degree of unpredictability. In fact, based on numerous references in the Fodor's series, there are strong indications that the unpredictability associated with the image of the "mysterious Orient" is a major attraction for Western tourists.⁴ The tourist often seeks experiences which are different from his or her everyday activity: hence, the strange and unusual are desirable for their own sake. Nevertheless, too great an emphasis on the unusual might lead to tourists feeling threatened; hence the Fodor's series also recognizes the need to comfort visitors with information which suggests that their experiences in Japan will not be too startling, primarily because they are guaranteed that they will encounter predictable experiences that would be expected in Western countries.

⁴ Examples of the appeal to the differences between "the Orient" and Western visitors abound in the Fodor's series; the following are examples: (1) "[The tourist] will not be disappointed here. To say that East Asia is a complex region is a gross understatement, but its very complexity makes it probably the world's most rewarding destination for a tourist." (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 3-4); (2) "Of course, the Orient is different from our world, and the usual label we pin on it is 'mysterious'. But this mystery can be pierced if we are prepared to give some thought to the differences separating us and if we are willing to junk many of our preconceived notions." (Fodor's, 1982, p. viii); (3) "Sophisticated and knowledgeable though it may be, Oriental thinking has little in common with Western ways of thought." (Fodor's, 1976, p. 9); and so on.

Throughout both the Fodor's and JTB's series, numerous elements of Japanese life are explained through analogy to elements of life in the United States and other Western nations. Descriptions of Japan as a nation, sociohistorical matters, touristic sites, accommodations, sports, social life, and so on, all are explained by reference to analogous facets of Western culture. To manipulate the tension which accompanies the search by Western visitors for the "unpredictable" or "mysterious" Orient, both Fodor's and JTB's have extended the category of "West" to include both America and European nations, and by including many different cultural elements from many different countries under the descriptor, "West." Moreover, the West is viewed as synonymous to the descriptors, "international" and "modern." Thus, modernity (or "Western," or "international," or "American") is portrayed as predictable, while traditionality (or "Eastern," or "Asian," or "Japanese") is portrayed as unpredictable.

However, Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks differ in their respective conceptions of the "West" and the "East." First, while both tend to utilize the concept of "West" to comfort potential visitors, the JTB appears to have an additional goal: to build an image of Japan as a legitimate member of the category of nations which are "international" or "modern." The JTB seems to feel it particularly necessary to stress the role of the Japanese government in defining standards for tourists' needs, presumably to reduce the degree of unpredictability associated with "the East," while at the same time approaching the status assigned to the more "predictable" (to Westerners) Western world.

Second, there is also a noticeable difference between the two series concerning the ways in which the unpredictable "Japan" / "East" metaphors are advanced. To emphasize the mysteriousness and exoticism associated with Japan, Fodor's applies the broader category of "the East" to subsume the narrower category of Japan. On the other hand, JTB does not apply the construct of the "East" ("Eastern" and "Orient" are almost never mentioned in the JTB's guidebooks); rather, the category of "Japan" itself

is used to emphasize a complex set of unique cultural traditions. The dimension of tension is strongly suggested through the pursuit of each guidebook series' particular set of agendas: as each author in these guidebooks attempts to fashion descriptions which are persuasive to readers, they are compelled to select from among the evidence, arguments and proof those supportive elements that are likely (based, that is, on the author's predictions) to convince readers. Given the need to ensure the commercial success of their organizations, then, guidebook authors must correctly forecast reader responses, while at the same time remaining aware that their predictions can only be partially successful. Thus, there are no writing formulas which guarantee that an author will persuade successfully. To a certain extent, authors can rely on elements of the known or predictable, but at the same time remain uncertain about the effects of their descriptions on their intended audiences.

Second, both the Fodor's and the JTB's series tend to create distinctions between predictability and unpredictability in order to heighten interest in Japanese culture. The internal tension in depictions of Japanese culture are seen most clearly in the 1991 edition of the JTB's guidebook, where Japan is viewed as embracing both traditional (unpredictable) and modern (predictable) elements. Both series, in their attempts to stimulate visitors to want to experience Japanese culture, emphasize the traditional parts of Japan as unpredictable, while using the modern aspects of Japan to provide tourists with comforting information that suggests that Japan is not too unpredictable. However, the Fodor's conception of "traditional Japan" is as a somewhat backward, "different" nation. JTB's conception of traditionality, on the other hand, relates more to novel aspects of Japanese culture.

Third, some stylistic mechanisms employed by the two series also differ considerably, reflecting the underlying themes of the authors and editors. Stylistic mechanisms characteristic of Fodor's include the following: (1) utilization of stereotypes; (2) providing "inside" information; (3) combining "contradictory"

elements of Japanese culture; and (4) evaluating contrasting elements of Japanese culture. Stylistic mechanisms idiosyncratic to the JTB's series include the following: (1) using information in a casual way; (2) creating unfamiliarity through fulsome description; and (3) selective combination of predictable and unpredictable elements.

Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Tension—An Overview

As one compares the Fodor's and JTB's series over time, it becomes evident that they evolve in different directions in their use of the dimension of tension. The Fodor's series, in its earlier editions, tended to rely primarily on the safety of the omniscient commentator, allowing authors not only to summarize stereotypical views of Japanese as certain (predictable) knowledge, but also to avoid having to connect their commentary to other, more substantive sources. At the same time, earlier editions of Fodor's permitted authors to emphasize the more negative or threatening (unpredictable) elements of visiting Japan. As a result, the earlier editions of Fodor's tended to be less restrained about use of the unpredictable and more restrained about use of the predictable. The 1990 edition shows the following specific changes from the earlier editions: (1) increasing willingness to employ highly personal assessments; (2) emphasis on Japan as a "safe" place to visit; and (3) less emphasis on clichés and stereotypes.

The JTB series, on the other hand, proceeds in somewhat the opposite direction. In earlier editions of JTB's guidebook, Japanese culture is described in terms which rely more on predictable elements (for example, the extensive list of bibliographic references in the 1955 edition, together with repeated reassurances about Japan as a safe place to visit), giving way to the more authoritative tone assumed by the JTB's guidebook in later editions. Indeed, by the 1991 edition, JTB had become so comfortable with its own cultural heritage, so confident of its modernization, that it is prepared to suggest that visitors who desire a "taste" of the "real Japan" might not be

satisfied with the customary tourist sites, instead offering advice about how to more fully participate in Japanese cultural life. Specifically, the JTB series exhibits the following patterns of change relative to the dimension of tension: (1) the emergence of the “unknown” Japan; (2) change from observing to participating in Japanese cultural life; and (3) increasing emphasis on the government’s role in reducing unpredictability.

Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to Tension in Fodor’s and JTB’s Descriptions

This section bolsters and supports in greater detail the general sketch presented above. The analysis is divided into two major categories: (1) identification of major themes and temporal changes in cultural descriptions of Fodor’s and JTB’s series, as suggested through applying the lens of the tension construct; and (2) a discussion of the characteristic stylistic mechanisms used by the two series for managing tension.

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Tension of Fodor’s Descriptions

In this section, first, four content themes relating to tension which occur repeatedly in the Fodor’s series are identified and analyzed: (1) balancing out images of the Orient and the West; (2) emphasizing the internal unpredictable element in Japan; (3) downplaying Japanese technical accomplishments; and (4) association of the unpredictable with the past. In addition, I will discuss several elements of change relating to tension in the Fodor’s guidebooks from 1962 through 1990.

Balancing out the image of the Orient and the West. In the Fodor’s series, there are many indications that authors must exert effort to provide enough familiar information to make their observations about Japan understandable, but at the same time present enough new information to engage and hold readers’ interest. Accordingly, the Fodor’s series must find ways to emphasize the exotic elements of Japanese life, but to do so within the confines of concepts which are presumed familiar to Westerners.

From its origins, the Fodor's guidebook has portrayed going to Japan not merely as a visit to a foreign nation, but as an element of the broader "exploration" by Westerners of the "mysterious East." This broader conceptual framework itself represents a state of tension, since the West is seen as the standard of stalwart predictability and the East so unknown as to be a "mystery," thus marking a journey to Japan as an adventure. The effort to emphasize the uniqueness of Japan in order to attract the attention of potential tourists, while at the same time encompassing enough predictability for these tourists to feel comfortable, can be observed in the introductory section, "Country by Country, Capsule Comments":

Assets: Plentiful supply of good hotels and entertainment; good transportation (but not by road)—the experience of meeting a country as fully developed as any in the West but steeped in thoroughly Oriental traditions—this unique blend makes Japan the leading attraction of Asia—Japanese women (they fascinate Westerners). . . (Fodor's, 1969, p. 9; identical quotation appears in the 1962 edition)

In these statements, unfamiliar aspects of Japan are coupled with the more familiar aspects of tourists' own life experiences. Japan as a nation is "as fully developed as any in the West" (predictable and familiar, particularly from the Westerner's viewpoint), but at the same time Japan is "steeped in thoroughly Oriental traditions" (unfamiliar and unpredictable, particularly to Westerners). Moreover, the details chosen are reflective of this dichotomy: women, as part of the mysterious Oriental experience (unpredictable and unfamiliar), nevertheless fascinate Westerners (familiar, since readers are assumed to know what they will find "fascinating").

In the later editions, one encounters more complete summaries of Japan, such as the following description, in which the mixtures and contradictions of several images from both predictable and unpredictable elements are used to describe Japanese life:

The Japanese are obsessed with the idea of being Asians, but they cannot escape the knowledge that their culture is a deviant one, a pattern all its

own. Onto a basically tribal-clan social organization and a temperament with a deep streak of Puritanism and taste for militaristic discipline, they have grafted Chinese religion, architecture and writing. And over this, in the last hundred years, a violent and often garish layer of Western technology and politics. The result is a curious mixture indeed, and it is no small tribute to the Japanese spirit that it has kept its integrity, its own stubborn ways of thinking and, more important, ways of feeling, throughout its successive vicissitudes. (Fodor's, 1976, p. 10; identical statements can be found on p. ix of 1982 edition)

The anonymous author of this passage clearly sees Japan as a very unique nation: hence, the appeals to unpredictability are strong and obvious. Although the category "Asia" said to be predictable from the viewpoint of Western touristic discourse, Japan is said to embrace simultaneously two qualities: Japanese are said to be obsessed with being Asian (predictable), while at the same time their culture is nevertheless different ("deviant") from the rest of Asia (unpredictable). Elements confirming the strangeness of Japan (such as the "tribal-clan" social organization and the "taste for militaristic discipline") are balanced against elements presumed to be more familiar to Westerners (the Puritan temperament, as well as Western technology and political beliefs). While the features of the culture that Japanese learned from China may be less well known to Westerners (unpredictable), Japanese technology and politics are nevertheless depicted as having been borrowed from the West (predictable), even though such borrowing is represented as having added a "violent and garish layer" (unpredictable) to Japanese life.

Through manipulation of these various images, authors of the Fodor's guidebook series are able to manage the inherent tension between predictability and unpredictability. The Fodor's guidebook confirms the validity of its basic descriptive metaphor: Japan is indeed a "curious mixture." Fodor's elaboration of this mixture perhaps suggests the quality described by a phrase in the foreword of the 1982 edition, "the exotic East, modern style" (p. v). Nevertheless, despite the exotic character of the East, tourists can always find comfort: "But you can travel by familiar modes, spend

your days either in luxury or modest circumstances, and speak the worldwide language of tourism, English, as you pursue your own brand of learning" (Fodor's, 1982, p. v).

The portrayal of Japan along the dimensions of tension implied by the dichotomy between East and West can further be understood through descriptions of sociohistorical circumstance. Accounts written by Westerners, about Western cultures, can take for granted commonly shared knowledge (predictable elements), using these familiar frameworks to introduce new information (unpredictable elements). On the other hand, accounts written about the East by Westerners present a somewhat more challenging representational task, since there is much less that the representer can take for granted. To relate the unfamiliar world of the unpredictable East to an audience of Westerners, then, the Fodor's guide must utilize familiar historical events or images from the West (predictable) to build up a coherent description.

The first example illustrates how such a comparison is accomplished. In explaining the role of the Emperor in Japanese history, Edward Seidensticker, in the 1962 Fodor's, states: "The emperor [Meiji] . . . himself was important as a symbol, and his passing, like that of Queen Victoria, seemed to bring to a close a chapter of history" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 74). Perhaps recognizing that the rulership of an emperor, particularly given the events associated with the Restoration, might have been perceived by Western readers as too unfamiliar, Seidensticker attempts to reduce some of the implicit tension in his representation by comparing the Emperor with the familiar image of Queen Victoria.

A second example illustrating how the familiar can be used to reduce the strangeness associated with the unfamiliar occurs in the following passage, in which Seidensticker assigns credit for the Restoration's success to Emperor Meiji's cabinet

ministers:⁵ “They were an extraordinary band of men, comparable to the remarkable band that made of the United States a nation and not just a collection of petty warring states” (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 74). Again, while the idea of the Meiji Emperor may be unfamiliar to Fodor’s Western readers, they are presumed less likely to have trouble understanding Seidensticker’s reference to the American revolution, and the role of another “remarkable band” which unified the United States.

A third example showing how Fodor’s explains the unfamiliar through recourse to elements assumed to be familiar to its readers occurs in the following description of the postwar occupation period of Japanese politics: “Japan quite lacks the unity of a country like the United States or Great Britain, where the fundamental need to resist totalitarianism is generally accepted, and differences are on questions of how the need can best be met” (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 78). While Japan’s politics may be difficult for Western visitors to comprehend, in the context of the political viewpoints associated with the United States or Great Britain, the Japanese political system may seem less puzzling.

In each of these three examples, tension is created and maintained by the balancing of unfamiliar elements of Japanese life with references to either the United States or Great Britain, both of which are English-speaking nations. On the one hand, there is a sufficient degree of uniqueness about the described elements of Japanese culture to warrant tourists’ attention. On the other hand, the Fodor’s guide consistently reminds its readers of points of correspondence between Japan and the more familiar Western world. Obviously, it is impossible for any two cultural situations to be considered “equivalent,” given the unique circumstances under which cultural practices evolve. However, the constant shifting back and forth between the

⁵ This statement is also analyzed under the discussion of the dimension of ownership, Chapter Four, p. 176.

East and the West appears, from the perspective taken by the Fodor's authors, to be necessary.

A similar relationship of tension involving the familiar and unfamiliar can be observed in Fodor's descriptions of touristic sites and locations in Japan. Visiting a site, the tourist is often excited by the prospect of the location's uniqueness. However, this perception of uniqueness cannot be permitted to overwhelm tourists to the degree that the experience becomes incomprehensible. Hence, the author of the tour guidebook can utilize familiar cultural elements in order to prepare the reader to experience the unfamiliar location, providing a framework within which to situate novel information. An illustration of this process is the following Fodor's description of Mt. Fuji:

The Fuji-Hakone-Izu district of Central Honshu in many respects appears to be a slightly less jagged Switzerland or a much more lush Rocky Mountain area. But the people are passionately Japanese in their own mystical way. They are closely related to the soil and approach to life. (Fodor's, 1982, p. 227)

By comparing the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area to presumably better-known areas in either Europe (Switzerland) or the United States (Rocky Mountains), the author seems to assume that readers will be able to build a connection which will make the location less ominous. However, since tourists seek different experiences, the Fodor's narrative introduces the unpredictable elements of Mt. Fuji, not by referring to the uniqueness of Fuji's geological or geographical characteristics, but to the strangeness of the Japanese people living "in their own mystical way." The Japanese "mystical way" is explained as the closeness which the Japanese people feel toward "the soil." The reference is puzzling: why would the visitor think that closeness to the soil is "mystical"? American farmers, too, are certainly "close to" their soil, yet the popular stereotype of American farmers is that they are pragmatic, conservative, and hardworking, not that

they are “mystical.” The term “mystical,” applied to Japanese, reinforces the perception of the “mysterious Orient” referred to in the foreword and elsewhere, thus creating in the reader a sense of uniqueness and unpredictability about Mt. Fuji.⁶

To reinforce the view that Japanese are superstitious, Seidensticker in the introductory chapter to the 1962 and 1969 editions uses the following argument:⁷ “For someone somewhere in Japan, every day is a Friday the thirteenth” (p. 65).

Superstitions, particularly those of foreign cultures, are fundamentally unpredictable; hence, Seidensticker must use other means to instill in readers a sense of familiarity. This task is particularly important, since the superstitions Seidensticker discusses are derived from the practices of “exotic” Japan. To accomplish his goal, Seidensticker resorts to one of the best-known Western superstitions, the unlucky character of Friday the thirteenth. However, the results of this comparison are less favorable to Japan than to Western cultures: while days on which the thirteenth of the month falls on a Friday are infrequent, and rarely taken seriously in any case, Japanese “somewhere” are said to believe that “every day” is “a Friday the thirteenth.” Moreover, in subsequent elaboration, Seidensticker expands on his thesis with numerous examples, suggesting that superstition is both widespread and highly regarded in Japanese life.

Frequently, the Fodor’s guidebook utilizes familiar comparisons to explain unfamiliar aspects of another culture’s government and political affairs. In the following example, Edward Seidensticker attempts to explain the Japanese conception of neutrality (presumably unfamiliar to his readers) by comparing Japan’s neutrality to that of some Western countries. In this passage, notice how Seidensticker relies on the

⁶ It is perhaps the very familiarity of Mt. Fuji which necessitates the formulation of unusual metaphors to create interest. As we have seen, Mt. Fuji is not only one of the best-known sites in Japan, it is criticized in later Fodor’s guidebooks as having been over-developed and for being too popular with Japanese. Given the number of elements of the area which are increasingly familiar as “standard” touristic attractions, perhaps the author thinks it necessary to enliven the description somewhat with the reference to “mystical” attachments to “the soil.”

⁷ This statement is also analyzed in Chapter Seven, pp. 457-458.

inherent tension given impetus by the distinction between East and West, so that he can make a broader point about the Japanese “national character.”

The Japanese notion of neutrality or non-alignment differs from the Swedish, the Swiss, and even the Indian in being tied to a violent opposition to any form of armament. What is called neutrality might therefore better be called unilateral disarmament. The Socialists have the enthusiastic support of the Communists in advocating it, and they also have the support of the noisier intellectuals, of the largest teachers’ organization in the land, and of the largest federation of trade unions. [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 79)

In Seidensticker’s rendering of history, there are elements of the expected (through appeal to concepts perhaps familiar to readers whose acquaintance with more substantial accounts of Japanese history are likely to be limited) together with elements of the unexpected (through appeal to “inside information” offered by authors such as Seidensticker, who have reputations for knowing about Japan). It is interesting that these two descriptive elements may also permit some of the more sweeping generalizations on the part of Seidensticker and other Fodor’s authors. For example, consider the emphasized portion of quoted passage: “The Japanese definition of neutrality or non-alignment differs from the Swedish, the Swiss, and even the Indian in being tied to a violent opposition to any form of armament. What is called neutrality might therefore better be called unilateral disarmament.” This passage appeals to stereotypical views about the citizens both of Japan and other nations (after all, who, among Fodor’s readers, is likely to have even the vaguest notion of the distinctions among the conceptions of neutrality in these four countries?), resulting in a picture of these countries as lacking in authority and political power. At the same time, the passage considered in its entirety holds out the promise of serving as a unique statement which the reader could easily drop into his or her next conversation and have it accepted with as little need for support as Seidensticker appears to have.

This reveals some interesting clues to Seidensticker's perspective. Because no attempt is made to point readers to other, perhaps more substantial, accounts of Japanese history, one may assume that the author does not consider such supportive evidence necessary (or at least that it is not necessary to include references to supportive evidence in the narrative). Why? Perhaps it is because, by omitting references to other histories, the author is permitted to make more sweeping generalizations which might be contradicted by other accounts. This may indicate that Seidensticker expects the words of his narrative to be taken at face value. It may, however, also reveal something about the reader: since Fodor's is the largest-selling Western guidebook series to Japan, the self-assurance of the author in making generalizations may reflect an awareness that the reader expects them. All these elements of author architectonics—that is, the popularity of the Fodor's series and Seidensticker's authority—are related to the knowledge assumed to be familiar to readers.

These characterizations support the arguments of the Bakhtin group that interacting communicants, acting under the impetus of the dimension of tension, each try to "live into" the meaning system of the other; the author does so by assuming that the reader has no need of the complexities of Japanese history, and the reader (more indirectly) does so by reserving the right to accept or reject the author's account, either buying the Fodor's guide or passing over it in favor of other guidebooks. These activities demand that author and reader try to anticipate and breach the imagined level of knowledge of each other.

The seeming assumption on the part of the author that the reader has no need of the complexities of Japanese history (and this applies whatever Seidensticker's reason for such omission, whether brevity, manageability, editorial limitation, or consumer need) means that the author reserves the right to inscribe Japanese history (in contradistinction to describing it). Both the reader and the author of cultural

description exercise choices whereby they select the key elements according to which the culture is to be inscribed.

Through his choices, Seidensticker both recognizes and reinforces the meanings associated with the category, "Western," contrasting "West" with the unknown and unpredictable "East." First, references to the West in these examples are not limited to the United States but are rather interchangeable among many "Western nations"—the United States, Great Britain, Switzerland, Sweden, and so on. Thus, to Western readers, there are many points of access to provide a sense of familiarity. Second, the concept of "West" embraces many dimensions: familiarity can be established through comparison to many different aspects of life in Western nations—politics, governmental structures, history, entertainment, to name only a few—as these coincide with Western stereotypes and expectations about the "Orient." The concept of the "West" includes many different nations, and many different aspects of these nations.

At the same time, these comparisons establish that the description is not simply about Japan, but about the East; nor is the author simply Fodor's, but the West. Through extension of the category, "West," the familiarity assumed to exist among Fodor's readers—that potential Western visitors know many different things about the "West"—is illusory. However, it is upon this assumed predictability about the West and the East that the tension inherent in Seidensticker's discourse is based.

Emphasizing the internal unpredictable element in Japan. In the Fodor's guidebooks, when Japan is contrasted with the West through comparisons involving predictable and unpredictable elements, Japan is inevitably assigned to the categories of "unknown" and "unpredictable." However, when Japan is described by itself, the principle of tension demands that, if the description is to be interesting, a contrast must be drawn between elements of the predictable and unpredictable within the Japanese culture itself. To accomplish this goal, Fodor's sometimes splits Japanese cultural topics into unpredictable and predictable elements. The more unfamiliar, more

unpredictable elements of Japan are often seen as part of “traditional Japan” or “ancient Japan,” whereas the predictable elements are frequently assigned to the category, “modern Japan.” In the following examples,⁸ we will see how Fodor’s authors extend their descriptions to dramatize the “unpredictable” Japan.

In the first example, taken from Durston’s chapter on Japanese eating and drinking, one finds a description of sake or rice wine. Notice how Durston’s fanciful prose brings stereotypes associated with Japan’s ancient past into her description:

With all this talk about eating and drinking, it would be an unforgivable transgression to overlook Japan’s number one alcoholic beverage, sake (rice wine), the “beverage of the samurai,” as one brewery puts it. The ancient myths call it the “drink of the gods.” There are over 2,000 different brands of sake produced throughout Japan today, and a lifetime of serious scene-of-the-crime research would be necessary to explore all the possibilities and complexities of this interesting drink. (Fodor’s, 1990, p. 73)

For a number of reasons, this is a very puzzling passage. To begin with, one should realize that sake is, by Durston’s admission, one of the most common drinks in Japan, known even to Westerners who know little else about the country. Thus, Durston is faced with the problem of elevating this common beverage to the status of the mythical through engaging fantastic stereotypes. Durston begins by asserting that sake is both widely produced and consumed (“the number one alcoholic beverage”). However, she also fashions a connection between two images associated with Japan’s ancient—and perhaps in the popular mind—more barbaric past. First, Durston quotes the advertisement of one company, that sake is “the beverage of the samurai.” Second,

⁸ Both examples illustrating this point are taken from the 1990 edition of Fodor’s. While there are certainly instances illustrating this phenomenon from the earlier editions, examples from the 1990 edition are more clearly illustrative of the practice of distinguishing between “traditional” and “modern,” primarily because it is only in the 1990 edition that Fodor’s unambiguously recognizes that Japanese culture has elements of both qualities. In earlier editions, as noted numerous times throughout this dissertation, elements of Japanese “tradition” are often over-emphasized while elements of Japan’s “modernity” are either subordinated or ignored.

she quotes “ancient myths” calling sake the “drink of the gods.” Both of these references are connected to sake’s popularity only tenuously. However, despite the weakness of the connection, these two images appear to do the job of heightening interest in the common beverage.⁹

Another example illustrating how Fodor’s utilizes the dimension of tension to dramatize unknown aspects of Japanese life can be seen in the following description of prices for shopping and eating:

Remember that in some cases, prices in smaller stores and markets might be listed with Kanji (Japanese pictographs derived from Chinese written characters) instead of Arabic numbers. In such cases, just ask, “How much?” It’s a phrase that all Japanese will recognize, because it is the name of a popular TV game show in Japan, and someone will either tell you or write down the price for you.

Shopping in Tokyo is generally an extremely pleasant experience, because salespeople are often helpful and polite. In major stores, many people speak at least enough English for you to complete your transactions. There is a saying in Japan that the customer equals God. Upon entering a store, you will be greeted with a bow and the word Iraasyaimase (welcome). The salespeople are definitely there to serve you. (Fodor’s, 1990, pp. 164-165)

First, we see the contrast between Arabic numbers (familiar elements) and Kanji (unfamiliar elements). To further infuse the description with unpredictability, the writer explains that Kanji characters are derived from ancient Chinese language (unfamiliarity). However, to avoid leaving the reader with too great a feeling of unpredictability, the author also reassures them that the question, “how much” (a familiar English conversational phrase) will be understood by Japanese. Another reassuring factor is of course that Japanese have learned the phrase through a popular

⁹ It is probably no accident that Durston finds it useful—for one of the few times in the Fodor’s series—to quote a popular Japanese advertisement. One of the chief purposes of advertising is to persuade consumers to buy products by creating romantic or dramatic associations that supposedly accrue to those who use the product. Advertising has a ready supply of images which appeal to the unpredictable or fantastic elements of Japanese cultural life.

television show. This confirms not only that the phrase is widely used (the show is “popular”) but that a cultural practice associated with Western nations (the English phrase) is influential enough to have served as the title of a television game show.

In describing shopping in Japan (unfamiliar), the author confirms that English may be used (familiar), although only in “major stores.” At the same time, there remain elements of unpredictability: English is not spoken by everyone, and those who do speak English may speak just “enough.” Japanese salespeople will greet customers with a Japanese phrase, “Traasyaimase” (the unfamiliar); nevertheless, visitors will still be able to “complete the transaction” (they are reassured by elements of predictability).

One is tempted to ask why it is necessary to discuss Kanji in the context of shopping. The chapter in which the passage occurs does not deal in general terms with Japan’s past history, nor does it provide a general overview of Japanese culture; yet the author skillfully moves Chinese language into the description so as to conflate the ancient and modern qualities of Japanese life. One doubts whether—in the context of shopping—tourists care about or even understand the connections between Kanji and Chinese. Hence, the conflation of ancient and modern here does not aim at providing information tourists need. On the contrary, the comparison seems to have been included to heighten the sense of unpredictability about the common activity of shopping.

Downplaying Japanese technical accomplishments. Because the dichotomy “predictable” / “unpredictable” is closely tied to the distinction between “modern” and “traditional,” the Fodor’s guidebook frequently uses familiar and unfamiliar elements in combination to deprecate Japan’s modernity. In these comparisons, the elements of modernity are presumed to be known to the Western reader, whereas elements in the Japanese culture are depicted as being somehow deficient, that is, not quite the equal of modern elements in Western cultures.

In the following example, Edward Seidensticker offers his opinion on the general appearance of city streets in Japan's two biggest cities, Tokyo and Yokohama. In the emphasized portion of the passage, the author offers an expected criticism, coupled with an unexpected criticism. However, the juxtaposition of the two criticisms combine to restrict reader perception of Japan as a modern nation:

The two cities [Tokyo and Yokohama] have a cluttered, unfinished look about them. The streets seem forever under repair and never quite in repair, and the most spanking new modern building begins to look a bit leprous after a few rainy seasons. Individual buildings can be good (before the rains get at them), but they add up to nothing. Tokyo and other Japanese cities viewed as physical plants completely lack character and integrity. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 56)

The passage begins with the author's central idea: that the two cities are cluttered and "unfinished." However, Seidensticker adopts an interesting strategy in order to persuade readers on this point. Given the preceding discourse in this chapter (which is highly critical of Japanese cities), the reader would not expect Seidensticker to be very complimentary in his description, as confirmed by his conclusion that the streets are "never quite in repair." However, Seidensticker also offers a backhand compliment to both cities' attempts to repair their streets (the streets seem "forever in repair"); given his tone in previous descriptions, this latter characterization is far less to be expected from Seidensticker.

What is the net effect of this juxtaposition? Seidensticker's strategy is to encompass two facts which may be apparent to anyone who visits Tokyo or Yokohama: that the city streets seem cluttered, but that at the same time, street repair seems to be a common activity. Thus, to the casual observer, even though the cities need to have their streets repaired, they seem to be performing that activity on a regular basis.

But that is not the tone one senses in the underlined passage, which somehow manages to convey the impression, not that the cities are working to fix the problem, but that, despite their best efforts, they are unable to make any headway. In fact, Seidensticker manages to leave the impression that both activities—that is, the need for repair, as well as its performance—constitute an annoyance to the tourist.

These effects are achieved by the deliberate juxtaposition of the expected or predictable (the condition of the streets, a complaint which is common to most Western tour guidebooks, regardless of the country described) with the unexpected or unpredictable (the “never-ending” repair activity¹⁰). Simply citing one or the other will not accomplish Seidensticker’s goal: if he criticizes the streets as “cluttered,” that could simply be attributed to the city’s structure; on the other hand, annoyances connected with road repair can be easily explained as a temporary frustration which will in time be cleared up, and which will in any case leave the roads in better condition. However, by juxtaposing the two descriptors in a sentence which suggests that both conditions “seem to be” permanent, Seidensticker implies not only that cities are poorly planned, but that Japanese cannot do anything about it, and by inference, that the tourist must bear the frustration which accompanies their failure.

In this way, the passage acts as a device to limit perception of Japanese productivity and capability for managing their own largest municipalities. This is a very problematic implication, since it seemingly holds Japanese to impossible standards of performance, while at the same time preventing them from achieving the unrealizable standard. This is done by the clever joining of the two descriptors. The predictable side of the conjunction tells the reader that his or her stereotypical fears of the foreign city are valid, that the streets really are as bad as feared, while the

¹⁰ This formulation also contributes to a sense of unpredictability because it cannot possibly be true: streets cannot be “forever under repair” and “never quite in repair.” Of course, Seidensticker cleverly phrases his passage so that he does not really assert that these two conditions are true, only that they “seem” to be true.

unpredictable side tells the reader that Japanese, despite their reputed technical ability, cannot deal with the problem. Thus both sides of the conjunction combine to offer an extremely negative opinion about the Japanese people.

Another example illustrating the process of juxtaposing predictable and unpredictable elements to lessen perception of Japanese modernity occurs in the following description of financial activity:

Tokyo is a state-of-the-art financial marketplace, where billions of dollars are whisked electronically around the globe every day, in the blink of an eye—and where automatic cash dispensers shut down at 6 PM. (It has the highest rate of household savings in the world, inspired by an ancient tradition of frugality.) It's a metropolis of exquisite politenesses, where the taxi drivers open the door for you when you get in and out—and where the man in the subway will push an old woman out of the way to get a seat. A city of astonishing beauty in its small details, Tokyo also has some of the ugliest buildings on the planet and generates 20,000 tons of garbage a day. It installed its first electric light in 1833, yet still has hundreds of thousands of households without a bathtub. (Fodor's, 1990, p. 79)

In this description, there are a number of predictable elements, based on what readers are assumed to know about the modernity of Tokyo: the exchange of “billions of dollars” in business transactions, the politeness of the city's residents, Japanese frugality, and so on. At the same time, the authors (Jared Lubarsky and Nigel Fisher) introduce elements of Tokyo perhaps not so familiar (that is, more unpredictable) to readers: Tokyo has “thousands of households without a bathtub,” its first electric light was installed in 1833, men will sometimes push old ladies out of the way to a seat on a subway train, and so on. In combination, these elements remind one of the style of Edward Seidensticker who, in the earlier editions of the Fodor's guidebook (1962 through 1982) seldom complimented Japan without including some criticism.¹¹ The

¹¹ The following are examples of Seidensticker's tendency to conjoin praise with blame (the condemnatory phrases are underlined): (1) “Individual buildings can be good (before the rain gets at them, but they add up to nothing.” (Fodor's, 1962, p. 56); (2) “. . . the Japanese countryside is lovely if a trifle wanting in variety.” (Fodor's, 1962, p. 60); and (3) “If the Japanese habits of bodily cleanliness are

general picture of Tokyo offered through this description is that despite its reputation as an international center of commerce, the city is still somewhat backward. Phrases such as “thousands of households without a bathtub” and “some of the ugliest buildings on the planet” are particularly deprecatory and condescending. In contrast to the generally milder tone of the 1990 edition, the chapter by Lubarsky and Fisher demonstrates that some of the old prejudices and stereotypes have not entirely disappeared from the Fodor’s descriptions, but have merely been reformulated. One suspects that Tokyo’s modernity would be one element of Japanese culture that is beyond dispute. Through the juxtaposition of the familiar and the unfamiliar, however, Lubarsky and Fisher have managed to cast doubt on the credibility of Tokyo as a symbol of Japan’s status as a modern nation.

Association of the unpredictable with the distant past. The Fodor’s series exhibits another characteristic conjunction of predictable and unpredictable in which unpredictable elements are associated with the distant past. Typical of such formulations is the following example from Edward Seidensticker’s introductory chapter in the 1962 Fodor’s, in which the past geologic history of Japan is described in the following terms:

For all its failure to appeal to its young, who find the buzz of Tokyo and Osaka more attractive, the Japanese countryside is lovely if a trifle wanting in variety. It is very green and very unlevel, and so calls to mind two other essential facts about Japan: that it is a new land, thrust up from the Pacific only yesterday in geological terms, and that it has heavy seasonal moisture, lying as it does in the monsoon belt of southern and southeastern Asia. [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, pp. 57-58)

Here again one finds in the underlined portion of the passage the conjunction of the expected and the unexpected, though in this case the two parts of the conjunction

above reproach their habits of housecleaning are not, and it is well not to scrutinize the portions of a room that do not immediately invite inspection.” (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 67). Although their tone is not quite so censorious, Lubarsky and Fisher appear to be following the same strategy in their description of Tokyo.

manifest the dimension of tension somewhat differently. Here, the quality of expectedness arises from the fact that the latter part of the conjunction (the statement about “heavy seasonal moisture”) is easily verified, whereas the former portion of the conjunction is difficult to verify (“[Japan] is a new land, thrust up from the Pacific only yesterday in geological terms”). The latter portion lies within the realm of immediate experience, whereas the former portion is lost in the long-distant past. Thus, the latter portion can be said to be expected (it can be verified by anyone who stays in Japan during certain seasons), while the former portion can be said to be unexpected (unique knowledge that can only be speculated upon by those with some familiarity with geology).

The net effect of the juxtaposition, however, is somewhat the same as for some of Seidensticker’s other descriptions. Seidensticker describes the countryside as “very green” (its verdance is attractive) but at the same time “very unlevel” (somewhat untidy and therefore unattractive). Once again, it is not these assertions that are problematic, but their juxtaposition. Analyzed through the lens of tension, this juxtaposition, taken together with the parallel explanation for each portion of it (that is, the subsequent reference to “seasonal moisture” together with the “recent” geological upheaval), is puzzling. Why would Seidensticker juxtapose these two portions, seemingly as if for the purpose of “calling to mind” two “other facts” about the country?

The answer may be that establishing a pretext for conjoining the two “facts” seems to legitimize the subjective evaluation (“very green” and “very unlevel”) that occurs earlier. Perhaps Seidensticker reasons that, if the two subjective descriptors can be joined to two seemingly objective facts, the credibility of the overall assessment will be correspondingly enhanced. This would appear to be confirmed by the use of the term “fact” to describe his supporting data.

However, when one considers that only one of the supporting facts is empirically verifiable, the assessment loses some of its force and so becomes less persuasive. Nevertheless, it is the tension pointed up by the unusual conjunction of these two descriptions that alerts the critical reader that the passage is in fact illustrates the dimension of tension.

Elements of temporal change relating to tension in Fodor's descriptions. As one compares the 1990 edition of the Fodor's guidebook to its predecessors, one notes a number of changes in the balance between predictable and unpredictable elements of the descriptions: (1) greater willingness to employ personal reports that are unverifiable (an unpredictable element); (2) less emphasis on warning tourists as element of unpredictability; and (3) less expectation that clichés and stereotypes will be accepted.

Greater willingness to employ reports that are unverifiable (unpredictable). The earlier editions of the Fodor's guidebooks (1962 through 1982) seemed at times to exhibit two contradictory perspectives: while most of the authors favored a distant, omniscient narrative tone, at the same time they expressed highly personal opinions about the country. As was shown in these earlier editions, the resultant voice could be characterized as "pseudo-academic." It is a seemingly dispassionate voice, employing such devices as passive verb constructions and references to expert knowledge. On closer examination, however, the descriptions proved to be largely devoid of substantive support.

In some ways, this situation is reversed in the 1990 edition, as authors are permitted directly to express highly personal opinions about Japanese cultural life. I have noted that one indication of this trend is the fact that nearly all of the 1990 edition is directly attributed to one, or more, authors, as opposed to earlier editions in which more than half of a given Fodor's guidebook might be anonymously authored. Another indicator of the trend toward individuated discourse is the fact that, even

though all authors of the 1990 edition are identified, the number of contributing authors is comparatively few. In fact, only six people (Diane Durston, Nigel Fisher, Kiko Itosaka, Jared Lubarsky, Jon Spayde, and Oliver Statler) are identified, and four of these six authors write more than one article, making a mere four contributors (Fisher, Statler, Lubarsky, and Itosaka) responsible for about three-quarters of the entire volume. Hence, the 1990 Fodor's guidebook is not only prepared to identify its authors, but also to allow them to express themselves in more than one area of specialization.

Of course, it is also possible that even in the earlier edition, the portions of the guidebook attributed to anonymous authorship are written by the same people who are identified as authors of other chapters, working together or individually. However, the distinction between the earlier editions and the 1990 edition is that, in the latter, virtually all the discourse is attributed to a named author, with the editorial authority of the Fodor's organization brought in only occasionally to bolster a particularly sensitive point.¹² These constraints apparently do not apply in the earlier editions, where more of the book is unattributed than attributed.

The shift toward the personal style can be explained by the dimension of tension.¹³ Unfamiliarity is heightened in the 1990 edition due to the destabilization of the sense of authorial omniscience and pronouncement characteristic of the earlier editions. Given the inclusion of ideas about cultural diversity into the experience of the tourist of the 1990s, the all-knowing narrator (whether identified or anonymous) of the 1962 edition is more difficult to justify. Moreover, Japan, as a nation, has by 1990 been represented in enough different guidebooks that Fodor's—which, for the better

¹² An example is the following from Fisher's description of the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area: "Though there are plenty of others who would disagree with us, for the foreign visitor we rank this region as the third most interesting in this chapter, unless you plan to climb Mt. Fuji" (Fodor's, 1990, p. 257). Use of the pronouns "us" and "we" verifies that the expressed opinion is that of the Fodor's editorial infrastructure, not Fisher himself.

¹³ The elements of the dimension of specificity in this shift are noted in analysis of the dimension of specificity in Chapter Three, pp. 81-84.

part of the 1960's and early 1970's, was one of only about a half-dozen comprehensive guidebooks to Japan—has had to recognize that pretensions to omniscience and declaratory, monologic phrasing are less likely to sell in the touristic marketplace. The availability of several well-received “alternative” guidebooks to Japan which entered the market in the mid- to late-1980's meant that tourists no longer had to rely on the well-established series for their information about Japan. Once Fodor's grip on the marketplace was loosened, the omniscient voice may have proved not only archaic, but might have constituted a decided marketing disadvantage.

Less emphasis on warning as element of unpredictability. One of the most dramatic indicators of the changed perspective between earlier editions and the 1990 edition of Fodor's is that the latter has virtually none of the blunt warnings about threatening aspects of Japanese life. This can be seen as a shift in attribution about certainty. Earlier editions contained a myriad of warnings about Japanese taxi drivers, food, water, accommodations, driving, trains, and a host of other potential pitfalls that might await the unwary traveler naive enough to think that traveling in Japan was just like traveling in his or her own country.

However, by 1990, a number of factors appear to have contributed to a generally greater feeling of comfort on the part of visitors to Japan. First, there is the fact that facilities had in fact improved; there is general agreement that Japan has steadily and consistently improved its infrastructure since World War II (Warshaw, 1990), to the extent that it is today recognized as an “advanced” country. Second, many of the improvements have been specifically directed toward the goal of getting more people to visit Japan more often. The empowerment of the Japan National Tourist Office (JNTO) and the Japan Travel Bureau (JTB) in the early 1960's (preparatory to Japan's hosting of the Olympic Games in 1964) signaled Japan's intention to lure potential tourists to the country, a strategy which seems to have proven largely successful. Third, and closely connected to the successes of the public

relations activities of the JNTO and JTB, Japan has a considerably better image in the eyes of the world than may have been evident in the earlier editions of the Fodor's guidebook. Fourth and finally, Japan's increasing importance as a commercial center for world trade has meant that it has attracted visitors to Japan whose primary activity is business, but who want to experience Japanese cultural life during their business trips.¹⁴ These factors, and others, have caused potential visitors to change their perceptions, from seeing Japan as a "cold and distant" land (to use Seidensticker's phrase from the 1962 and 1969 editions) to viewing a visit to Japan as an interesting and even profitable activity. As the perception of the tourist has changed, so has the tone of the Fodor's guidebook. Earlier, it was necessary to focus upon and accentuate the exotic aspects of Japan; over time, however, it has become more necessary to focus upon the better-known, more predictable elements of Japanese life.

Less emphasis on clichés and stereotypes. A third important change in the predictable/unpredictable balance in the 1990 edition of the Fodor's guidebook is the noticeable decrease in the use of cultural stereotypes; even when such stereotypes are used, they are frequently couched in tentative and uncertain language which is markedly different from the earlier blunt declarations of "how the Japanese are" seen in the descriptions of writers such as Edward Seidensticker. The more overt stereotypes in the Fodor's series are far too numerous to list, but they are of a general form. For example, consider the stereotype contained in the concluding paragraph of Edward Seidensticker's introductory chapter from the 1962 edition: "It has been said above that Japanese are good at keeping the foreigner in his place, but then perhaps the visitor need not feel too cruelly discriminated against. The inhabitants of this land are as alert as lynxes in making other Japanese keep their distance, too" (p. 68). By 1990, we can compare Oliver Statler's circumspect approach to the common stereotype

¹⁴ In the mid-1980s, the tour guidebook market began to cater specifically to business travelers with titles such as the following: Jobs in Japan (Wharton, 1984) and the Economist Business Traveler's Guide: Japan (1986). See Chapter Two, pp. 21-26.

that Japanese are “inscrutable”.¹⁵ “Inscrutable is an adjective that has long been applied to the Japanese; in my opinion, it’s misapplied. Some of this is because they speak with their own brand of nuance. But to describe the Japanese face as an expressionless mask makes no sense to me.” This change involves not only specificity, but certainty. As Japan becomes more modern as a nation, on its own terms, the necessity to resort to “safe” characterizations, such as stereotypes, becomes less and less necessary.

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Tension of JTB’s Descriptions

In this section, first, I will focus on three content themes relating to tension which recur in the JTB’s guidebook series: (1) bridging the link between “traditional” Japan and the “modern” West; (2) bridging the link between the experienced and unexperienced; and (3) making the known unknown. Second, I will examine elements relating to tension which indicate change in the JTB’s series over the period 1955 through 1991.

Bridging the link between “traditional” Japan and the “modern” West. The comparison between East and West is used by JTB to create tension in its touristic discourse. In the following discussion, I analyze examples relating to accommodations, touristic sites, social life, and sports, explaining in each how JTB manages to build a link between “traditional” Japan and the “modern” West to attract visitors into the “unpredictable” world of Japanese life.

Tourists, particularly international tourists, ask for comfortable accommodations even as they visit other locations for the purpose of experiencing the strange and unfamiliar. For example, visitors to foreign countries stay in luxurious hotels at night, while during the day they go out in search of a touristic “adventure.” This demand for comfortable accommodations may, however, sometimes be

¹⁵ This passage is also mentioned briefly in discussion of the dimension of specificity in Chapter Three, p. 82.

challenged. Although many tour guidebooks have formulated standardized ranking systems to evaluate quality in accommodations in host countries, the degree to which expectations are satisfied still depends upon the host country. While demands for comfortable accommodations may seem external to touristic interaction, accommodations remain an integral part of the tourist's experiences. Hence, some effort is required for the touristic writer to manage a proper balance between what tourists expect and what they may actually encounter.

In the description of accommodations, we can observe the operation of the dimension of tension on at least two levels. First, as previously noted, in various places in the JTB guidebook, two kinds of hotels stand in contrast to each other: the "Japanese-style" (ryokan)¹⁶ and the "foreign-style." "Foreign-style," a term used in the 1955 edition, is later replaced with "Western-style" in the 1975 and the 1991 editions. The "foreign-" or "Western"-style hotels are said to be comfortable and capable of satisfying the needs of foreign visitors. Japanese hotels, on the other hand, are said to be very different from Western-style hotels: "The accommodations, facilities and service at ryokan differ widely from those provided by Western-style hotels . . ." (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 48). By contrasting these two major kinds of accommodations, tourists are permitted either to choose the predictable (Western-style hotels), or the unpredictable (Japanese-style ryokan).

However, this first level of tension can be further explored. As will be demonstrated, the descriptions for both Western-style and Japanese hotels are in constant tension. For "foreign visitors," "foreign-style" hotels are predictable: their standards, lifestyle, food, services, and so forth, are all expected and previously experienced by foreign visitors. This is especially true, given that most English-speaking foreign visitors are from Western countries. Since the West is the area of the

¹⁶ See Chapter Three, pp. 104-107.

world which is allowed to define modernity, the descriptor “Western-style,” when applied to “modern” accommodations, creates a sense of predictability and security.

However, the visitor may still be uncertain as to whether the Japanese can provide true “Western-style” accommodations. The tension between visitor expectations and experiences which are likely to surprise can be clearly observed in the following statement:

All these [Western] hotels are equipped with modern conveniences, including central heating and air-conditioning. Many have special facilities that include restaurants serving Western food and such traditional Japanese dishes as sukiyaki, tempura, and sushi. Many hotels have beautiful Japanese landscape gardens, although business hotels generally only have limited facilities. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 47)

The extended reference to “modern conveniences” seems to be for the purpose of assuring “Western visitors” that Japanese are competent to manage “modern facilities.” By providing detailed descriptions in support of Japanese competence, the tension can be abated. While these hotels are equipped with “modern conveniences,” and their restaurants serve “Western food” (predictable), they at the same time have “Japanese gardens” as well as “traditional Japanese dishes” (unpredictable). To ensure that the “unpredictable” Japanese dishes are perceived as authentic, their Japanese names are used.¹⁷ Thus, at just the point where readers may become too comfortable by appeal to the “modern accommodations,” they are reminded of the uniquely Japanese features of such accommodations. The tension so created serves to attract the attention of tourists.

But the tension exists not only in the description of Western hotels, but in descriptions of the traditional Japanese hotels as well. To the Western visitor, ryokan will always have an air of unpredictability, as contrasted with the presumably better-

¹⁷ This linguistic device is similarly employed in the section describing food: there are Western-style restaurants (predictable), and the Japanese lyoliya (unpredictable). To ensure that the Japanese restaurant is perceived as authentic, the original Japanese word, lyoliya, is used.

known qualities of Western-style hotels. Indeed, given the evident goal of creating a sense of uniqueness, the JTB chooses to use the Japanese term ryokan in place of the less romantic "traditional Japanese inn."

According to the 1955 edition, ryokan are said to be below international standards. The apologetic attitude implied by this evaluation may reveal the Japanese discomfiture at the presumed unpredictability of ryokan for the foreign visitor: how can one expect the service, food, or any other aspect of the traditional Japanese hotel (a place about which foreign tourists are likely to have little or no knowledge) to meet international standards? However, in the 1975 edition, Japanese ryokan are said to meet "certain requirements" of international quality. The reference to "certain" standards compels readers to assume some sense of the predictable and the unpredictable simultaneously: while one may be comforted that a start toward satisfying "international standards" has been made in Japanese hotels, the extent to which standards have been implemented remains unclear. The 1975 edition claims only that visitors will be "quite comfortable" (the predictable element), although they may not be "thoroughly comfortable" (the unpredictable element).

In the 1991 edition, this reference to ryokan is modified once again: ryokan are said to "meet international standards." There is no longer any doubt as to the extent to which ryokan satisfy demands of international tourists in terms of the quality to which they are assumed to be accustomed. By dropping the reference to "certain" standards, the JTB guidebook implies that, in terms of quality (as measured by "international standards"), Japanese ryokan are like other so-called "Western-style" hotels. Improvements having been made, Japanese hotels are fit as objects of consumption by foreign visitors: "Ryokan, traditional Japanese-style inns, or hotels, have been improved to such an extent that they now play an important role in providing accommodations for both foreign and Japanese guests" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 48).

Nevertheless, the sense of predictability brought on by reference to “international standards” is immediately tempered by bringing a sense of unpredictability into the discussion: ryokan are still classified as “traditional Japanese” hotels but they are for both “foreign and Japanese guests.” Given the uniqueness of the traditional Japanese inns, the JTB guidebook encourages its visitors to stay at ryokan in order to taste “traditional Japan,” portrayed subsequently in the chapter as an “ideal” for those who want to experience Japanese culture. How is “Japanese life” experienced in these hotels? According to the JTB guidebook,

Recent years have seen a particular increase in the number of foreign guests who want to expand their knowledge and experience of Japan by staying in a traditional Japanese room and eating Japanese food. Sleeping on a tatami mat, and bathing in a large bath and in outdoor hot springs have come to be appreciated as a unique experience not to be missed by the traveler in Japan. Foreign visitors should make a point of staying at least one night in one of the traditional ryokan in Tokyo, Nara or Hakone. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 48)

Thus, even though traditional Japanese inns are depicted as predictable because they offer the same level of services and quality as Western hotels (which set the standards for predictability and standardization), Japanese inns never lose their essentially Japanese character, indicated in the quoted passage by the reference to traditional Japanese food, sleeping mat (notice the use of the Japanese word tatami), and the public bath (unpredictable and unique). The uniqueness of Japanese hotels is highlighted in the JTB guidebook’s suggestion that “foreign visitors should make a point” to stay at a ryokan (it is both expected of the adventurous tourist as a social behavior, while at the same time it is recommended that one should not necessarily make a habit of staying at ryokan, but should do so “at least once”). However, visitors need not be overwhelmed by the uniqueness of Japanese ryokan: despite the strangeness of Japanese inns, there are nevertheless an increasing number of foreign visitors who have “tasted” the Japanese lifestyle by staying in them, thus creating a

sense of security and predictability. In its description of Japanese ryokan, the JTB guidebook successfully moves from predictability to unpredictability, and then from unpredictability to predictability.

Indeed, the juxtaposition of the predictable Western-style hotels and the unpredictable traditional Japanese hotels, together with the inherent instability in the description of each, demonstrate that touristic discourse is far more complex than being simply a matter of whether a description is “accurate” or not. The JTB guidebook could have emphasized the similarities between the two styles of accommodation: both kinds of hotels are run primarily by Japanese people, Japanese food is served in both kinds of hotels, both are appreciated by foreign visitors, and so forth. However, rather than minimize the differences between the two, the JTB guidebook instead utilizes differences to create tension in reader perception: in Western-style hotels one can find the Japanese element, and in the Japanese-style hotels, one can find Western standards. Regardless of which style one chooses, one can always predict the outcome to a certain extent, but must leave the remainder to the unknown. This tension helps provide the traveler a store of experiences which serve to clarify the adventurous aspects of a visit to Japan.

In another example illustrating the attempts of JTB to bridge “traditional” Japan and the “modern” West, the JTB author responds to his or her own discourse by fashioning a message comprised of predictable and unpredictable elements. The passage begins with several references to elements likely to be interpreted by the visitor as unpredictable:

Imposing shrines, temples and palaces with elaborately designed gardens reflect the glory of Kyoto. In all, the city has over 200 Shinto shrines and some 1,500 Buddhist temples, including 30 of the latter that are the headquarters of various Buddhist sects. Kyoto is also a city of festivals, with colorful events filling the calendar in Kyoto from New Year’s Day to the last day of the year.

However, Kyoto is no mere repository for Japan's traditional culture. Covering an area of 611 sq. km., it is the seventh largest city in Japan and an important industrial hub as well as the educational center of western Japan. It is also equipped with well-organized transportation facilities and hotel accommodations. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 655)

In the first paragraph, the author uses repeated images to suggest that Kyoto is a city of wonder, with festivals, "colorful events," and impressive and numerous religious shrines. To the visitor, these images (the precise nature of which are unspecified) represent decidedly unpredictable elements. Since most visitors are unlikely to have had even minimal contact with actual Buddhist or Shinto shrines, or ever to have seen a Japanese festival, the listing of interesting locales and practices can only make the atmosphere of Kyoto even more provocative and exciting.

At the same time, however, the author must draw back into the world of the predictable by asserting that Kyoto also possesses modern facilities, stating in the latter paragraph that Kyoto is more than "simply" a repository of culture. One of the more interesting facets of this latter paragraph lies in the words which introduce it: "However, Kyoto is no mere repository for Japan's traditional culture." In few other places in the guidebook is JTB's eagerness to portray Japan as a modern country so dramatically illustrated. After going to a great deal of trouble to portray Kyoto as an impressive "repository" of culture, the author withdraws, saying that Kyoto is no "mere" repository, implying that a city which could only serve as a center for traditional culture is somehow lacking in status.

This strategy serves to heighten the tension between predictable and unpredictable elements of the message, and by so doing, bridges the link between Japan and the West. Both predictable and unpredictable elements are exaggerated: in the former segment, Kyoto is not portrayed as a cultural center, but as a city of wonder; in the latter segment, these elements of wonder are relegated to the status of "mere repository." Why would the author wish to go to such lengths to heighten this

contrast? It would seem more effective to portray both the predictable and unpredictable sides of the comparison with a little more restraint, resulting in a more convincing, though less dramatic, narrative.

The answer may lie in the paradoxical nature of the touristic transaction itself. To be attractive to tourists, a site must have at least two elements: it must be exotic or mysterious enough that people are attracted to the idea of visiting it, yet it must be safe enough that people will not feel threatened. Perhaps Kyoto's reputation as a "city of wonder" makes it necessary, first, to play into the potential tourist's preconceptions concerning the "mystery" of Japan and Asia (after all, what touristic text would be believable if it did not confirm expectations about the city?), and second, to exaggerate the city's "modernity" through reference to its accommodations and transportation facilities. In this passage, one may be witnessing a strategy similar to the Fodor's author who decried the "maddening jingle," "Don't say 'kekko' until you've seen Nikko," while at the same time acknowledging its essential truth.¹⁸ Some sites or locations develop reputations of their own over time, independently of touristic descriptions, so that the authors of tour guidebooks are compelled to acknowledge such sites in terms that their audiences have come to expect. To accomplish this goal, while at the same time pursuing another agenda in promoting the site's modern facilities, one can choose to intensify or heighten the contrast between the predictable and the unpredictable. In such comparisons, it is as if the author has no choice but to point up the value of the site, so that it becomes necessary to resort to exaggeration to distinguish the text from other descriptions in the tour guidebook market.

A third example in which the dimension of tension functions to bridge the link between Japan and the West can be found in the JTB's description of Mt. Fuji. In all three editions, the JTB guidebook description includes the following elements: (1) the first foreigner who climbed the mountain; (2) the first European woman who reached

¹⁸ See Chapter Four, pp. 251-253.

the summit; and (3) an anthropologist named Frederick Starr from the University of Chicago who returned to Japan fifteen times and climbed Mt. Fuji five times.¹⁹ The 1955 edition highlights the name of the anthropologist in italics to mark his special status; in the 1975 edition, on the other hand, the names of all three people are in italics, while in the 1991 edition none of the names is italicized. Several interesting aspects of these passages warrant attention.

Through applying the lens of tension to these references, one can gain insight as to how Western visitors can simultaneously find comfort and challenge in Mt. Fuji. According to the JTB guidebook, Mt. Fuji is indeed unpredictable, from its geological significance (its magnificent beauty, its eruptions as a volcano, and so on), to customs and beliefs associated with the mountain (its masses of followers, the ancient belief that women should not be allowed to climb the mountain, the challenge of hiking up to the summit, and so on). These qualities reinforce a sense of mystery in the minds of potential tourists. At another point, the JTB guidebook quotes poems written in honor of Mt. Fuji, thus further increasing the unpredictability and excitement associated with the landmark site.

However, one cannot rely only on unpredictable elements to convince tourists to visit the mountain. Therefore, the author builds up a sense of familiarity through describing the experiences of three Westerners. Although readers are persuaded that a visit to Mt. Fuji will be exciting, they are nevertheless reassured that they are not the first people to encounter this unexplored, exotic, strange location. One need only consult the guidebook in order to verify that others have experienced Mt. Fuji before.²⁰ For the three Westerners, of course, there were also modern accommodations. Again, just at the point at which Mt. Fuji seems to have assumed too much unpredictability,

¹⁹ These references are also discussed in terms of the dimension of uncompletedness in Chapter Seven.

²⁰ Indeed, the JTB style skillfully leaves the impression that a number of others have experienced Mt. Fuji. For example, the reference to the "first woman" implies that other women subsequently climbed Mt. Fuji.

readers are brought back to the ordinary world to which they are more accustomed. It is no wonder, then, that a detailed description of Dr. Frederick Starr, an anthropologist and professor at the University of Chicago, becomes necessary:

He first visited Japan in 1904, returning 15 times over a period of 30 years. He climbed Mt. Fuji five times, dressed like a native pilgrim in white tunic and kyahan (gaiters), straw sandals and sunshade, and crying “Rokkon Shojo” (May our senses be purified!) and “Oyama wa seiten” (May the weather on the mountain be good!).

He died in Tokyo in 1933, but his love for Mt. Fuji lives on in the form of a monument erected to his memory in full view of Mt. Fuji. His words are inscribed on it, as follows: “Fuji bare and naked in a blaze of sunshine is beautiful; Fuji with its summit wrapped in cloud and mist is more beautiful; Fuji blotted out by the fog until but a hint of line is left is most beautiful.” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, pp. 459-460)

In these passages, readers can sense the excitement and some of the awe that Dr. Starr must have felt for Mt. Fuji. The unpredictability of Mt. Fuji apparently led Starr to come back four times, and in climbing the mountain, he is reported to have tried to be like a native pilgrim. These elements of unpredictability are not likely to be perceived by the Western tourist as threatening, since Starr was himself a Westerner. It is quite possible that some Japanese behaved like Starr. However, a description of such a Japanese figure will not generate a sense of familiarity in the minds of foreign visitors; instead, the unpredictability, the unfamiliarity, of Starr-as-pilgrim may make foreign visitors uncomfortable. Starr’s appearance in the garb of a pilgrim—dressed in white tunic and kyahan (gaiters), straw sandals and sunshade, as well as crying out Japanese words—while unpredictable, is nevertheless also tempered by the fact that Starr is a Westerner, so that his “unpredictable” behavior becomes perhaps more familiar; Western readers can rely upon their own life experiences to reliably interpret Starr’s activities.

Moreover, regardless of how far beyond imagination Mt. Fuji may be, Starr's comments reinforce elements of Fuji's predictability. Indeed, what other text could be more convincing and comforting than one which is written by people who share one's life experiences? This is particularly important, since the Japanese who stand in relation to Mt. Fuji are far more difficult to predict than "modern Japanese": the more traditional Japanese may be mass followers, particularly those who want to continue the ancient custom of not allowing women to climb the mountain.

The linkage between the familiar and the unfamiliar is not limited to Dr. Starr as a Western figure. The Japanese themselves also contribute to the bridge between the predictable and unpredictable by inscribing Starr's words on his monument: thus, in the shadow of the mysterious Mt. Fuji, among unpredictable and unknown Japanese people, Starr, a Westerner, was nevertheless officially recognized by the Japanese. The description of Starr draws the unpredictable Mt. Fuji closer to potential visitors, making it more predictable for them; following this closure, the recognition of Starr by the Japanese makes the unpredictable Japanese more predictable (particularly since the recognition of Starr is evidenced by that most permanent and venerable of symbols, the inscribed statue). Between predictability and unpredictability, one may choose to read the poetic passage describing Mt. Fuji, or to experience the mountain in terms of the predictable world.

In the following passage explaining the status of women in Japan, one sees another manifestation of the dimension of tension. Near the end of the chapter on history, after a great deal of elaboration concerning the development of the Japanese economy, the following passage occurs:

In the midst of such social changes, the Japanese social consciousness showed a dramatic development. The revolution in attitudes held by and about women touched all parts of society. 1975, designated as the International Year of Women, was a watershed year that saw widespread recognition of women's abilities in all areas of society.

During the 1980s, the revolution that was taking place in the woman's image and life-style fused with growing demands for sweeping changes in the people's life-styles on the whole. This movement saw a shift away from an emphasis on "quantity" to a recognition of the importance of "quality." (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 102)

It should be noted that the 1991 JTB chapter on history is organized chronologically. Immediately prior to the discussion of women's roles, the author describes various aspects undergoing change in Japanese society, particularly those relating to economic and material success. Concerns for the status of women, as confirmed by the order of text, are conceived to be of comparatively recent origin; nevertheless, the transition from discussing material success, to discussing women's issues, seems very abrupt. From JTB's perspective, women's issues are part of social change, relating to the Japanese "social consciousness" which eventually "touched all parts of society," thus justifying commentary on such issues in the section on Japanese history. Not surprisingly, the discussion of this new social movement is absent from chapters on history in the 1955 and 1975 editions.

There are many social roles besides gender that, in the process of social change, modify the contents of Japanese cultural life. However, these other roles, such as parent-child, teacher-student, boss-employee, sibling-sibling, and so forth, are not highlighted as worthy of explicit commentary in the history chapter, and hence do not seem to be considered intrinsic to "social consciousness." To understand the selection of women's roles as part of the historical discourse, then, one needs to speculate about the potential audience the guidebook seems to have in mind. The JTB guidebook is written for English-speakers who are primarily from Western nations. The women's movement has its origins in Western nations, and as such, provide a standard against which Japan measures its own progress. This reference to the West, and by extension, to the international community, is clearly expressed in the reference to 1975 as the International Year of Women.

Introducing the position of women into the discussion of history illustrates the dimension of tension. After being exposed to the long discussion on Japanese history, the majority of which is uniquely Japanese and may thus be unfamiliar and unknown to the guidebook's readership, readers are finally assured that they do share something in common with Japanese. By describing the recognition of women, a familiar image is merged with impressions about the less-well-known (that is, more unfamiliar or unpredictable) Japanese women: in Japan, women's abilities are said to be recognized as they would be in any other nation which has "social consciousness." Japanese women, in other words, are no longer regarded as mysterious, unpredictable Orientals. The audience is more likely to be comforted by the expectation that they are going to visit a country which gives the same kind of recognition to women that they are accustomed to in their own countries. In particular, women's issues are not separated from other aspects of social change, but rather contribute to the "sweeping changes in the people's life-styles on the whole."

However, this sense of predictability is at the same time coupled with elements of unpredictability. Although the abilities of Japanese women are said to be "recognized," the precise manner in which such recognition is actualized remains uniquely Japanese, not Western. It is interesting to note that in the above statements, there are more assertions than proven points. Readers do not know, for example, exactly how women are viewed and treated in Japanese society. For further understanding of JTB's opinion on this matter, one has to turn to pages 231-239, where there is a more detailed discussion of Japanese society under the section, "Modern Japanese": "In Japan, as far as the typical family is concerned, it will not be in the near future that both the husband and wife equally share the burden of household affairs" (p. 236). Whether equal sharing of household responsibilities is a defining feature of women's recognition remains to be determined. However, it is clear that under the same seemingly predictable and standardized description (recognition of women

viewed as a principle agreed upon “internationally” and hence predictable), the recognition of women’s abilities is uniquely expressed in each society, and thus remains unpredictable to tourists.²¹

Another example in which tension is used to link Japan and the Western world is to be found in the following discussion of Kano, the Japanese who modified and coordinated the various schools of judo:

. . . [Kano] made it possible to use both the art of throwing and the art of mat-grappling in randori (free-style training). In this way, judo became a modern sport in every sense of the word. Comparable to any other modern sport, it gradually spread throughout the world. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 224)

This passage is taken from the section titled, “Budo (Martial Arts) and Traditional Sports,” which is in turn located in the chapter, “Traditional Japan.” Things belonging to traditional Japan, as we look at culture from the visitors’ point of view, are the factors which can be called “unique.” Judo is part of this “tradition,” and hence it is defined as unique and unpredictable.

To comfort “modern tourists,” however, an effort is made to infuse this description with elements of predictability and standardization. First, by comparing judo to “any other modern sport,” and by equating judo to modern sport (it “became” a modern sport), the JTB guidebook aims at creating a sense of familiarity among its readers. What precisely is judo? Is it an art, an exercise, a training of the spirit, or all or none of these? The JTB guidebook chooses to define judo as a sport, and further asserts that it has “became a modern sport in every sense of the word.” “Sports” are comprised of activities engaged in by modern people; “modern sports” are seen to be for “modern people.” How judo is defined depends upon how various discourses

²¹ Evaluation by Westerners of the status of women in Japan must also be considered in light of stereotypes about the passivity of Japanese women, so frequently reinforced in the Fodor’s series (see discussion under the dimension of specificity, Chapter Three).

contest with each other, so that there is no final conclusion as to how judo should be viewed. When judo is defined in relation to “modern sports,” its uniqueness becomes less threatening, and thus more predictable. Second, the assertion that judo has “gradually spread throughout the world” also conveys a message to the primarily Western audience: judo is not simply unique to Japanese, it also belongs to people other than Japanese. As the JTB guidebook puts it, “. . . indeed, it has become a very popular sport in recent years, both in Japan and abroad” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 224). Since judo has become a popular sport outside Japan, readers can hardly ascribe the uniqueness of judo only to Japanese. Rather, judo is now shared among people abroad, and hence, it can be viewed as more predictable. A tension is thus created: one cannot take judo for granted (since it is part of Japanese tradition), but at the same time, one is able to understand it (since it is a worldwide, “modern” sport). Thus, readers may find that judo remains somewhat familiar, while at the same time still be willing to experience the uniqueness of “authentic” Japanese judo.

A final example exemplifying using the dimension of tension to connect Japan and the West occurs in the following description of multilingual tour guides. In the 1955 edition, English-speaking people are described as elements included in “Western-style” hotel packages: “In addition to the registered hotels, excellent foreign-style hotels, with English-speaking employees, are to be found in all the principal cities and tourist resorts” (p. 17).²² At the “foreign”- or “Western”-style hotel, there is always the need for translators—translators who are able to link the Japanese world with the “Western” world. In the 1975 edition, the need to go beyond English to other spoken languages is also recognized. According to the 1975 JTB guidebook, “. . . there are a large number of licensed guides who have passed the state language examination” (p. 39) and “are qualified” to speak various kinds of languages. The reason for guides

²² Descriptions of many other activities, such as shopping, also emphasize the fact that many Japanese are able to speak English.

to be trained is said to be the fact that “. . . [the] Japanese language is reputedly very difficult to learn” (p. 39). The 1991 JTB guidebook also emphasizes the multilingual training of licensed guides, except that the need for Japanese guides to be multilingual is no longer seen to be due to the problem of the Japanese language itself, as in the 1975 edition, but due to the inadequacy of visitors: “. . . [since] very few foreigners . . . can speak Japanese, there is a great need for translators and interpreters” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 45).

The change from 1955 to 1975 appears to correspond to the increasing contact between nations as tourism becomes more important, whereas from 1975 to 1991, the varying descriptions show the Japanese taking an increasingly superior position with regard to language. Regardless of the attitude taken by the JTB guidebook toward multilingual guides, the tension between the predictable and the unpredictable dimensions of tour guides is evident. By informing its potential visitors that guides in Japan, or hotel managers, are able to speak English, JTB’s description aims to establish predictability: visitors, particularly those who speak only English, are guaranteed to encounter the kind of communication that they typically experience at home. This predictability will comfort the visitor, so that he or she will not feel so threatened during a visit to Japan.

However, since tourists always demand some kind of novel experience, adventure must also be included as part of their visit. This sense of unpredictability is accomplished primarily through three mechanisms. First, although tour guides are able to speak their native language, they have to “pass state language examinations” in order to be “qualified” to be tour guides. Encountering a tour guide or a hotel manager who is able to speak English is assumed to make the visitor’s trip more predictable (at least the visitor can communicate with someone in the foreign country); the fact that these guides need to pass an examination further enhances the sense of

unpredictability (since their English may not be identical to that of native English speakers).

Second, tour guides who speak foreign languages are limited only to “the principal cities and tourist resorts” rather than being available throughout Japan. Therefore, although visitors may experience some sense of familiarity (as long as one travels in big cities, one will have fewer problems communicating), they may at the same time be threatened with a certain degree of unpredictability (if one is away from big cities, the chances are high that one will be placed in a situation where one may not be understood by the natives).

Third and finally, the assignment of blame—that the Japanese language is very difficult to learn (from the 1975 edition) and that very few visitors are able to speak Japanese (1991 edition)—also creates a sense of tension. While guides and hotel managers are able to speak the native’s language (a predictable element), the fact that visitors do not understand Japanese, for whatever reason, prevents them from getting in touch with the heart of Japanese culture and customs (an unpredictable element). Beyond the English language, there exists an exotic, alien world, a unique world described by the Japanese language, the substance of which will remain unknown and unpredictable to foreign visitors.

In all of these examples, it is clear that the concept of “West” is often utilized as a reference point to provide JTB’s Western visitors with a sense of familiarity and security. The unpredictable elements are often contrasted with similar elements in the more familiar “West.” Unlike the Fodor’s guide, JTB entices its readers by appeal to the uniqueness or traditionality of the Japanese, rather than through appeals to exoticism or mysteriousness suggested by Fodor’s metaphors like the “exotic East.” It is interesting to note that, at no point in the six examples quoted above, does JTB put Japan in the category of the “East” to highlight Japan’s uniqueness. If reference is

made to the East, it is often so that JTB can assert Japan's premier status among other Eastern nations, rather than to place Japan under the shadow of the rest of Asia.

Bridging the link between experienced and unexperienced. Predictable and unpredictable elements of description can also be combined to forge links between the world of experience of the potential tourist and the as-yet-unexperienced elements of the world that await during his or her visit. An example is to be found in the 1991 JTB guidebook, where sixty-three "new sites of discovery" are identified, beyond the better known locations such as Kyoto, Nara, Nikko, and so on. These "new sites of discovery" comprise an entirely new subsection in the 1991 edition. Why do visitors need to be informed of these "new discoveries"? According to the JTB guidebook, such locations provide a better chance for in-depth understanding of Japanese life, which might be otherwise unattainable:

These places [popular touristic sites] are certainly rich in Japanese character and not to be missed, but these are not all there is to sightseeing in Japan. There are many other places throughout the country that allow one to come into contact with the long history, natural beauty and unique traditional culture of Japan. By visiting these places, the tourist can discover a new side of Japan and thus obtain a deeper understanding of the country. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 68)

JTB's description aims directly at generating a sense of unpredictability, implying that popular touristic sites may have become too predictable (one reason why they are popular), while "new discoveries" are less well-known to visitors and hence more unpredictable. Although Japanese history, natural beauty, and unique traditional culture are said by JTB to be part of major touristic sites, the "new discoveries" locations nevertheless provide a different dimension which must be sought out and explored in order to be appreciated. Although the so-called "major touristic areas" do not necessarily differ from "new sites of discovery," by contrasting the two types of locations and by promising that "new discovery" sites will provide

tourists a chance to see the “real” Japan and thereby engage a “new understanding,” the JTB guidebook successfully utilizes the dimension of tension to attract reader attention. The “major tour sites” are thus classified as standardized and predictable, so that tourists are encouraged to explore the unknown and the unpredictable.²³

However, unpredictability implied in the “new sites” is not limitless. First, the sixty-three “New Sites of Discovery” are designated as such by the Japanese government, and are included as part of the official guide (that is, their choice has been approved by people who have the formal power to classify sites and locations). How much surprise will the tourist encounter at a site approved by the government? Indeed, one would expect the tourist to discover a “new” side of Japan only by finding out something “behind the scenes” on his or her own. By designating a site as a “new discovery,” and by recommending it in the guidebook, the Japanese government sets limits for visitors, making their “adventure” more predictable. While “new sites” may provide another view of Japan for tourists unaccustomed to the country, it is to be expected that the sites will be somewhat safe and comfortable.

Throughout the JTB guidebook, there is an emphasis on the role played by the Japanese government in every aspect of the Japan tourist industry. Officials are active in setting up hotel standards, restaurant standards, tour-guide interpreter standards, hygiene standards, and so on. Tourists can take comfort that the government participates in such activities. Nor is this counter to the idea of “new sites of discovery.” Apparently, the person who “discovers” “new sites” is the Japanese government, not tourists. Hence, the sense of unpredictability associated with “new sites” is to some extent neutralized by the sense of predictability created through the well-intentioned Japanese government which sets the standards for so many things relating to tourism.

²³ Of course, this does not mean that tourists should not visit these major places at all. Built into the description in each of these “major sites” is another form of tension.

Second, in the "List of 'New Sites of Discovery'" (pp. 69-70), one finds little information about the locations: one is given on the prefecture, the area, and the major elements of interest to the tourist. The brevity of these descriptions stands in sharp contrast to the level of detail in other JTB site descriptions; the locations indeed comprise only a "list." Instead of offering information on how to get to a given site or detailed explanations concerning why these sites are special, the JTB guidebook instead informs its visitors: "When going to any of these areas, consult one of the JNTO's Tourist Information Centers (TIC) or 'i' system information centers, and refer to the Travel Information (pages 62-64) in this book" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 68). The guidebook continues: "Japan National Tourist Organization is a semi-government organization founded in 1959 as a part of the Ministry of Transport to promote travel in Japan" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, pp. 62-63). Later one finds this explanation: "The 'i' system is a network of local public entities organized under JNTO to provide information to foreign travelers" (p. 63). Why does the Japanese government need to play an extensive role in tourists' "discoveries"? Perhaps it is to ensure that the standards of all travel-related facilities can be guaranteed, thus representing another level of predictability.

The promised adventure is hardly an adventure at all, because it is tempered by the comfort implied by government-guaranteed standards, observed and regulated under the control of various public and semi-public organizations. One can discover "another side of Japan" through cultivating an appreciation of Japan's long history and unique traditions, while at the same time not be worried that the "new" locales will prove too strange, particularly since many sites are "designated" by the government. JTB's description is in a constant state of tension between the unpredictable (new discovery beyond "popular" tour sites) and the predictable (the suggestion that the interested visitor contact government organizations to get more information).

Another example illustrating the use of the dimension of tension to forge a bridge between what the tourist expects to experience, and the promise of new experiences, occurs in the following passage. The JTB utilizes predictable elements in the form of cultural stereotypes about Japanese society; however, the author combines these predictable elements into a plan whereby visitors may expand their perspective through independent exploration:

Recent data on tourism indicates that over 40% of the foreign visitors to Japan are interested in learning about Japanese people, the Japanese way of life and traditional Japanese culture. Many aspects of Japanese culture are already well known abroad. Some of the more popular examples include the tea ceremony, flower arranging, judo, kendo and karate. However, there are many other, less well-known aspects of Japanese culture that are certain to be of interest to the visitor willing to seek them out. By visiting places and seeing with one's own eyes and actually participating in some of these cultural activities, the visitor is sure to learn more about Japan and deepen the cultural aspects of his or her voyage in this country. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 68)

Most readers of this passage will probably agree that many visitors to Japan are curious to learn more about the country. In addition, the mention of the "popular examples" of Japanese cultural practices probably conforms to the images most foreigners have of Japan: the tea ceremony, flower arranging, martial arts, and so forth. To this extent at least, the material is predictable.

Unpredictability enters the picture in the form of the suggestion that the visitor might want to venture beyond boundaries imposed by previous expectation into "less well-known" areas. Nevertheless, "unpredictable" elements are referred to in a curious turn of phrase: there is no specific mention of what these "less well-known" areas might be. Thus, the passage, which at first glance might seem to be a straightforward call to adventure is in fact overbalanced on the side of the predictable. Several things popularly associated with Japan are specified, but there is no

corresponding mention of the “less well-known” features, not even an example to pique the tourist’s interest.

What might be a reason for this obvious imbalance? It cannot be that “less well-known” features of the country do not really exist: any visitor coming to Japan, or even returning to Japan, will find much about the country that he or she did not know before. A more likely explanation is that the section on “adventuring” is itself to be expected in the modern guidebook. In line with the elevated sense of cultural diversity of recent years, the “old guard” of touristic description, in which the author assumed an air of lofty contempt, advising the tourist that, for reasons of personal growth, he or she should spend time in “less-developed” countries, no longer seems appropriate. The more modern attitudes of sensitivity to cultural integrity, as well as pressures toward “political correctness,” make the appeal to the old stereotypes less functional.

Nevertheless, it is clear from the JTB narrative that such stereotypes still exist. Encountering examples showing the author is framing persuasive appeals based on stereotypes in the Fodor’s guidebook, one is less surprised. If, on the other hand, one encounters appeals to stereotype in the JTB guidebook, one is given more pause. It may be that the JTB guidebook simply wants to make a profit. However, it may also be that the Japan Travel Bureau has a vested interest in maintaining the traditional categories, even if such categories are reinforced with considerably more detail than one finds in the Fodor’s guide. This conclusion appears to be supported by the reference to an official list of “New Sites” for the adventurous traveler.

Making the known unknown. In the interest of making well-known features of Japanese cultural life more interesting to tourists, the JTB often uses the dimension of tension to infuse cultural elements presumably better known to the tourist with elements which increase uncertainty. In the following I examine two features of Japanese life widely associated with Japan in the popular consciousness: the Ginza shopping district in Tokyo, and the brief form of Japanese poetry called in the West

haiku, but referred to in the JTB guidebook as haikai. So well known are these two facets of Japanese life that any tour guidebook would likely find it advisable to comment on them. Indeed, this perception of necessity can be said to comprise part of the predictable element of the dimension of tension in the description: people are likely to examine touristic discourse for information, based upon what they expect to see. However, as will also be evident, while the subject is expected, the information which is offered to explain the subject may not be anticipated.

The first example passage provides a detailed description of the famous Ginza shopping district:

Shops cram the many bustling back streets along both sides. Here in Ginza are numerous showrooms, boutiques and department stores as well as famous establishments such as Mikimoto, restaurants serving cuisine from all over the world, coffee shops, bars and other places of amusement. Ginza is also one of the world's leading art-gallery districts, containing some 250 to 300 establishments. At night, the gay neon signs light up the sky, while the store windows are brightly illuminated. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 358)

Because many visitors will already be aware that the Ginza is primarily a shopping district (a place, in other words, where one shops), the JTB guidebook seems to think it necessary to add information about the various other kinds of businesses which might not be so readily expected by the visitor: for example, the Ginza "is also ("also" is a clue that the author intends to deliver unexpected information) one of the world's leading art gallery districts . . ."

The description of the Ginza in both expected and unexpected terms comprises another standard form of touristic discourse. In this form, readers/viewers/listeners are allowed enough information about a well-known cultural feature to feel that they are familiar with it, and then they are presented with new or unexpected information which recasts the supposedly familiar feature in a different light. The author of the JTB guidebook might have had in mind a number of goals when he or she chose this

particular means of describing the Ginza: to elevate the Ginza above the status of a shopping mall (it has “one of the world’s leading art gallery districts”), or simply to encourage spending by letting potential tourists know that they can buy much more in the Ginza than clothing.

In another example, however, the goal is much more serious; the passage below discusses the poetic form haikai and makes special reference to its most renowned practitioner, Matsuo Basho:

It was Matsuo Basho (1644-1694) who exerted himself, with ultimate success, to assimilate the traditional concepts of medieval literature and give them a popularity and freedom, thus elevating haikai to essentially the same level as renga and Chinese poetry. He tried to penetrate the realm of yuga (elegance) through assimilation with nature and by seeking after never-failing freshness in an effort to avoid adherence to traditional beauty. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 160)

In this passage, the predictable element is the poetic form of haikai. Known by the name haiku, such poems are studied in secondary school English classes in many nations, including the United States. Because of their brevity (popularly believed to be only seventeen syllables) they are a favored assignment for creative writing classes.

However, upon reading the description of the haikai form in the JTB guidebook, one learns that this popular conception of the poetic form is restrictive and misleading. The JTB guidebook describes the form at length (three full pages), situating it both in terms of literature and Japanese philosophy. Notice, for example, how the author of the JTB guidebook uses technical philosophical terms such as renga and yuga (these are explained earlier in the chapter from which the quotation is taken), suggesting the broader systems of knowledge that give substance to this seemingly unimposing literary form. In this passage, the preponderance of emphasis is on the unpredictable side (if one is a Westerner), which is at the same time more predictable (if one is Japanese).

Elements of temporal change in the tension of JTB's descriptions. Over time, the writing of JTB's guidebook undergoes subtle changes in its management of the dimension of tension. First, as Japan and Japanese become more modern and predictable to Westerners, there is greater need to identify "new aspects" of the country for its visitors. Second, associated with this increased sense of predictability concerning Japan is an increase in encouragement to tourists to actually participate in Japanese cultural life. Third, there is an increasing emphasis on the Japanese government's role in reducing unpredictability for Japan's visitors, and consequently, a less apologetic attitude taken by JTB with regard to Japan's unpredictable elements. I turn to a detailed discussion of each of these three themes.

The emergence of the "unknown" Japan. Along with JTB's declaration that Japan approaches modern/international standards, the 1991 Fodor's guide emphasizes "new discoveries" in Japan, presumably to ensure that Japan remains forever unpredictable. In the past, for example, the unpredictability associated with the ryokan and other elements unfamiliar to Westerners was considered sufficient to attract the tourist's attention; however, once ryokan were depicted as approaching international standards, there was a danger that they would be seen as too much like the accommodations of Western nations. Hence, even though ryokan retain some unpredictability (it is suggested that visitors should have a "taste" of living in the ryokan), they are not as strange as they once were. To experience a touristic adventure, visitors must go beyond what is listed in the tour guidebook to explore "new sites for discovery," and to encounter the unexpected, even if such sites must be designated by the government.

In earlier editions, information specified in JTB's guidebook is likely to have seemed exotic enough to attract tourists' attention in and of itself. These earlier guidebooks imply that one can get the "traditional flavor" of Japan through almost any touristic encounter: the accommodations where one lives, the foods one eats, the

people one encounters, and so on. By the 1991 edition, however, the tourist is advised to go to unknown locations in order to, in the JTB's words, ". . . come into contact with the long history, natural beauty and unique traditional culture of Japan." In the 1991 edition, indeed, a clear distinction is made between the "more well-known" and "less well-known" elements of Japan. The "less well-known" elements comprise the unpredictable aspect of Japan which tempts visitors. The JTB's statement, "The tourist can discover a new side of Japan. . .," implies that better-known attractions described in previous editions have already become the "old side of Japan," too well-known to enable foreign visitors to experience the unpredictable element of Japanese cultural life.

For this reason, one finds increased encouragement in the 1991 edition to explore the "unknown" parts of Japan in order to formulate a new balance needed for the description to exhibit the requisite level of tension. The 1991 edition promises "in-depth understanding of Japanese character" acquired through exploration of "new or unknown" Japan, pointing to a significant change in JTB's management of the dimension of tension, through opening up areas of unpredictability.

From observing to participating in Japanese cultural life. In its 1991 guidebook, the JTB actively encourages visitors to participate in Japanese cultural activities, a recommendation very seldom encountered in its previous editions. Earlier, JTB guidebooks implied that visitors simply need to be in Japan to observe unpredictable elements of Japanese culture. The 1991 edition implies that simple observation is probably insufficient to instill in the visitor a sense of unpredictability, given that the visitor may by 1991 share too much common knowledge about Japan. Rather, tourists are advised to participate in Japan's cultural life in order to experience the excitement that a different culture can offer to its visitors. In the passage quoted earlier, JTB states: "By visiting places and seeing with one's own eyes and actually participating in some

of these cultural activities, the visitor is sure to learn more about Japan and deepen the cultural aspects of his or her voyage in this country" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 68).

The new balance achieved between the elements of predictability and unpredictability offers another clue as to how JTB has changed in its portrayal of Japan (Japan is viewed as more predictable in the eyes of the Westerners), and also in its view of its Western visitors (who are urged to discover more about Japan).

Increasing emphasis on government's role in reducing unpredictability. Over time, one also sees in the JTB guidebook series an increasing emphasis on the Japanese government's role in reducing the unpredictability associated with a visit to Japan. Throughout Japan, the New Official Guide, numerous references are made to government's role in ensuring the comfort of visitors as they experience Japanese hotels, restaurants, transportation, and even "new sites of discovery." Although earlier JTB editions also mention the Japanese government's role in tourism, the 1991 edition is notable for its references to the pervasiveness of government activity—the Japanese government is shown as an agent visitors can trust. Together with the increasingly important role taken in tourism by the Japanese government, one also can see in the 1991 edition hints of a change in attitude. In earlier editions, JTB often took an apologetic tone in describing the unpredictable elements of tourists' experience; in the 1991 edition, unpredictability is no longer portrayed as a burden but rather as a primary attraction for visitors. Through the intercession and management by the Japanese government, Japan is a safe place to visit. Even though unpredictability concerning Japan was once seen as a problem of Japanese culture, in later years it is reclassified as part of "tradition." In fact, as mentioned previously, the 1991 edition of JTB's guidebook evidently considers elements which were once "unpredictable" to lack sufficient challenge for the visitor who wishes to actively participate in Japanese life and explore the "unknown" Japan.

Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Tension in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions

In addition to the content themes and patterns of reference which point to use of the dimension of tension, both the Fodor's and JTB's series are marked by a number of stylistic mechanisms which allow authors in both series to more easily create a sense of tension between the predictable and the unpredictable.

Fodor's—Stylistic mechanisms. In this section, I want to consider some of the specific methods used by authors in the Fodor's series to manage tension in its texts. Despite the differences exhibited among various authors, there are several devices which tend to recur often enough that they can be said to characterize a "Fodor's style." Stylistic mechanisms relating to tension in the Fodor's series include the following: (1) utilization of stereotypes; (2) providing "inside" information; (3) combining "contradictory" elements of Japanese culture; and (4) evaluating contrasting elements of Japanese culture.

Utilization of stereotypes. While the utilization of stereotypes is a common feature of touristic discourse—perhaps even of all cultural description—appeals to stereotypes are more numerous and extensive in the Fodor's series. As demonstrated in previous analysis, the JTB series contains many instances in which authors are at obvious pains to demonstrate that stereotypes are invalid; in the Fodor's series, stereotypes are not only frequently used, but used in a curiously offhand way, particularly in the earlier editions. By the 1990 edition of Fodor's, stereotypes are not excluded but they are used less casually and phrased more circumspectly. These observations can be explained by the dimension of tension. Stereotypes can be seen as expressions of certainty, not in the sense of being supported by extensive evidence (often the opposite, in fact), but in the sense of being safe and comfortable conceptions to which the potential visitor can be oriented. Unpredictable information about Japan, on the other hand, disconfirms stereotypes, leading to greater uncertainty (the former,

more certain mental state engendered by the stereotype must be reexamined and reformulated).

For the writer of touristic discourse not a resident of the country he or she is writing about, it is often difficult to fashion credible descriptions about daily life without appealing to the elements of understanding that are presumed to be shared by the readers. As a result, the writer must frequently resort to stereotypes in order to establish a framework which is then employed to make an incursion into areas presumably new to the reader. This is illustrated in the first sample passage, taken from Diane Durston's chapter on Japanese cuisine. The passage begins by linking to the reader's perception that many activities in Japan are extremely expensive:

Tales of horror floating around the world of unsuspecting tourists swallowed up by money-gobbling monsters disguised as quaint little restaurants on the back streets of Japan's major cities abound in these days of the high yen. There are, however, many wonderful little places that offer excellent meals and thoughtful service—and have no intention of straining anyone's budget. To find them, you must not be afraid to venture outside your hotel lobby or worry about the fact that the dining spot has no menu in English. Many restaurants have menus posted out front that clearly state the full price you can expect to pay. (Some do add on a 10% tax, and possibly a service charge, so ask in advance.) (Fodor's, 1990, p. 71)

This passage illustrates how the known can be used as a stage to build up the unknown (using the familiar to explain the unfamiliar). Durston plays on the fear associated with "horror stories" about living costs in Japan, but does so circuitously; she does not actually say that restaurants in Japan are expensive, but rather that tales of high prices "abound in these of the high yen."²⁴ This strategy allows Durston to connect with architectonics presumed to be shared by readers through reference to a

²⁴ This passage is also cited as an example of setting up a "straw man" under discussion of the dimension of uncompletedness in Chapter Seven. Notice that the expression of the stereotype is over-generalized: Durston neither claims that she or any other specific person is responsible for the "tales of horror."

common symbol, the “high yen,” which many are likely to identify with the economic power of Japan against the comparative weakness of the rest of the nations of the world. Indeed, taking the symbol of the “high yen” and coupling it with the existence of “horror stories” about high prices brings the question of potential expense into the immediate realm of the tourist’s experiences. This connection is intensified and dramatized by calling overly expensive establishments “money gobbling monsters” disguised as “quaint little restaurants.”

However, note that the supposed accusation against certain Japanese restaurants is illusory. Durston does not herself make any claim about the “quaint little restaurants”; instead, she makes a general reference to reports of such places “abounding” in these days of the “high yen.” Thus the basis upon which the remainder of her argument appears to rest in reality does not exist. It is, in effect, a stage upon which she introduces her own “inside information”; having cited what she asserts to be widespread “tales” describing the expensiveness of certain restaurants, Durston seems more justified in providing the reader with the information that one can find restaurants that are not too expensive, presumably aided by having chosen the Fodor’s guidebook.

Earlier editions of Fodor’s exhibited this pattern of introducing unique knowledge by referring to what was presumably already known to its readership. In the earlier examples, however, the known portion of the equation was seldom approached so tentatively. In earlier Fodor’s editions, authors such as Edward Seidensticker and Richard Leavitt would at least make and stand by strong assertions which reflected a summary of what is presumably known; in Durston’s passage, no such firm declaration is made. One could view such a construction in two ways. First, it may indicate that the “tales” Durston refers to do not actually exist; second, however, it may indicate that Durston is deferring to the possibility that the reader needs a greater range of choices in choosing a restaurant.

However, there seems to be another level to Durston's choice of known factors to use in fashioning an explanation. If no support is offered to prove that tales of high prices "abound," then the attempt to explain their pervasiveness by reference to "these days of the high yen" seems suspect. Is Durston saying that the "high yen" is the reason for high prices in Japan, or that the "high yen" creates a general anxiety which leads to a large number of stories, or that some restaurants, either in anticipation of tourist attitudes toward the "high yen" or as a general practice, raise their rates high enough to become "money-gobbling monsters"? Given the construction of Durston's passage, any or all of these interpretations is possible; moreover, this multiplicity ensures that the level of unpredictability is increased, even as Durston's overall strategy, as stated, appears to be to alleviate uncertainty. Durston seems to introduce uncertainty so that she may more appropriately offer comfort.

Notice, however, that the dimension of tension seems to be dictating the terms of Durston's phrasing. In order to demonstrate the value of her "inside information," Durston must counterpose such information against a popular perception; furthermore, lacking a legitimate popular perception, Durston is obliged to create one by suggesting that her point is demonstrated by "tales of horror floating around the world." On the other hand, since "many restaurants" have their menus posted outside so the tourist can see the prices (a common enough cultural practice), why is it necessary for Durston to bring up the issue of "money gobbling monsters" at all? One possible reason is that Durston expects common stereotypes—the "high yen" expense, as well the possibility of natives taking advantage of the foreign tourist—to be taken at face value by the reader. The reader is left with the impression that Durston's wisdom can be used to rescue Western tourists from a trap that may never have existed in the first place! To demonstrate this, one need only consider how the passage might have read had Durston simply stated that most restaurants have their menus posted and that the tourist could check prices for him- or herself. To get this self-evident

information, one would hardly need to invest in buying the Fodor's guidebook. Perhaps this is why Durston seems obliged to add advice to the end of the passage informing tourists of the possibility of sales tax and service charge (although this too is seldom news to anyone who has dined in restaurants).

One might justify Durston's approach by arguing that there is nothing wrong with allaying tourists' fears in advance of their visit to a foreign country. However, as the above analysis demonstrates, Durston's purpose appears to be far more complex than mere reassurance. She is attempting to "sell" her information based upon a problematic linkage of that information with a number of questionable assumptions, including the stereotypes that Japanese take advantage of Westerners (the "high yen" corresponds to "money gobbling monsters"), that the unfamiliarity of most tourists with the Japanese language makes them prone to being fooled, that most tourists are paranoid ("one must not be afraid to venture outside the hotel"), and so forth. Paradoxically, Durston's strategy to allay tourist fears depends on her ability to activate the fears in what she takes to be the shared experience of these same tourists.

Durston's strategy bears some similarity to the approaches taken in earlier editions of Fodor's in that the author tries to capitalize upon tourist fears in order to justify what is offered as advice. As in previous editions, tourist fears become the predictable factor of the equation and advice the unpredictable. The difference, however, is in the fears that are chosen as those elements that the tourist must be warned against. In earlier editions, tourists were warned about standards for cleanliness in food and drink, presumably because that fear was more prominent in the minds of tourists at that time. In the 1990 edition, on the other hand, Durston finds it necessary to activate another form of fear, one more suited to the times: the fear of being financially exploited by Japanese. In 1990, the perception of Japanese as having taken advantage of Westerners is widespread, supported not only by reports about the "high yen," but by Japanese ownership of property in Western nations, by Japan's

reputation for cultural borrowing, by Japan's trade imbalance with Western nations, and by many other popular stereotypes. Thus, sociohistorical factors appear to be strongly affecting such appeals to stereotypes: in 1962, it would probably have been less effective to depict Japan as an economic exploiter; nor would it have been as persuasive in 1990 to depict Japan as a place where standards of food cleanliness are questionable.

Another example in which stereotypes are used to build up a picture of Japanese cultural life is found in the following description of dining in Buddhist temples, from the 1962 Fodor's chapter on Nara. The anonymous author is evidently very surprised by the fact that people in a religious vocation could be so adept at the preparation of food. In the emphasized portion of the passage, notice how the author combines information which is expected or unsurprising (that Buddhists are religious) together with information which—to the author at least—is unexpected (that some Buddhists are good at preparing food).

To experience dining out in the most unique manner possible, we recommend highly that you take luncheon or dinner at one of the Buddhist temples. The food will be purely vegetarian, but done in an amazing variety of tastes and manners. Not only is such a meal an epicurean delight, but the surroundings are purely Japanese and thoroughly refreshing after a morning of tramping through Nara. The fact that Buddhist monks and acolytes serve you will not prevent you from ordering a bottle of cold beer or some sake to go with the meal. You are advised, however, that you must order in advance, either the day before, or during the morning of the same day you intend to visit the temple for lunch or dinner. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 317)

In this passage, the author betrays a number of preconceptions about Buddhism which prove to be unsupported in fact. The first is that Buddhists are opposed to sensory enjoyment. The author implies his or her prejudice by use of the introductory phrase, describing the experience of dining in a Buddhist temple as the "most unique [dining] possible." By using this extravagant depiction, the author reveals his or her

belief that good dining at a temple is an experience without parallel. At the same time, the author betrays a second preconception: that Buddhists do not enjoy diversity. Notice that the author expresses delight at the “amazing variety” of the cuisine. Finally, the author apparently believes that Buddhist philosophy forbids not only practitioners, but those who dine at temples, from drinking alcoholic beverages.

Thus, in an attempt to provide the reader with what is considered unusual or unique information, the author betrays what he or she holds as stereotypical views of Buddhist philosophy and approach to life. In other words, it is the style of the quoted passage—particularly when viewed according to the dimension of tension—that reveals that the author, when it comes to Buddhism, considers exquisite dining to be the exception rather than the rule. Furthermore, the preconceptions that this writer apparently thinks are shared with potential readers comprise the predictable element of the description, whereas the author’s “amazement,” together with the reasons for his or her reaction, comprise the unpredictable element.

However, this author takes a narrow view of Buddhism, a religion which numbers among its many manifestations sects in which worldly achievement and sensual enjoyment are considered morally good. However, as shown at other points in this analysis, given the restrictive summaries characteristic of previous Fodor’s references to Buddhism and other religions (through, for example, ignoring the religious symbolism in statuary such as the Daibutsu²⁵ and the Kudara-kannon,²⁶ it is hardly surprising that the anonymous author of the Nara chapter would be unaware of the finer points of secular Buddhism. Nevertheless, by treating dining in the temple as an extraordinary activity, the author may also be preparing his or her readers for further stereotypes about Buddhism. Lacking awareness that Buddhist practices may encompass both the values of the phenomenal world together with asceticism, both the

²⁵ See Chapter Three, pp. 140-142.

²⁶ See Chapter Four, pp. 226-228.

Fodor's author and the readers of the Fodor's guidebook may be led to expect that all aspects of Buddhism are similarly modifiable, even those which represent the highest spiritual aspirations of the religion (such as ecstatic artistic inspiration). Since, according to the style of the Fodor's author, readers are predisposed to judge religious aspects of Buddhism as being of less importance, such failure to discriminate Buddhism's finer points may only serve to reinforce further mistaken preconceptions.

In many cases, all that is required to dissect the Fodor's stylistic mechanisms which use stereotypes to create a sense of tension is the critical reader's willingness to apply the tension construct. One need simply ask oneself what factors appear to be assumed by the author as common knowledge and what is offered to the reader as presumably new (unfamiliar, unpredictable) information. Separation of the predictable and unpredictable elements can often lead to immediate insight about the author's agendas.

Providing "inside" information. As suggested in the discussion of Durston's passage on the expense of dining in Japan, there is sometimes a strong suggestion of a commercial motivation for providing information to counter the real or imagined stereotypes of tourists. In the following example, taken from the 1962 chapter on Kyoto, Francis King indulges in a favored activity of those who write touristic materials: providing "inside" information. This specific discursive form is particularly interesting in light of the dimension of tension. Often, the writer of the tour guidebook wishes to establish his or her work as more authoritative than other work on the same subject. In addition to making opinionated statements about sites and locations (numerous examples of which are analyzed elsewhere in this dissertation), the author may also choose to give the reader information which suggests that he or she can obtain such information only by reading the author's description. In the passage quoted below, Francis King tells the reader how to see the best of the artistic holdings of the Nishi Honganji, a famous Kyoto temple:

When you enter the temple precincts, first view the two large halls facing you and then make your way to the temple office situated on the extreme left as you face the buildings, and ask there for permission to view the apartments and buildings in the interior. If you do not do this, you will see only what is open to the general Japanese public and you will miss the major treasures. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 301)

Through the use of a directive narrative with a great deal of sensory detail, King steps the reader through the temple environment (this spatial-direction style is common in many of Fodor's site descriptions, perhaps even more so in the more pragmatically focused 1990 edition).²⁷ In this passage, the known is represented by information which is available to most people ("what is open to the Japanese public"), and the unknown by the "inside" information provided by King. These two forms of information are juxtaposed in a way that suggests, not simply that the reader can obtain access normally denied other tourists, but that advantage can be gained over Japanese: if one does not take advantage of King's information, one will see only "what is open to the Japanese public."

The implication that a foreign visitor would be permitted to see Japanese artifacts denied to the majority of Japanese citizens is troubling, particularly when it is a Western writer who is drawing that conclusion. Moreover, given the other stereotypes in the Fodor's guidebook (such as the often-repeated charge that Japanese are insular and even xenophobic), King's promise of privileged access almost certainly cannot be true: why would Japanese listen to a request from a foreigner who probably speaks only English, and give preferential treatment to that person rather than one of their own countrymen?

²⁷ An example of this style, in which emotion is traded for straightforward information, is also discussed in analysis of the use of Sarusawa Pond as a geographical marker, rather than the site of a particularly romantic and tragic story (see the discussion of uncompletedness in Chapter Seven).

The dimension of tension suggests that each utterance is to a certain extent formulated in awareness of accepted rules of social discourse (these are the predictable elements of linguistic formulations). The accepted social factor here seems to be the assumption on the part of the Western writer (King) that the Western visitor has a right to see what the Japanese people may not see. The fact that tourists sometimes value such purportedly “inside” information highly is a reflection of the difference in power between the visitor and the visited. The visitor often assumes the right to take advantage of the “best” that the site has to offer: the cheapest rates, the best value for one’s money, the avoidance of being cheated by the cultural Other, and so on. However, when one encounters such “inside” information in the touristic text, one should certainly look beyond the information’s immediate utilitarian value and try to discover at what price to the cultural Other the information has been bought.

King’s description creates a feeling of tension, sensed intuitively in the suggestion that the Western visitor, armed with King’s unique information, is somehow tricking the Japanese public. However, here, as in the passage on Japanese dining by Durston,²⁸ the predictable elements of the tension seem suspect. Just as Durston could not attribute her “money-gobbling monster” metaphor to any identifiable person or persons, so King never says that the tourist will be disadvantaged by not following his advice; this outcome is only implied in the final sentence which suggests that the unwary tourist may “miss the major treasures.”

To fully comprehend the opportunistic undertones of King’s purportedly privileged information, one need only compare his 1962 account to the account found in the more pragmatically oriented 1990 Fodor’s:

Nishi-Hongangi Temple. Visits to some of the buildings are permitted four times a day on application from the temple office. Prior to leaving home, write to the temple (enclosing a self-addressed envelope and an

²⁸ See this chapter, pp. 319-323.

international reply coupon) at Shichijo-Agaru, Horikawa-dori, Shomogyo-ku, Kyoto. Give your name, the number of people in your party, and the day and time you would like to visit. You can also phone for an appointment after you arrive in Kyoto: tel. 075/371-5181; because you'll probably experience language problems, ask your hotel to make the arrangements for you. (Fodor's, 1990, pp. 248-249)

Stylistically, there are great differences between the depictions in the 1962 and 1990 editions. In the latter edition, there is no attempt to set up tension between the known and unknown aspects of visiting Nishi-Hongangi. Absent also from the 1990 edition is the attempt to suggest that the Western visitor can obtain some advantage over Japanese visitors; in fact, the 1990 edition places the Western visitor at a disadvantage by suggesting that one will ". . . probably experience language problems." Finally, the information about visiting the temple is relayed in a factual, straightforward, unembellished style,²⁹ in contrast to King's attempts to heighten the drama associated with a fairly ordinary activity for tourists. The 1990 edition, far from heightening the familiar/unfamiliar contrast which leads to tension, appears to be reducing tension by over-emphasizing elements of the familiar.³⁰

Combining "contradictory" elements of Japanese culture. Since the visitor to Japan is likely to view a significant amount of his or her experience as new, non-Japanese authors describing Japan often like to point to purported contradictions in Japanese cultural life.³¹ In such stylistic formulations, authors often familiarize readers with

²⁹ A similarly straightforward style is employed in the 1991 edition of the JTB guidebook in its description of this location: "The paintings are by Kano Koi and Kaiho Yusefso, while those adorning the sliding screens in Kuroshoin (a National Treasure), next to Shiroshoin, are by Kano Eitoku. Admission to Shoin is permitted only on Saturday afternoons and Sundays (10:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m., 1:30 p.m., and 2:30 p.m.). It is granted on application to the temple office by a reply postal card. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, pp. 674-675) Comparing King's 1962 description with both the 1990 Fodor's and the 1991 JTB's descriptions further emphasizes the idiosyncratic nature of King's style.

³⁰ By "familiar," I mean "easily available," not necessarily that the information will be known to the visitor.

³¹ The early editions of Fodor's are replete with examples of constructions which utilize contradiction. For example, Edward Seidensticker's chapter titles are often revealing: "Japan: A Crowded, Lonely Land" sets up a theme elaborated at length in Seidensticker's chapter (that despite the large numbers of Japanese in metropolitan centers, Japanese people are aloof, withdrawn, and hesitant to express themselves to outsiders).

two elements of Japanese life, placing these in antithesis to demonstrate their “contradiction,” then concluding with analysis demonstrating the author’s insight in being able to resolve the seeming “contradiction.” As explained in the dimension of tension, such formulations contain elements of both the predictable and the unpredictable: the predictable, in the form of information which is presumed to be known, the unpredictable in the forms both of the contradiction and its resolution by the author. To illustrate, I turn to the following descriptions of Japanese customs and culture, taken from Seidensticker’s chapter, “Arts and Lesser Pleasures: Traditional Tastes for New Vogues.”³² I will examine two key passages from this chapter.

In the first passage, which is in fact the initial paragraph in the chapter, Seidensticker sets up a theme which will be pursued for the remainder of the discussion: the conservativeness of Japanese, as balanced against their drive to experiment with the new and different. As will be evident, Seidensticker could hardly have fashioned a more appropriate expression of the dimension of tension: the passage acknowledges the predictable as a base against which to compare the unpredictable.

The Japanese have attracted much attention of late for the austere good taste of their architecture and household furnishings. It by no means tells the whole of the story, a fact to which anyone who has observed the mad array of colors that is the Ginza at night or the splash and clutter of a plebeian entertainment district can testify. Yet it is certainly there and important, and it makes a good beginning for a consideration of Japanese accomplishments in the arts. [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 83; identical statements occur in the 1969, 1976, and 1982 editions)

In this passage, one sees the clear distinction between giving readers what they expect (the “austere good taste” for which Japanese have “attracted so much attention of late”), conjoined with something they might not expect (the “mad array” of colors

³² This too is a subtitle formed from counterposing contradictory elements: “tradition” suggests the old, “vogues” the new.

that “is the Ginza at night”). The implied base of knowledge for these opposing characterizations is interesting. Even a person who has never visited Japan might still be aware that the Japanese “have attracted attention” for their austerity; on the other hand, a person who has never visited the country is unlikely to be able to verify that the Ginza marketplace is a “mad array of colors.” The former characterization, being expected and predictable, is based on a cultural stereotype and hence should easily fit into the prior beliefs of the reader. But the latter characterization would, for most Western readers, be less likely to be included as commonly shared knowledge about Japan.

Evidently, then, we have in this passage the struggle spoken of by the Bakhtin group: there is a tension shown between what the author believes the audience to know and what the same author apparently sees as new knowledge. But notice how Seidensticker employs the tension suggested by this polarity to bootstrap a theme for the remainder of the chapter: “. . . it [that is, the contrast between austerity and exuberance] makes a good beginning for a consideration of Japanese accomplishments in the arts.”

For what reason could this comparison be considered a “good beginning” for a thoroughgoing analysis of an artistic heritage as rich and varied as Japan’s? Apart from the fact that the comparison helps Seidensticker in making a point that he already believes to be true, the analogy seems somewhat forced. One senses that “austere good taste” must refer to homes and furnishings, whereas “mad colors” are associated with the noisy and commercial Ginza district. However, the key to understanding the role of the dimension of tension in this passage lies in the realization that the forced comparison is made because this is the point on which the author wants to convince the reader. Seidensticker has chosen these points of comparison, conjoining them in tension, and thus alerting the critical reader that there is more to the passage than meets the eye.

In a second, related, passage from the chapter, Seidensticker retreats from an earlier criticism of the literary tradition of the Japanese, in which it was suggested that Japanese haiku, the enigmatic naturalistic poems typically comprised of a mere seventeen syllables, were representative of Japanese literature as a whole. An important point to remember is that, despite the retraction in the passage below, there is no suggestion that the initial comparison³³ is anything other than a precise description.

Nor should it be thought that the tiny haiku, big enough for a pair of suggestive nature images and no more, is the whole of Japanese literature. The Japanese too are capable of sustained flights, and their greatest book, a long 11th century piece of fiction called The Tale of Genji, has been described as the first novel in the literature of the world. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 84)

If haiku are not "the whole of Japanese literature," one is tempted to ask, what was the reason for bringing up that suggestion in the first place? Notice that the tone of the "retraction" is somewhat grudging. More importantly, however, one is once again confronted with the "forced comparison." The author has chosen perhaps the briefest of Japanese literary forms and compared it with one of the most extensive, and in so doing, appears to have covered a great deal of territory in between the two extremes.

Applying the lens of tension, one also sees in the forced comparison an example of conjoining the predictable with the unpredictable. The predictable element is the haiku, which is taught in many American English and literature courses. However, The Tale of Genji is less familiar to Western readers, so that its introduction here—

³³ The earlier passage portrays Japanese literature in the following terms: "A similar restraint is also to be found in literature, particularly poetry, and the drama. Through most of their history the Japanese have limited themselves to tiny poetic forms, the ultimate being the seventeen-syllable haiku" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 84).

particularly subsequent to the earlier suggestion that the haiku is more representative of Japanese literature—supplies the unpredictable side of the tension equation.

The implications of the heteroglossic joining of ideas in tension are somewhat the same as for the previous example. By choosing the extreme ends of the continuum (shortest literary genre to longest) the Fodor's author dispenses with the burden of being forced to deal with the intervening points on the continuum. Thus, the linking of haiku and novel is hardly accidental, but appears to be a deliberate attempt to contain within a single sentence the whole of Japanese literature. To state the obvious conclusion, as the author has done, that the haiku is “not the whole of Japanese literature” is in fact an admission that this is precisely what the author did try to do in the earlier passage.

In the following example,³⁴ Seidensticker pursues a similar agenda, employing tension to juxtapose the familiar (the appearance of New York subway travelers) with the unfamiliar (the appearance of passengers on a “big city” commuter train in Japan).

To the Westerner who arrives after having seen other Asian countries, Japan may seem like home, or at least an approach to it. The efforts of the Japanese to be well groomed must be described as successful, and a commuter train in one of the big cities is likely to contain fewer frayed cuffs than a New York subway train. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 82)

The stylistic convention in this passage was known to the Bakhtin circle as the hybrid construction, and it was employed by Bakhtin in his analysis of Dostoevsky's novels. The hybrid construction involves the conjoining in a single passage, without clear demarcation, of utterances written in different styles. Throughout the narrative up until this point, Seidensticker had used the third person active mode, seldom switching to the passive voice. However, in describing Japanese grooming habits

³⁴ This passage is also analyzed in the discussion of the dimension of uncompletedness, Chapter Seven, pp. 472-475, as well as the discussion of the dimension of specificity, Chapter Three, pp. 69-71.

(which surely cannot be applied to all Japanese), the author states, "The efforts of the Japanese to be well groomed must be described as successful." The use of the passive voice often signals an increased distance between the author and the reader: rather than delivering an opinion, the author gives a judgment which presumably reflects the opinions of others, while at the same time removing his or her evaluation from the realm of the overly subjective. Moreover, the judgment is given somewhat grudgingly ("efforts . . . must be described as successful"), and further, it is said that the Japanese have been striving to emulate some standard that has been settled upon by other social actors (their "efforts to" be well-groomed have been weighed and found acceptable by the author of the guidebook).

A further marker of the hybrid construction is to be noted in the latter portion of the passage: ". . . and a commuter train in one of the big cities is likely to contain fewer frayed cuffs than a New York subway train." Again, the predictable or known, as well as the unpredictable or unknown, are combined to depict Japanese according to qualities presumed to be possessed by people of New York. Hidden in the generalization is an even greater assumption of authority, namely, the author's right to deliver evaluations based upon relatively trivial evidence ("frayed cuffs . . . on subway trains").

The conjunction "and" is itself a clue to the tenuousness of this linkage: not "because," which would require more precise causative argumentation; not "since," which would require a more narrow formulation of the former utterance; and certainly not simply leaving the conjunction out entirely, since the linkage of the substantial (the generalization about grooming delivered in the passive voice) with the trivial ("frayed cuffs") would leave the author open to charges of incompetence in writing (the connection between "claim" and "proof" is not sufficiently self-evident to allow one to dispense with a conjunction). No, "and" is the perfect choice for Seidensticker: in addition to its function of allowing the author to avoid responsibility for linking the

“evidence” in the former and latter parts of the utterance, it also absolves the author of any responsibility for linking two different styles. Both parts of the utterance (alternatively, since they are in two different styles, the Bakhtin group might argue they are two different utterances) make unwarranted generalizations, though each of a different character. The former generalizes from the safety of the passive voice acting in place of the arbiter’s culture in making judgments about “good grooming taste,” while the latter adopts a much different tone, assuming authority from “having been there” (saying in effect, “If you had traveled on the subway train in ‘some of the big cities,’ as I have, you too would confirm that there are not so many frayed cuffs.”). The weak connector “and” constitutes a sleight-of-word, hiding the fact that both judgments are objectionably condescending, though in different ways. In this latter portion of the quoted passage, one sees the conjunction “and” serving as a cue to the insubstantial conjoining of the known to the unknown.

Evaluating contrasting elements of Japanese culture. A final characteristic stylistic mechanism encountered in the Fodor’s series is one in which elements of Japanese culture are conjoined for the purposes of drawing a contrast. For the Fodor’s authors, this mechanism can be somewhat more difficult to execute than others, since its effectiveness depends on the making comparisons about features of Japanese life concerning which readers may have little or no information. Nevertheless, the evaluative contrast is common to touristic literature (though used with considerably less frequency in the JTB’s series³⁵) and is taken up here as an example of the dimension of tension.

In the following example, Francis King describes the city of Kyoto by comparing it to the presumably better-known city of Tokyo. Beginning with a more reasonable casting of the comparison, in which King seems to display more caution than at other

³⁵ This difficulty is less onerous for the JTB series, primarily because JTB does not consider making the Western visitor comfortable with Japanese culture to be one of its major goals. Rather, JTB aims at providing a thorough information base upon which to build an understanding of Japanese life.

points in his chapter, he nevertheless still arrives at one of his habitual conclusions: that East and West are separate from each other and that the tourist will inevitably be drawn to the "East."

Tokyo, now the largest city in the world, is often compared unfavorably with Kyoto, its noise, vulgarity, and dirt being contrasted with Kyoto's calm, good manners, and cleanliness. But although the people of Kyoto are noted for their conservatism and reserve, Kyoto has often taken a leading part in the modernization of Japan. It was in Kyoto that the first primary school in Japan was established, that a street-car first ran, and that a power-house first functioned. Kyoto is now the only Japanese city that has its own municipal orchestra. Old and new, East and West have always mingled here, even if it is the old and the East that chiefly interest the modern visitor. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 275)

In this illustration of the dimension of tension, the predictable is represented by the qualities of Tokyo, assumed to be known to Fodor's readers, whereas the more unfamiliar aspects of Kyoto are offered as the unpredictable element. Nevertheless, King continues, Kyoto in fact possesses a number of similarities to Tokyo which are often overlooked. In the first portion of this passage, therefore, King displays a less extreme basis for his comparison than in other examples we have analyzed from his chapters. Notice the difference in tone that results when more allowance is made for divergence. On reading the passage, one is more convinced that King has thought the matter through. In the terms of the Bakhtin circle, the "new" evidence is reasonably proposed within the framework of "old" evidence and the result is a far more convincing narrative.

In other examples, I have referred to King's habit of beginning with broad assertion and ending up with overly idealistic portrayals of the cultural phenomenon or locale in question.³⁶ Here, however, King begins with less emphasis on generality

³⁶ For example, earlier in King's chapter, one finds the following: "In Kyoto, more than anywhere else in Japan, one is aware of East and West, the old and the new existing side by side; but they exist not in opposition, but in perfect harmony and peace. . . . What is best of past and present has here been united;

and more attention to detail, and yet ends up at the idealistic portrayal (the second underlined portion of the quoted passage). Thus, it will be instructive to trace the path of the argument, to see how the dimension of tension manifests itself, first, in the comparison between Kyoto and Tokyo, and later, in the comparison between “East” and “West.”

One can begin by speculating about the position in which King finds himself at the outset of this quotation. He is seemingly aware that Kyoto is, despite its rich cultural heritage, a less-well-known location than Tokyo. To find points of comparison, he therefore centers upon stereotypical views of Tokyo: it is crowded, it is noisy, and it is more associated with progress rather than “tradition.” Moreover, he qualifies his position by implying that the “unfavorable” comparison between the two cities is popularly propounded,³⁷ but that this view is not necessarily shared by King himself. He elaborates the exceptions he takes to the alleged popular view by offering information which counters the stereotypes of Tokyo as a “progressive” city and Kyoto as the “traditional” repository of Japanese culture.

The choice of these two categories, however, is most interesting: notice that it is Tokyo which is said to be the unfavorable side of the comparison, based on the fact that Tokyo must suffer the less desirable qualities of urban life which inevitably accompany “progress.” Why not put the matter with Kyoto also claiming to be progressive? Why does King not say that Tokyo is also a repository of “traditional culture” (which, by any account, it is)? The comparison, which appears to be bidirectional, is revealed through application of the lens of tension to be unidirectional: King is discussing only one-half of the progressive/traditional continuum with regard

to mediate between the two has been the role of Kyoto for the last 1,000 years” [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 278).

³⁷ Here, too, one sees the use of the “straw man” tactic: King asserts what is supposedly a general report without explicitly attributing the report to any particular person, only to refute the “report” in subsequent analysis.

to Tokyo, while at the same time discussing both halves of the continuum with regard to Kyoto.

Now one is in possession of a possible answer to the question of how King gets to the second comparison, the second underlined portion of the passage, in which he—once again—states that Kyoto is a place which harmoniously, “perfectly,” blends East and West. As in a previous example, King makes the curious assertion that Kyoto has for some time successfully blended East and West. But in this comparison, he makes explicit what was only implied in the previous example: in this example, he states that it is only the “East” (the old, the traditional) that holds interest for the “modern” visitor.

It is clear that King has provided an uncharacteristically tentative comparison of two Japanese cities, categorizing—as he has previously—cultural practices into one of two very broad categories (“East” and “West”), apparently in the belief that, although Kyoto (in contradistinction to Tokyo) possesses strong elements of both the “progressive” and the “traditional,” it is the “traditional” that is of interest to the modern visitor.

Up until the very last phrase, the critical reader operating from within the Bakhtin framework might feel him- or herself to be following King’s reasoning. These last words, however, are quite unexpected. Wouldn’t it be more reasonable to assume that the “modern” visitor would be more interested in the modern (progressive) aspects of life in Japan? Indeed, King’s direction in the paragraph seems to be tending toward just this conclusion. Yet at the very end of the passage, King seems to divert the argument into an unexpected channel.

I believe that this puzzling turn of phrase is best explained by the dimension of tension. In King’s chapter, the passage currently being analyzed occurs prior to the statement cited earlier concerning the “perfect blend” between East and West. Thus the East/West comparison in reality prepares the reader for the more elaborated

version. Remember that explaining the dimension of tension relies on the conjunction of what is known with what is unknown. Previously, the known was conceptualized in largely distant terms, including, for example, stereotypical views of cities, broad notions of culture, and so forth. However, the known may also be conceived in more localized terms, as when previously known information is placed in tension with unknown information within the chapter (or other linguistic unit) itself. In effect, the reference to Kyoto's blending of East and West in the current passage serves to establish a known base for the elaboration (new or unpredictable knowledge) that will be performed later.

The earlier passage read, "Old and new, East and West have always mingled here, even if it is the old and the East that chiefly interest the modern visitor." The later elaboration reads, "In Kyoto, more than anywhere else in Japan, one is aware of East and West, the old and the new existing side by side; but they exist not in opposition, but in perfect harmony and peace. . . . What is best of past and present has here been united; to mediate between the two has been the role of Kyoto for the last 1,000 years." This explains why the earlier quotation, while necessary, nevertheless seems out of place. King is preparing the reader for the subsequent quotation which, as noted, is the more questionable.

A brief digression about the process of publishing may not be out of place here. Often one thinks of the process of writing as a relatively straightforward operation: because the narrative is read in linear fashion, one needs to remind oneself that it almost certainly was neither written nor edited that way. Thus, to say that King's earlier evaluation prepares the reader for the later evaluation is not to say that the preparatory phrase is placed in advance or executed in sequential order. It is just as possible that either King or an editor noticed the later utterance and as a result thought it necessary to add the earlier utterance. By matching the two within the framework of the dimension of tension and by not being diverted from judging new information for

old (or vice versa), one is able to discern the possible reasons for what appears to be a fairly consistent pattern of reference.

One final point about the influence of Kyoto on Japan's "progress" needs to be made. Notice that King must express his opinion about Kyoto's progress only in terms which are likely to be accepted by Western readers: "It was in Kyoto that the first primary school in Japan was established, that a street-car first ran, and that a power-house first functioned. Kyoto is now the only Japanese city that has its own municipal orchestra." Whether or not these examples are the only ones available to King, it is clear that they represent a special definition of "progress," and one which is likely to make more sense to someone who shares that definition. For someone who does not happen to think that street-cars or municipal orchestras indicate cultural advance, King's assertion is likely to be more problematic.

JTB—Stylistic mechanisms. Like the Fodor's guidebook series, JTB's guidebooks are also consistently marked by a number of stylistic idiosyncrasies. Stylistic mechanisms in the JTB's series relating to tension include the following: (1) using information in a casual way; (2) creating unfamiliarity through fulsome description; and (3) selective combination of predictable and unpredictable elements.

Using information in a casual way. The predictable or standard elements of a given point of view evolve over long periods of time, and rely upon the incremental building of what comes to be accepted as standard knowledge. In the JTB's descriptions, large bodies of literature are available to support arguments, so that JTB authors often use materials that have come to be acceptable (that is, sanctioned as "legitimate" sources over time). Interestingly, however, in JTB's discourse it seems to be less a question of whether "acceptable materials" tend to support one's position than whether they are simply available to be used.

As has been pointed out repeatedly, there is often little connection between what appears in standard guidebook descriptions and the established body of

knowledge which might conceivably confirm or disconfirm them. Thus, standard knowledge appears to serve primarily as window-dressing, stylistic elaborations permitting the author to stand elevated upon the existence of “historical” descriptions (and thus permitting broad declarations about what is “best” about Japanese culture), while at the same time not tying the author too closely to the substance of such representations. In other words, almost as soon as the references to established knowledge have been brought into the discussion, they are dismissed, having performed their primary function of supporting the author’s credentials as an informed commentator.

The reason for the process of selection and recombination is to be found in the agendas of the writers of tour guidebooks. Guidebook authors have a particular point of view to propound, a given perspective which must be “sold” in preference to other perspectives competing for the right to represent the target culture. Thus, discourse in tour guidebooks uses standard or established knowledge as an array of elements upon which to base its persuasive messages.

It would seem, then, that one way to discover the author’s intent is to look at how standard knowledge is employed in that author’s discourse. As noted above, one of the features which distinguishes the JTB guidebook from other touristic literature is the overwhelming depth and breadth of its descriptions: it is indeed less a tour guidebook and more an encyclopedic reference work. However, like the encyclopedia it resembles, the JTB guidebook is saturated with references. For example, the 1955 edition contains an extensive bibliography with books in both Japanese and English (there is no bibliography in the 1975 and 1991 editions, which perhaps reflects Japan’s increasing confidence—with the passage of time, there is less need to place responsibility for describing Japan upon any source other than JTB). For the Fodor’s guidebook, there is no bibliography in the 1962 through 1982 editions, although there is a section on recommended reading in the 1990 edition. Yet when it comes to

interpretation of history, both guidebook series select from the pool of historical facts, and both use their selected data to fashion discourse which is in line with the goals they wish to promote. It is not fair to say that the 1955 JTB guidebook, which has an extensive bibliography, is more believable or credible than the 1962 Fodor's guide, which does not. Neither series cites references extensively, but the 1955 JTB guidebook makes bibliographic references available for the tourist or other reader to check them if they wish. Whether the reason for including the references is to impress readers with the depth of JTB's descriptions, or to place its descriptions within an accepted framework, or for some other reason, it remains true that the inclusion of the bibliographic sources is a deliberate strategy chosen by JTB to link its descriptions with other standard representations of Japan. Moreover, the known references can be seen as emphasizing the predictable elements of Japanese culture: not only are the references cited as standard sources, but many can be verified by checking the library. In the earlier edition, the JTB appeared to have needed such predictable information in order to counterbalance the amount of unfamiliarity presumed to be shared by its readership. This conclusion seems to be confirmed by the removal of the bibliography from the 1975 and 1991 editions; in these editions, with the increasing familiarity (predictability) of Japanese culture, JTB may have felt that it was no longer necessary to counterbalance the unpredictable with predictable, "standard," information.

Creating unfamiliarity through fulsome description. Often, in order to enhance reader interest in a given site or location, authors of touristic description indulge in what might be termed the "fulsome description." In such descriptions, the virtues of a location are presented to such an exaggerated degree that the author's credibility seems suspect on its face.

We have seen a number of examples of this stylistic mechanism in both the Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks. However, given the apparent need of the Fodor's authors and editors to retain an air of critical evaluation, they seldom indulge in

fanciful depictions of Japan.³⁸ The JTB, on the other hand, frequently uses fulsome description to boast about the “wonders” of Japan. Certainly, the fact that JTB guidebooks are published by the government may have something to do with the frequency of fulsome description; one can hardly encounter a touristic description sanctioned by any government body that does not describe a given location as beautiful beyond words. Thus, while the format of such descriptions may be seen as inevitable and hence highly standardized and predictable, the standard format must be unique in the way in which it combines the best scenic features of a given location and attempts to downplay its weaker points. Consider the following example:

Japan lacks the grand-scale scenery found in America and Europe, but it has a unique beauty all its own that makes it one of the most picturesque countries in the world. Seasonal changes, the time of day, and even weather conditions enhance the natural beauty of the country. The infinite variety found in the coastline, islands, mountains, valleys, lakes, rivers, rocks, forests and plains is a characteristic feature of Japanese scenery. Temples, shrines, feudal castles—both restored and left in ruins—farmhouses and other typical Japanese structures blend harmoniously with the natural scenery. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, pp. 76-77)

In the passage above, one notes some of the standard exaggerations associated with fulsome descriptions: “most picturesque,” “infinite variety,” and “blend harmoniously.” These comprise the elements of predictability. At the same time, however, even though these descriptions may be applied to some of the scenery encountered on a daily basis, they could hardly apply to every location, or even to most locations. Certainly there are locations which are not “picturesque,” or structures that do not “blend harmoniously” (whatever that might mean) with the natural scenery. Yet this style of description remains one of the common forms of touristic discourse.

³⁸ One is tempted to wonder, however, whether Fodor’s descriptions of sites in the United States more frequently use fulsome description.

I believe that the dimension of tension affects fulsome descriptions in the following way. The predictable elements (the standard fulsome adjectives, the format of the genre itself) permit the author to fashion a framework upon which to situate the unexpected or unpredictable information that needs to be presented. Even though the reader expects certain results from the standard scenic descriptions (ugly scenic elements, for example, are not likely to be mentioned), one presumes that the specific elements of the described location will be new to the reader: they will comprise the unpredictable elements which must be fitted to the familiar framework.

Onto the familiar framework of standard scenery description, then, the JTB guidebook author fits a number of specifically Japanese elements (such as “feudal castles”). The assumption appears to be that these elements will have more meaning if they are presented in a format to which the audience is accustomed. Nevertheless, as even rudimentary analysis demonstrates, the net result is that nothing about Japan has really been described, for the simple reason that the descriptions are not sociohistorically specific. As the Bakhtin group argues, there is no such thing as an entity that is described by the phrase “feudal castle”: there are specific castles, in specific locations, but there is no “generic” castle, certainly not a castle which stands in a similarly general relation of “harmoniously blending” with equally general or abstract scenery. In this passage, then, one finds convincing verification of the Bakhtin group’s dimension of tension. Both the expected and unexpected elements, in dynamic opposition to each other, create a false sense of meaning where little meaning exists.

Selective combination of predictable and unpredictable elements. At other points in this discussion, I refer to the preoccupation which touristic writers appear to have with highly specific information; often, such information is presented as the foundation upon which one can base somewhat questionable conclusions. I turn now to two examples in which the JTB guidebook selects certain unusual historical details,

creatively recombining these details into general conclusions that direct reader attention toward selective readings of current and past events. Often, this stylistic mechanism achieves its effect by merging familiar and unfamiliar elements, as will be demonstrated in subsequent discussion.

In the first example, the JTB author discusses the combination of different styles of clothing worn by the royal family. Notice how smoothly the author makes the transition from the Meiji Restoration to the present time by referring to a cultural element which seems largely irrelevant to political life: ceremonial dress.

Socially, the Meiji Restoration of 1868 brought great changes. Age-old Court ceremonials were considerably modified or entirely replaced by European forms. Exceptions included dress concerned with the enthronement of the Emperor, the Crown Prince's marriage and Shinto services in the Imperial Palace sanctuary. The Emperor and the Empress now appear in court in European clothes, as do Court officials and ladies as well as the general public. On special occasions, a Court dress called keiko is worn by the ladies. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 218)

There are several elements of the tension between the familiar and the unfamiliar in the above passage. For example, one encounters the term "Western clothes," and one's immediate assumption is that it represents the familiar (whether the term actually does apply to the Western reader's experience is a question taken up momentarily). The unfamiliar is represented by the descriptions of Court dress (as it happens, this is quite unfamiliar, since only the Japanese name—keiko—is provided, not a description of what the "dress" might look like). Thus, apparently, the author has provided both elements of the dimension of tension.

On closer examination, however, one can see that, not only is the familiar not really familiar (one has difficulty visualizing what is meant by the descriptor "Western clothes"), but the unfamiliar is not really that unfamiliar (no details are offered—there is only a word that has no referent to anyone who has not encountered it before—hence, the details that are customarily provided as part of the dimension of tension are

absent). In other words, the supposedly familiar term, by its vagueness, is more unfamiliar, while the supposedly unfamiliar term, by the fact it is merely an abstraction, is more familiar (that is, particularly in this context, it looks like a Japanese word and one may take the author's word for it that it does describe a "dress").

This is particularly interesting in light of the extraordinary level of detail customarily used to describe most other aspects of Japanese culture in the JTB guidebooks. Use of this strategy tells us that the author's agenda may not be to describe dress, but to describe status. Had the author wished simply to describe "Western" and "Japanese" dress, that would have been simple enough, and a good strategy, if the author had been talking about anyone other than the royal family. Since it is royalty that is being described, however, a number of accommodations become necessary. First, since Japan has become a "modern" nation, it would hardly do to leave the impression that royalty held court in traditional Japanese dress. Second, however, it would be equally inappropriate to suggest that royalty, as a surviving visible symbol of traditionality, would completely abandon traditional dress, so keiko (for women, not men) are sometimes worn on special occasions. Indeed, given that royalty is being described, perhaps the choice of "dress" as a specific point of comparison is more appropriate than it may first appear. The dimension of tension permits the critical reader to probe the passage, based upon its actual and apparent use of predictable and unpredictable elements, and thereby to draw closer to what may be the author's true intentions.

Employing elements of the dimension of tension may be equally useful to the author of the JTB guidebook in the second example passage, in which he or she is discussing the holdings of the Todaiji Temple in Nara. Notice how the author again seeks to fuse the cultural knowledge which is assumed to be part of the reader's architectonics to the listing of the considerable possessions in the temple. The resultant

narrative yields an image which suggests not only that Japan is preeminent in the world of art collecting, but that indeed it is the center.

Along with the growing popularity and prosperity of Buddhism, art and industry also made great progress. Many splendid specimens have been preserved of the temple architecture, Buddhist sculpture, metal casting, painting, embroidery, lacquer work and other arts that flourished in these days. In the art history of Japan, this period is called the Tempyo Age. In the precincts of the Todaiji Temple at Nara is a repository known as the Shoso-in, which houses more than 9,000 articles of impressive beauty and craftsmanship. These treasures, most of which were used by Emperor Shomu, include several articles brought from Greece, the East Roman Empire (Byzantine Empire), Persia, India, China (of the Tang Dynasty) and Paikche (Korea). Redolent of exoticism, these age-old art specimens, mostly in a fine state of preservation, speak eloquently of the international character of Nara culture. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 87)

Here, the author does not simply rest on the unchallenged reputation of Nara as a repository of fine art, but attempts to further enhance Nara's reputation by demonstrating that it somehow "acquired" objects from other distant countries. This is a rather odd choice, particularly given that none of the imported objects is specifically described (whereas the Japanese holdings of the temple are catalogued in extraordinary detail), apart from the general description that they are "redolent of exoticism."

Some of the most obvious benefits of travel are those moments when one's perceptual horizons are extended by the realization that one's previous perceptions have been limited and, upon the provision of unexpected information, one is forced to revise previous ideas about a particular subject in a foreign culture. So it would be, one suspects, by the inclusion of information that classical Japan had sufficient international contacts to have acquired valuable objets d'art from many other countries.³⁹

³⁹ Personally, on initial reading, I found this information impressive and it provoked for me a reconsideration of my previous ideas about Japan.

The effect of expanding one's perception is seemingly achieved in this passage by the inclusion of familiar material (primarily in the form of references to art from other countries, such as Greece, which—as with the reference to “Western clothes,” above—seem to connect with readers' previous experience) together with unfamiliar elements (that objects from foreign countries had made their way to Japan in the distant past). As described in the dimension of tension, the combination of these two factors or elements results in an overall message that gives readers the impression that, if they had been entertaining the thought that ancient Japan was landlocked and isolated, they were wrong: the foreign objects “speak eloquently of the international character of Nara culture.”

This, at any rate, is apparently the message that is intended to be conveyed by the passage. However, whether the objects actually do “speak eloquently” of the internationalism of the Nara culture is somewhat questionable. For one thing, the specific character of the foreign holdings, their value, and indeed, even the specific countries from which they come, are left unspecified. Again, there is a careful management of the familiar element of the dimension of tension which could lead one mistakenly to assume that enough supportive detail has been provided. In fact, despite the appearance of specificity (the listing of countries, together with the approximate number of total holdings), there is very little specific detail in the passage, particularly concerning the provocative references to foreign art. Certainly, the passage raises far more questions than it answers (for example, how was the art “obtained”: by plunder, by gift, by cultural exchange?), leading one to suspect that just enough information is provided to whet the reader's appetite, but not enough to confirm that the holdings testify to the “international character” of Nara culture. One needs to be alert to this sort of persuasive strategy in tour guidebooks: a significant portion of touristic writing is devoted to the process of using individual pieces of

information, subtly expressed and creatively combined, to enhance the attractiveness of a particular culture.

**THE TOURISTIC TEXT AND SOCIOPOLITICAL STRUGGLE:
AN APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF MIKHAIL BAKHTIN
TO THE STUDY OF TOUR GUIDEBOOKS OF JAPAN, 1955 TO 1991**

Volume II

BY

GEORGE RICHARD HOLT

**B.S., Southern Illinois University, 1985
M.S., Southern Illinois University, 1986**

THESIS

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Speech Communication
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1994**

Urbana, Illinois

CHAPTER SIX

THE DIMENSION OF OPEN AND CLOSED PERCEPTION AND THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION

General Overview

The dimension of open and closed perception was introduced as the fourth of five dimensions derived from the work of the Bakhtin circle. As an element of cultural representation, open and closed perception links cultural description to the unique and idiosyncratic character of individual architectonic systems. Earlier, the dimension of open and closed perception was defined in the following terms: "All communication is based on the belief of the communicator that his/her own system of perception is open and unfinished, but that the system of perception of those s/he describes is closed and finished."

The principle of open and closed perception is based in part on the idea that each individual's architectonic system is unique to that individual alone, and incapable of being shared with other individuals. Therefore, the Bakhtin group argued, the describer of a culture can only surmise the nature of the meaning systems (architectonics) of the cultural Other. The more distinct the described culture from describer's culture, the more the describer must guess about the meaning the other culture. In effect, then, all cultural description limits, confines, and finishes the world of the member of the other culture, while at the same time expanding, freeing, and opening the world of the describer him- or herself.

Since each person's architectonic system is unique to that person alone, the Bakhtin group argued, no two representations of a given cultural feature can be the same: the describer's assumption that his or her world remains open (that is, characterized by the freedom to dictate the terms of the representation) is bound to

conflict with the assumptions of the person whose culture is being described. The member of the described culture is confined in the words of the describer.

The dimension of open and closed perception is a subtle and revealing concept which permits exploration of how cultural description limits understanding of culture, even when the describer's expressed purpose may be to expand reader perception. Since all description works, to some extent, to limit what is described, all cultural descriptions necessarily limit perception of the world of the cultural Other. Ironically, as we have seen, the cultural elements about which the author knows least are often most susceptible to confining descriptions.

How should one describe and introduce Japan to its visitors? The choices, while confined within, and unique to, sociohistorical context, are nevertheless selected by authors who describe Japan, and are based on unique authorial architectonic systems. Many potential choices about what to include in a description must be made: what kind of information should be selected, to what extent the details of each piece of information should be revealed, in what ways the information should be presented, what kinds of images of Japan are needed, how the audience should be addressed, and so on.

The passages from the Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks which are examined below as reflecting the dimension of open and closed perception represent a selection of some of the potential ways in which the perceptual horizon of the described is limited while the horizon of the describer is expanded. Both guidebook series contain a significant number of examples illustrating the dimension of open and closed perception. Analysis of these examples reveals identifiable attempts to limit perception of Japan. In some ways, it is easier to see the dimension of open and closed perception at work in the Fodor's series: Fodor's authors and editors, not being Japanese (except for Kiko Itasaka, who writes three chapters in the 1990 edition), frequently inscribe Japanese

culture in ways that seem to lack knowledge and understanding of Japanese life.¹ At the same time, however, there are many descriptions written by the JTB which also close reader perception of Japan. While the efforts of JTB have been shown consistently to be oriented toward providing a more positive image of Japan, there are also instances in which JTB's descriptions exclude key elements, perhaps to make certain that the primarily Western readership does not gain too negative a perception of Japan.²

As the example passages are analyzed, one should always keep in mind that no description can be fashioned without limiting what is described while at the same time allowing the author of the description to open his or her perception by choosing the resources that will be used to support the description. However, by applying the lens of open and closed perception, one will at least be able to more fully describe the sociohistorical circumstances which lead authors to make such choices.

Yield of Comparative Analysis of Open and Closed Perception—An Overview

Comparing the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series, one can see a number of distinct differences when analyzed through the lens of open and closed perception. First, in the Fodor's series, there is a more or less constant enclosure of Japan by

¹ An example of this characteristic Fodor's device was analyzed in the discussion of the dimension of specificity in Chapter Three, where Kiko Itosaka's description of the more than 2,000 stone lanterns at the Kasuga Shrine at Nara was compared to the Fodor's description. The comparison demonstrated that Itosaka's description evidenced a deeper and more subtle understanding of the religious significance of the shrine than did the anonymous Fodor's author, who is not—or at least is not identified as—Japanese. As noted in that discussion, Fodor's Western authors and editors seldom describe the religious significance of temples and the artifacts they house, thus limiting reader perception of important elements of Japanese culture. At the same time, while closing reader perception of Japanese, note that the Fodor's descriptions open the perceptual horizons of their authors by permitting them to declare what they think is important for tourists to know (for example, the "fact" that the gigantic Daibutsu statue, also at Nara, is "more known for its size than its beauty").

² A good example of JTB's tendency to exclude from its descriptions material which might prove difficult to explain is its handling of the description of Shimoda, site of an alleged romantic affair between Townsend Harris and Okichi intimated by the Fodor's guidebook. The 1991 JTB guidebook devotes nearly two full pages (pp. 481-483) to describing the historical import of Harris's diplomatic efforts, but does not mention Okichi. Notice that the reader's perception of the touristic significance of the town of Shimoda is correspondingly constrained.

elaborations of the descriptors, "past," "traditional," and "underdeveloped," together with a corresponding assignment of Western cultures to the categories "modern" and "developed." Such classification closes reader perception about Japan as a "modern" nation by consigning it to the category, "traditional." On closer examination of various editions of Fodor's guidebooks, it is clear that, year to year, there is a progressively greater, though very gradual, willingness to grant that Japan is approaching modernity. At the same time, however, Fodor's readers are often presented with an image of Japan in which its progress toward modernity is viewed as a negative feature, sometimes even constituting an obstacle to the visitor's enjoyment. The JTB's guide, on the other hand, seems to struggle against Japan's confinement in the "traditional" category. Depictions in the earlier editions of JTB's guidebook portrayed Japan as a traditional country; however, these descriptions have evolved into the current JTB view that Japan is capable of embracing both traditionality and modernity simultaneously, harmoniously, and successfully.

Although the Fodor's series seems gradually to have come to terms with Japan's increasing power in the international realm, it nevertheless attempts to inscribe Japan to an inferior position by maneuvering the labels "modernity" and "traditionality." Through the authors' selection of these labels, readers participate in a closed world where nations are perceived, not simply in terms of their comparative differences, but along a scale which suggests that Western nations are "modern" and Eastern nations are "traditional." Because readers of the JTB guidebook are primarily English-speaking Westerners who share a common orientation toward the "modern"/"traditional" dichotomy, JTB must assert Japan's authority and thus open up a new perceptual world for visitors to appreciate Japan's quality, without regard to its classification as either a "modern" or "traditional" country.

Second, in describing Japan's contact with other nations, the Fodor's guidebook tends to emphasize the reliance of Japan upon other countries. In accounting for

Japan's cultural elements and intellectual activities, Fodor's often restricts reader perception by emphasizing Japan's borrowing and imitating of cultural practices, suggesting that such activities reveal the Japanese lack of creativity and initiative. The JTB guide, on the other hand, aims at creating perceptions which foster an appreciation of Japan, primarily by declaring Japan's cultural and political independence, by providing an excessive amount of information in its descriptions, and by consistent reference to Western standards for judging the quality of certain elements of Japanese culture.

Third, the style of writing in the Fodor's guidebooks employs elements distinctive to the series which are directly related to the dimension of open and closed perception. Many stylistic mechanisms are open to various writers of the Fodor's guide to fix the image of Japanese in specific directions; the following are discussed in detail: (1) pseudo-specification; (2) use of extravagant closures to set perceptions of locales; (3) applying the proven closure to more than one situation; and (4) closure by comparison with the familiar. These stylistic mechanisms affirm the discourse on modernity and traditionality under whose terms Japan is to be perceived. Readers' perceptual world of Japan thus is restricted by the broader framework according to which the West (modern) is superior to the East (traditional).

The JTB guidebooks, on the other hand, employ the following idiosyncratic stylistic mechanisms to approach JTB's goal of providing a positive image of Japan to its visitors: (1) establishing the illusion of extended activity; (2) closure through elevation; (3) closure through extended analogy; and (4) closure through selective use of evidence.

In the following, I turn to a discussion of important changes revealed through the lens of open and closed perception that occur over the twenty-eight years covered by the five sampled volumes of the Fodor's series (1962 through 1990) and the thirty-six years covered by the volumes of the JTB series (1955 through 1991).

Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Open and Closed Perception—An Overview

As mentioned in previous chapters, the Fodor's guidebook series shows little change over the period 1962 through 1982, but a dramatic change in 1990. The JTB's series, on the other hand, can be seen as elaborating and slightly modifying a format that remains basically the same from the 1955 through the 1991 editions.

Although a guidebook series appears to be the "same" from year to year, using the lens of open and closed perception to critically compare each edition to previous and subsequent editions reveals several significant patterns indicating both change and resistance to change in both the Fodor's and JTB's series. In the Fodor's series, for example, two patterns are particularly worthy of note: (1) association of Japan with "traditional," and the West with "modern"; and (2) classification of Japanese as cultural learners and borrowers.

The JTB guidebook's content over the years from 1955 through 1991 can be seen as a more or less continuous effort to assert Japan's resistance to efforts from many different quarters to confine or close perception of Japan through cultural inscription. Even though JTB has published Japan, the Official Guide for more than seventy years (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 1), visits from Westerners remained relatively infrequent until the early 1960s (Johnson, 1988), perhaps as the result of the Tokyo Olympic games in 1964. As the number of Western visitors has grown, JTB's descriptions of Japan have become increasingly confident. Nevertheless, one is able to notice in JTB's descriptions suggestions of resistance and aggressiveness in reformulating Japan's position with respect to the rest of the world. The development of JTB's descriptions is examined through analytical exploration of two major recurrent themes: (1) the struggle to define Japan within the "modern"/"traditional" dichotomy; and (2) inscription of a positive image of Japan.

Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to Open and Closed Perception in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions

In this section, more detailed elaboration and support will be offered for the general sketch just presented. The analysis is organized into three major sections. The first two sections point out major themes and temporal changes in the Fodor's and JTB's descriptions uncovered through application of the lens of the open and closed perception construct. A third section discusses stylistic devices used by the two series to manage the opening and closure of reader perception.

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Open and Closed Perception of Fodor's Descriptions

In this section, I will discuss two content themes relating to open and closed perception which occur repeatedly in the Fodor's series. The first content theme has to do with Fodor's assignment of Japan to the categories "traditional" and "underdeveloped," in contrast to its simultaneous classification of Western nations to the categories "modern" and "developed." Assignment of these labels by Fodor's is aided and supported by a consistent negation of Japan's modernization, which is often portrayed as confusing and inconsistent with tourists' expectations. The second content theme relates to Fodor's emphasis on the reliance of Japan upon other nations, downplaying its cultural and political accomplishments, thus making it less likely that readers will consider Japan a creative, dynamic, and successful country. Following a discussion of these content themes, I will analyze several elements of change relating to open and closed perception in the Fodor's guidebook series.

Association of Japan with "traditional," West with "modern." Although Japan has gradually acquired status as an economic force in the international realm, the Fodor's guidebook series nevertheless consistently portrays Japan as "traditional" and "underdeveloped," while at the same time assuming that Western nations are "modern" and "developed." Two specific issues will be discussed in this section:

(1) linking Japan's past and present; and (2) Japan's modernization as a source of problems and confusion.

Linking Japan's past and present. Through Fodor's categorization, the contrast between West and East is analogized not only to the contrast between "modern" and "traditional," but also the contrast between "present" and "past." Over the years, these classifications have become an integral part of Fodor's touristic discourse about Japan, often limiting perception of Japan as a country which is "as modern" (and hence, as powerful) as countries in the West. Fodor's closure of its readers' perception of Japan leads to the situation in which Japan is known, not simply by its accomplishments, but by the degree to which Westerners judge how far Japan has "detached" itself from "traditionality" and moved toward "modernity." The Fodor's perspective is shown in the following quotation:

Usually, we are prepared and willing to admire Asia's ancient monuments, its temples and palaces, its sculpture and miniatures and even its teaching, but we also make the mistake of failing to link this past with the Asia present. The link is a strong one: Asia's marvelous heritage still governs its everyday life, if only on a subconscious level at times. (Fodor's, 1962, p. viii)

The area called "Asia," of which Japan is classified by the Fodor's description as a part, is conceived largely in terms of its past. Even elements of modernity, according to the Fodor's guidebook, must be associated with the past, unless the visitor wants to make a "mistake." Asia cannot be seen simply to exist in the present, because there is a "strong link" to the past which governs Asians' "everyday life." Among the closures of Japan accomplished by this description, two are particularly noteworthy. First, the fourteen nations described in the Fodor's 1962 edition, Japan and East Asia, are apparently subsumed under one overarching descriptor—"Asian." Thus, the Fodor's author seems comfortable making assertions, not only about "everyday life" in Asia, but also about the origins in the past of "everyday life" in fourteen very different

nations. Second, however, the passage suggests that the Asian orientation toward the past may be inescapable because Asians may not always realize its effects: "Asia's marvelous heritage still governs its everyday life, if only on a subconscious level at times [Emphasis added]." While the past of any culture could conceivably be seen as invisibly affecting its present activities³ it is highly unlikely, for example, that a Fodor's guidebook describing the United States would attribute present-day American moral behavior to an "unconscious" orientation toward values derived from Puritanism.

As some have argued (see, for example, MacCannell, 1976), the "past" is often used by tourists as a justification for travel to more "traditional" countries. According to this view, the member of the "modern" culture seeks solace in the "past" of another country, primarily because "modernity" in his or her own country has been purchased at a high price. Modernity is viewed as leading to industrialization (which often damages the environment); large-scale social institutions (which exacerbate anomie and loneliness); overcrowding (which leads to strain on services and promotes social problems such as crime); and so on. In the visited country, on the other hand, the tourist is often persuaded by touristic discourse that problems accompanying modernity have been obviated because that the country is "less modern" (that is, more "traditional," and hence, "simpler and better").⁴

³ At the same time, assigning the quality of unconscious mental activity to a metaphor covering fourteen disparate nations seems to be stretching descriptive license a bit far.

⁴ The emphasis on the purity of the past is one of the most idiosyncratic markers of touristic descriptions of "traditional" countries by writers from "modern" countries. For example, in the section, "Great Itineraries," from the 1990 Fodor's edition, one notices these descriptions of specific travel routes: (1) "Introduction to Traditional Japan (One Week) . . . Like every nation, Japan has some sights that are more famous than others. These sights tend to be in the major cities. The following itinerary covers the barest minimum, but it does include modern Tokyo; the splendor of Nikko; the temples and shrines of Kamakura, the power center of Japan's first shogunate; the temples of classical Kyoto; and Nara, Japan's first permanent capital." [Note: even though "modern Tokyo" is mentioned, the preponderance of the discussion centers on the traditional elements of Japanese culture.] (p. 37); (2) "Scenic Japan. . . Tohoku, in northern Honshu, is a mixture of modern cities and small villages, rustic farmhouses and glorious temples, and high mountain ranges and indented shorelines. Tohoku has yet to be commercialized; there is still the feeling that one is traveling in another era." [Emphases added] (p. 38); (3) "Into the Northern Frontier . . . Northern Japan is rural Japan, steeped in folklore and natural beauty. Though tourist facilities are available throughout the area of northern Honshu and Hokkaido, the number of

By stressing the link between the past and present of “Asian nations,” Fodor’s manages to emphasize the timeless nature of Asian cultures while at the same time inscribing them to the category “underdeveloped.” Although in recent years Japan has come to be seen by many Westerners as the exception to the “traditionality” of other Asian nations, by linking Japan to the rest of Asia, Fodor’s limits perception of Japan in ways that are difficult for the reader to ignore: as demonstrated in the quoted passage, the Fodor’s guidebook series is intended to acclimate its readers to Japan. Once Japan is placed within the category linking it to the “traditional” past, representation of Japan is confined, specified, and limited; readers exposed only to the Fodor’s account obtain access to Japan primarily through this limiting perspective.

The necessity to employ the “past” as a defining feature for being classified as “traditional” raises the question of whether the past so described accurately reflects “true” elements of history. In other words, how is one to know whether the “traditional past” is “real”? As an example illustrating how Fodor’s uses the dimension of open and closed perception to inscribe Japan’s past, I turn now to the description of Kyoto, Japan’s fifth largest city and an important tourist attraction. Despite the fact that it is one of Japan’s most “developed” municipalities, Kyoto is often described as an ancient city; hence, how Kyoto is situated along the continuum of

tourists is fewer. This itinerary gives the traveler the chance to see the other side of Japan—not the industry that has spawned the country’s economic miracle or the aristocratic temples of Imperial Japan—but rustic Japan, with more of what the country looked like before it was swept into 20th-century Western technology. [Emphases added] (p. 39); (4) “In the Shadow of the Mountains . . . Old traditional Japan is fast disappearing, but the north coast of Western Honshu has largely avoided the eyesore of modern industrialism. This area is ideal for anyone willing to go off the beaten track and take a leisurely trip through small villages, rustic countryside, and medieval castle towns.” [Emphasis added] (p. 40); (5) “Warm Weather Adventure . . . Starting from Kyoto, this itinerary covers the Inland Sea, Shikoku, and Kyushu. Both Shikoku and Kyushu have their southern coasts washed by the warm Black Current, which causes almost tropical weather. Since both Shikoku and Kyushu see fewer foreigners than the major tourist centers, such as Kyoto and Tokyo, this tour offers the opportunity to experience the less commercialized side of Japan” [Emphases added] (p. 41). Particularly in the emphasized portions of these itinerary descriptions, one sees the Fodor’s appeal to tourists, based on Japan’s purportedly “traditional” character, ironically counterposed to the frequent assertion that these sites are desirable because they have not been “spoiled” by tourists or other signs of “development”!

traditionality/modernity is particularly intriguing. Among the many descriptors applied to Kyoto, one aspect is particularly deserving of attention: how the sense of traditionality, or the blend between the old and new, are differentially conceived by different authors with different perspectives. As several editions of the Fodor's guidebook are compared, one is able to see that authors are open to their own systems of thought as they conceive Kyoto in unique ways. However, although these authors differ over the issues of whether Kyoto's sense of "oldness" is real or not, or whether the "blend" between the East and the West is successful or not, the authors continue to conceive Kyoto along the dimension of traditionality/modernity.

Most Westerners seem to be attracted to Kyoto because it is ancient. At the same time, there is some question about how old some of its "traditional" buildings are, given that portions of the city have been extensively rebuilt.⁵ Francis King, in his description of Kyoto for the 1962 and 1969 Fodor's editions, explains the city in the following terms: "Kyoto contains over 2,200 old temples and shrines, most of which remain in their original state, the former Imperial Palace, and several royal villas" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 275). In these and other descriptions, King depicts Kyoto as a city full of tradition, at one point claiming that it would require several "laborious weeks" to appreciate its antiquities.

In the 1976 and 1982 editions, the chapter on Kyoto is written by a different author, Richard Leavitt. As can be seen in passage quoted below, Leavitt's perception of Kyoto's "antiquity" is somewhat different: although Kyoto retains a sense of "oldness" worthy of tourists' attention, Leavitt argues that to some extent Kyoto's "oldness" is illusory:

⁵ As Varley (1984) notes, "Kyoto, which became the seat of the court in 794 after its move from Nara, was also laid out symmetrically like Ch'ang-an; and it too spread erratically into the northeastern suburbs. But, whereas Kyoto was often devastated by warfare and other disasters during the medieval period and has few buildings within its city limits that predate the sixteenth century, Nara has retained substantially intact a number of splendid edifices and their contents dating from the eighth century" (p. 31).

The “ancient” temple you admire may well have been founded 600 years ago, or more. But it has probably burned and been rebuilt several times; and it may have been completely dismantled, like a set of children’s blocks, repaired and reassembled with new parts within the past 20 years, always in the original pattern. The pieces change, but the form persists—this is the genius of the Japanese. (Fodor’s, 1976, p. 327)

The Kyoto temples, though admired by visitors, are compared by Leavitt to “children’s blocks.” Apparently, Leavitt does not share Francis King’s enthusiasm for Kyoto’s “ancient” temples, suggesting that some buildings are form without substance, attributed in Leavitt’s description to the “genius of the Japanese.” Hence, Leavitt’s conception of Kyoto, in contrast to King’s, seems controlled by a perception that tourists are being deceived. Leavitt’s outrage at this “deception” is clarified later in the chapter: “The tourist who goes about Kyoto asking, ‘Is this old?’ is asking for trouble, for the answer may well be, ‘No!’ The entire city was burned flat in the civil wars of the 15th century, for one thing” (Fodor’s, 1976, pp. 327-328).

In these passages, one senses how powerful can be the tourist’s expectation that “traditional” sites be “authentic.” Leavitt’s frustration seems to arise, not from any inherent deficiency in Kyoto’s buildings, but from his anger that the buildings he thinks are very old may not be as ancient as he supposes. However, one should note that the idea of historical sites being judged as “authentic” originates in Western systems of knowledge which, as MacCannell (1976) notes, often leads tourists to seek their own “pasts” in the pasts of more “traditional” countries. Thus, Leavitt’s description forges a complex network of closures on reader perception of Kyoto: (1) limitations of the common perception that Kyoto is a traditional city; (2) casting into doubt the common belief that Kyoto’s temples are “must-see” sites in Japan; (3) suggesting that some deception is at work to trap the unwary visitor; (4) implying that one’s expectations about Kyoto’s antiquity will get one into “trouble”; and so on. More revealing, perhaps, is the fact that Leavitt is apparently untroubled by the

restrictions he places on reader perception of Kyoto. His narrative contains no indications that he thinks there might be anything wrong with a Western touristic writer questioning one of Japan's most important cultural centers.⁶

A second aspect of Kyoto concerning which King and Leavitt differ is the nature of "old" and "new." According to King, Kyoto is, as the subtitle of his chapter puts it, "the best of past and present."

In Kyoto, more than anywhere else in Japan, one is aware of East and West, the old and the new existing side by side; but they exist not in opposition, but in perfect harmony and peace. . . . What is best of past and present has here been united; to mediate between the two has been the role of Kyoto for the last 1, 000 years. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 278)

King's depiction of a harmonious and peaceful mediation between old and new (or between "East" and "West"), however, is sharply disputed by Leavitt in the 1976 and 1982 editions of Fodor's. In fact, Leavitt warns visitors that modern industry has taken over Kyoto, overshadowing any sense of the city's antiquity:

Your first view of Kyoto will be a shock—several miles of dreary industrial hodgepodge culminating in the garish hideousness of Kyoto Tower, hardly the 'ancient' capital' you came to see. Modern Kyoto is not a sleepy relic. It is Japan's fifth largest city, a center of trade, education,

⁶ Leavitt's chapter is replete with blunt declarations about Kyoto, expressed with disdain and even contempt, as shown by these examples: (1) "Japan is a state of mind, a stubborn, insular, uniquely idiosyncratic mixture of ideas and attitudes, of values and feelings, complex, clannish, deep-rooted patterns of emotion and behavior that outsiders rarely understand and seldom enter." (p. 287); (2) "Every tour of Kyoto takes in Nijo Castle, Heian Shrine, Sanju-sangen-do, and Kinkaku-ji. These super-standardized choices will be unbelievable crowded in season, and are somewhat garish, for Japan, but they are worth seeing nonetheless." (p. 289); (3) "Southwest of Kinkaku-ji lies Ryoan-ji, the Temple of the Peaceful Dragon. The famous garden, 15 stones arranged in groups of 5, 2, 3, 2, 3, on a bed of raked sand, is both simple and suggestive; what you see in it will depend on a quiet mind and a free imagination. Battalions of sightseers interfere with the first and the other is encumbered by all the pretentious rubbish that has been written about the 'deep Zen meaning' of this garden. (The temple's own English-language handout is a particularly abject example of this.)" (p. 292); (4) ". . . Daisen-in, supposedly a temple, has become a commercial sideshow of unbelievably brassy vulgarity. Avoid it at all cost." (p. 297); and so on. In these and other passages, one gets the sense that Leavitt frequently uses descriptive closure to severely limit reader perception of Kyoto.

and industry, with all tall buildings, traffic jams, serious smog and litter problems, and over 14,000,000 people. (Fodor's, 1976, p. 329)

After reading Leavitt's description, visitors may be uninterested in Kyoto, or at least less eager to spend a significant amount of time in the city. However, the disparities of descriptions from authors included in the "same" guidebook series lead one to ask this question: how can Kyoto be perceived so differently by different observers?

Any observation must be framed and evaluated with respect to the system of thought of the observer. There is no "right" or even "most accurate" depiction of Kyoto. Writers base their observations on their own architectonic systems. As they fashion inscriptions of cultural features into their texts, they are to some extent free to choose the images which will emerge in their descriptions. Moreover, even though descriptions are constrained by the genre of touristic discourse and are jointly owned by other social actors, the system of thought and the perspective taken are to some extent matters of authorial choice.

While Kyoto may mean "tranquillity" to one writer, it may also mean "awkwardness" to another; while one writer may see modernization as the achieving of harmony with the old, another may perceive modernization as a threat to the traditional. From the perspective of open and closed perception, one's own system of perception is forever open and unfinished, allowing one to arrive at new insights, to examine the same object from different directions, and to change perceptions about the object if one chooses to do so.

However, once the inscription through writing has reached print, perception of the described other can be said to be more or less fixed, closed, limited, and finished.⁷

⁷ I make this assertion in the knowledge that the dimension of uncompletedness (see Chapter Seven) ensures that no representation can ever be said to be complete or finished. Here, however, I am attempting to suggest the author's purpose in writing cultural description, rather than trying to define

In King's article in both the 1962 and 1969 editions, Kyoto's ancient flavor is said to be abundant and prized by the tourist, thus confining Kyoto to a context where traditional and modern, old and new, are said to coexist harmoniously. On the other hand, in the 1976 and 1982 editions, Leavitt suggests some problematic features associated with the modernization of Kyoto, making it more difficult for readers to have access to alternative views that might suggest that traditionality and modernity can exist in harmony. Clearly, the potential tourist gets a more favorable picture of Kyoto from King than from Leavitt: reading King, one wants to visit Kyoto; reading Leavitt, one might be less eager. The openness permitted each writer, then, functions in different ways to close reader perception about Kyoto in the service of steering the reader toward the writer's idiosyncratic point of view.

It should also be noted that, although King and Leavitt differ in their views about whether Kyoto can legitimately be labeled "old," as well as whether Kyoto's "oldness" can coexist harmoniously with the "new," both authors share the belief that Kyoto's traditionality is important. However, the critical reader, applying the lens of open and closed perception, may legitimately ask why Fodor's, from the chapters in its 1962 and 1969 editions (authored by Francis King) to the chapters in its 1976 and 1982 editions (authored by Richard Leavitt), seems to become less tolerant of Kyoto's increasing modernization. King's chapters show appreciation of Kyoto's past and its present, while Leavitt disparages Kyoto's past and castigates its present. If it is beneficial for all human cultures to move toward modernization, why does Fodor's not celebrate Japan's success in modernizing its fifth largest city? As should become evident in analysis of the sample passage in the next section, this reluctance on Fodor's part may represent an attempt to inscribe Japan as a "traditional" country. Regardless of how well Japan succeeds in its modernization, the Fodor's series seems to insist that

some absolute characteristic of inscription through written language. Regardless of whether authors are ever able to close perception of the other culture, they always seem to be striving toward that goal.

its level of modernity can never approach that of Western nations, and moreover, that if Japan does achieve equality (the possibility of Japanese achieving superiority is never even hinted), then Japan will be less appreciated by Western visitors. Through such closures of perception, readers may find it difficult to ignore the traditional-modern dichotomy as they think about Japan, and may be left with lingering doubts as to whether Japan will ever be classified as a "modern nation."

Japan's modernization as source of problems and confusion. By a number of economic and social measures of progress, the Japanese are widely regarded as having achieved the status of "modern nation." As Warshaw (1990) notes,

Japan now has the world's third largest economy. In terms of wealth it towers over all other Asian countries. The income of the average Japanese was just \$100 a year after the war. By the mid-1980's it was over \$10,000 a year. The Japanese people now enjoy longer lives, more leisure, and better health than many of the countries that won the war. (In Great Britain, for example, per capita income is about \$7,500; life expectancy at birth is approximately seventy for men and seventy-six for women, two to three years less than it is in Japan.) Some of Japan's industries, notably those making ships, automobiles, cameras, and computers, either outproduce or are close to outproducing all others in the world. This one small country exports almost 8 per cent of the total goods sold in the world. It has only 4 percent of the land in the United States, but it creates 20 per cent of the goods and services that Americans do. (pp. 119-120)

In the face of such evidence of Japan's extraordinary economic success, the task confronting the Fodor's guidebook is how to account for Japan's achievements in recent years, so clearly superior to the performance of many Western nations, in terms that do not threaten those nations. As one traces the evolution of discourse on this subject in the Fodor's guidebook series, one perceives a reluctance to recognize Japan's achievements. In Seidensticker's introductory chapter, which remains intact from the 1962 through the 1969 editions, urban Japanese are described in the following terms:

It would be a mistake, however, to think that the old discipline has completely disappeared. For one thing, there is a sharp divergence

between city and country, and the fact that the youth of Tokyo tends to be so fresh from the farms means that on the whole it is docile, hard-working, and not likely to indulge in anything more daring than [sic] a movie or a glass of beer. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 66)

In this passage, Seidensticker leaves the impression that, since the majority of Tokyo's youth are from the farm, perceptions of the city as a modern location must be tempered with the realization that young people are unlikely to indulge in anything more daring than "a movie or a glass of beer" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 66). In this way, Tokyo's youth are seemingly excluded from the category, "modern."

Seidensticker's other evaluations do little to change the perception that Japan is essentially a backward nation struggling to come to terms with its comparatively recent economic success. Rather than depicting Japanese economic achievements as spectacular, or praising the Japanese for their industriousness, Seidensticker portrays Japanese modernization as confusing, contradictory, and paradoxical. There are many ways to account for the elevation of Japan's status in the international community through modernization; however, Seidensticker chooses from among these explanations those that create more doubt than certainty about Japan's success.

At another point in the chapter, for example, Seidensticker asserts, "Above all, the Japanese are a nation of workers, and if much of their activity seems purposeless, the energy devoted to labor has made their economy one of the half dozen most powerful in the world" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 67; identical statements can be found in 1969 edition). Thus, even while admitting that Japanese are a "nation of workers," Seidensticker tempers his positive assessment by adding that Japanese activity "seems purposeless," thus implying that Japanese economic success is due to worker's "energy devoted to labor" and not to other factors assumed to be exclusively owned by "modern" nations (such as technological advances or superior educational infrastructure).

(either in the 1962 or 1969 editions) does he offer a positive image of Japan's modernity that is not accompanied by a deprecatory remark.⁸ On the other hand, Seidensticker's chapter is removed from the 1976 and 1982 editions and is replaced with a chapter by Douglas Moore Kenrick. In the 1990 edition, no trace of either Seidensticker's or Kenrick's narratives remain. These changes may reflect gradual acceptance by the Fodor's editors of Japan's economic status, which by 1990 can hardly be challenged.

That authors of cultural descriptions simultaneously open their own fields of perception while they close or limit the perception of the described cultural Other, can often be seen in descriptions of cultural practices, particularly those performed on a day-to-day basis, perhaps because of the difficulty of writing about "characteristic" facets of life in a given culture without making broad summaries of many specific incidents, real or imagined.

In the passage quoted below,⁹ Edward Seidensticker once again levels an attack on Japanese modernity, suggesting that although "education and progress" may have been achieved, they have been purchased at the cost of ruining Japan's landscape:

More often it is a ring of lower hills, closing in his narrow valley, and so framing the typical Japanese scene. The scene is one of garden-like perfection, save where education and progress have marred it with schoolhouses (among the ugliest buildings in Japan . . . [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 60)

⁸ For example, Seidensticker's characteristic descriptive style is to couple praise ("Individual buildings can be good (before the rain gets at them). . ." with condemnation (" . . . but they add up to nothing.") (p. 56). At another point Seidensticker states, ". . . the Japanese countryside is lovely. . ." but adds, ". . . if a trifle wanting in variety." (p. 60) Describing the influence of Buddhism, he states, "It has left behind a rich physical heritage in its temples and paintings and sculptures . . .", adding, ". . . but the Tokugawa Shogunate came upon it weary and faltering and effectively killed it as a vital religious force. Today it has little to say to thinking people, and exists largely for purposes of burying the dead and keeping up their graves." (p. 65) On the subject of hygiene, "If the Japanese habits of bodily cleanliness are above reproach . . ." is coupled with ". . . their habits of housecleaning are not, and it is well not scrutinize the portions of a room that do not immediately invite inspection." (p. 67) In these and many other passages, Seidensticker reveals his reluctance to offer unalloyed praise for Japan's accomplishments.

⁹ Portions of this passage are also analyzed in the discussion of the dimension of ownership, Chapter Four, pp. 247-249.

perfection, save where education and progress have marred it with schoolhouses (among the ugliest buildings in Japan . . . [Emphasis added]
(Fodor's, 1962, p. 60)

In this description, Japan's modernization (that is, education and progress) is viewed as an interference with its visual beauty (an important element of its "traditional" image). This example of closure of perception about Japan is unfortunately one of the most common features encountered in discourse written by a member of a culture which considers itself superior to that of the described cultural Other. One of the implications of such closure is that, regardless of whether signs of modernization or advancement are evident, these may be taken by tourists as obstacles to their enjoyment.

In the quoted passage, Seidensticker implies that indicators confirming that Japan has attempted to modernize itself—to place itself, that is, at or above the level of more "advanced" countries—are reprehensible because it interferes with the visual impression of the visitor. Seidensticker portrays the Japanese countryside as one of "garden-like perfection"; even if that were true, how is it that Seidensticker is permitted to open his own perceptual horizon by attempting to state what is "perfect" for the Japanese (thereby simultaneously closing reader perception of Japan)? In the quoted passage, it is an ideal (that is, non-existent) scene of "perfection" that sets the standard, so it is hardly surprising that Seidensticker feels that the Japanese are unable to actualize this ethereal, "perfect," image. This kind of depiction, in which real, living cultures are portrayed in ideal terms, can be characterized as an attempt to fixate the other culture in a nonspecific present.

Beyond this closure, Seidensticker offers negative evaluations of the signs of Japanese progress, particularly in education. "Education" and "progress" are conjoined in a phrase that suggests that both have somehow damaged Japan:
". . . education and progress have marred it with schoolhouses (among the ugliest

buildings in Japan).” In effect, this closure of reader perception operates in the future, suggesting that “education and progress” will continue to mar Japan’s “garden-like perfection.” It is interesting that these various closures are accomplished in the absence of substantive evidence: Seidensticker offers no specific claims about Japanese education, nor is there any evidence that Japan ever did enjoy scenes of “garden-like perfection.” This judgment, coupled with the previous attempt to denigrate progress and education, places limitations on reader perception that Japanese will ever achieve modernity.¹⁰

Classification of Japanese as cultural borrowers and learners. By insisting upon the prevalence of the categories of “modern” and “traditional,” the Fodor’s guidebook series fixates Japan’s image as a nation inferior to nations in the West. Another means of accomplishing this goal is to describe Japan as characteristically engaging in cultural borrowing or learning. In this way, not only is Japan shown to be dependent on other nations, but innately lacking in the creativity, competence or drive to originate and develop its own cultural activities.

In the following example, Edward Seidensticker¹¹ tries to account for the early contact between Japan and China. In examining this passage, one should note two important factors: first, closure is accomplished, not just concerning Japan, but concerning China as well, and second, that the portrayal of Japan (as China’s inferior)

¹⁰ Researchers have reached similar conclusions concerning the touristic inscriptions of Taiwan as backward and underdeveloped (Chang & Holt, 1990).

¹¹ One is able to deduce Seidensticker’s authorship of this chapter (“From Clan to Chaos—the ‘Japanese Spirit’ Through Thick and Thin”) only by a complex and torturous route. In the 1962 edition, Seidensticker is listed as the author of “Japan and Its People—A Crowded, Lonely Land.” Two subsequent chapters—“From Clan to Chaos” and “Arts and Lesser Pleasures”—are not attributed to Seidensticker in the 1962 edition. However, the author’s notes in the introductory chapter in the 1969 edition contains the following information: “[Seidensticker] is also the author of the two following chapters, From Clan to Chaos and Arts and Lesser Pleasures.” (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 55) Since a computer-scanned text comparison of these latter chapters reveals them to be virtually identical to the chapters in the 1962 edition, one can conclude that Seidensticker is the author of the first three chapters in the 1962 and the 1969 editions. However, reading only the 1962 edition, one would be likely to conclude that the second and third chapters are anonymously authored.

restricts perceptions the reader might have that Japan's early culture was due to the efforts of Japanese.

Pre-modern Korea was moreover a remote tributary of China, the heart of the Orient. The distances involved are of little consequence today, but for the early Japanese both the distances and the perils along the way—hostile men and open seas—were formidable. That many of them braved the journey all the same is tribute to their eagerness to learn. China was remote and grand, the source of culture and the center of the world, not an equal to invade and be invaded by as medieval France was to England. The Chinese for their part looked upon Japan as but one in an array of subsidiary states. (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 61-62)

This description, which appears in identical form in the 1969 edition, clearly portrays Japanese as eager learners, seeking out the teacher, China.¹² Even in the face of dangers to be faced in traveling to China, Japanese are said to have "braved" the journey. On the other hand, Seidensticker makes clear his opinion that Japan could never have invaded China, even though Japan was invaded by China, thus becoming only one of China's "subsidiary states." This picture, while perhaps agreeable to people other than Japanese, is unlikely to find a receptive audience among Japanese themselves.¹³ While Fodor's has no apparent interest in portraying Japan in a negative

¹² In the 1976 and 1982 editions, Seidensticker's chapter is replaced with a chapter by Douglas Moore Kenrick. Notice the different picture of Japanese initiative offered in Kenrick's assessment: "Of course the seas that keep invaders out rarely confine an island people. For most of her history Japan has been no exception. A rugged terrain and a taste for fish encouraged coastal shipping and fishing. Hardy sailors bred merchant adventurers and bold pirates in days of yore. They voyaged along the coasts of Korea and China and countries throughout South-East Asia, trading and robbing as they went. . . . Had their own government not stopped their adventuring, it is possible that the Japanese might have colonized Australia and New Zealand long before European navigators found those southern lands." (pp. 41-42) Kenrick's depictions describe the Japanese as more active and exploratory; Seidensticker's portrayal, on the other hand, suggests that, even though they "braved" hostile seas and people, Japanese nevertheless approached other countries as more or less passive students willing to learn what they could.

¹³ JTB's discomfort with the portrayal of the Japanese as students of China is dramatically confirmed by this version of Japan's early history from the 1991 edition of the JTB's guidebook: "As might be expected, continental culture reached Japan's shores, first through Korea and then directly from China. Both Confucianism and Buddhism, destined to exert a tremendous influence upon the Japanese people in subsequent years, were introduced from Paikche [in Korea]. Together with this inflow of culture from the continent, there was a great movement of people from Korea and China coming to live in this

light, neither does it gain by portraying Japanese in a positive light. Moreover, since the subject matter concerns ancient history, even if Fodor's takes into account the modern image Japan tries to project for itself, it can still safely assume a relatively neutral role in presenting its own version of reality.

Notice that Seidensticker's depiction of Japanese initiative relies heavily upon a number of interwoven closures of reader perception of Japanese-Chinese interaction in Japan's early history. Among the closures Seidensticker advances are the following: (1) the relationship between China and Japan is clearly formulated to show China as the superior culture; (2) Japan's native culture is slighted by implication (Japan's eagerness to learn implies that its culture needed input in order for it to develop); (3) China is depicted as the focal point for all of Asia (Seidensticker refers to China both as "the heart of the Orient" and "the center of the world," while Kenrick in the 1976 and 1982 editions implies that China may have been only one of a number of destinations for early Japanese explorers); and (4) Korea is portrayed an extension of China, and hence possibly to be considered somewhat superior to Japan.

It is worth noting, then, that while Seidensticker does not directly question Japan's status in its early history (or at least not as directly as he does when it comes to Japan's modern history), the cumulative effect of the four closures mentioned above is to severely constrict reader perception of Japan's initiative. Reading Seidensticker's passage does not instill a sense of confidence about Japan's role in the creation of its own culture in the distant past. Such closures make stereotypes about Japanese as cultural borrowers more reasonable: after all, if Japanese began their history taking cultural practices from other nations, then the modern reader might be more easily persuaded that they show an innate capacity for "borrowing" that persists to the present day.

island country." (p. 85) The JTB's account suggests that Japanese not only did not seek out Chinese teachers, but that Chinese and Koreans came to Japan to teach the Japanese.

Another account provided in Seidensticker's chapter on Japanese history in the 1962 Fodor's guidebook expresses a similar opinion regarding Japanese borrowing of Chinese culture:

The Japanese for their part borrowed a literate culture from China, at first through Korea, but were in the happy position of being left alone to do what they chose with the borrowings. It is therefore possible to treat much Japanese history as an alternation between periods of more or less straight borrowing and periods when there governed "the Japanese spirit," an elusive force making over the borrowed material into something different and highly individual. (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 69-70)

At another point (pp. 70-71) the author states, "In the same period [sixth to eighth century] a distinctly Japanese culture emerged above the initially irresistible flood of ideas imported from China." Later in the chapter, "Culturally, it [13th to 17th century] was a second period of fairly open borrowing from China" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 72). Finally, "The institution of the Shogunate . . . [is evidence that] something uniquely Japanese was present even during the most uninhibited phases of borrowing from China" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 72). The author's use of terms such as, "borrow," "irresistible flood," "imported," and "uninhibited," suggest a somewhat one-sided view of early Japanese-Chinese contact. Even the provision of a single counter-example of a uniquely Japanese practice (the notion of the Shogunate) is framed as a minor exception to the overwhelming flood of culture taken in from China during the "most uninhibited phases of borrowing." Here, too, perceptions of the reader about Japan are likely to be restricted by the Fodor's author's unambiguous opinion of the superiority of Chinese culture and the Japanese desire to "borrow" it "uninhibitedly."¹⁴

¹⁴ Despite the attempts of JTB to downplay the amount of borrowing of Chinese culture by Japan, most scholars think Japan owes its early development to China: "In the next generation a group of innovators, seizing power at the court in the so-called Taika Reform of 645, pushed forward the borrowing of Chinese technology and institutions with increased vigor. The effort continued at full flood for almost two centuries more, tapering off only in the ninth century. It transformed Japan from a

The fact that these assessments are repeated word-for-word through the 1982 edition confirm that Fodor's apparently felt no need to revise the way in which Japan's early history was depicted. In the 1990 edition, on the other hand, the presentation is somewhat different. Jon Spayde's chapter on history (pp. 44-60) contains three brief references to Japan's borrowing from China: (1) "After 587, when the Mononobe were crushed, the Soga led Japan's aristocracy in a wholesale adoption of Buddhism and Sino-Korean culture." (p. 45); (2) "Prince Shotoku (574-622) . . . supported the serious application of Confucian principles to the ruling of Japan and was a genuinely devout student of Buddhism." (p. 46); and (3) "Like the tough-minded pragmatists who Westernized Japan 13 centuries later, [leaders of the Taika Reform] put foreign ideas at the service of their Japanese goal: a centralized Japan under an emperor powerful enough to resist both invaders and usurpers." (p. 46) Obviously, these assessments do not suggest Japanese dependence on China as strongly as references in the Fodor's editions 1962 through 1982. Japanese initiative is much more strongly emphasized in Spayde's 1990 account: the Soga "led Japan's aristocracy" in a "wholesale adoption" of Sino-Korean culture (notice that "China" is not mentioned by name); Prince Shotoku "supported" the "serious application" of Confucianism (Confucianism is not described as a Chinese philosophy); and those responsible for the Taika Reform are said to "have put foreign ideas at the service of their Japanese goal . . ." At another point, Spayde even relegates China to the status of one of an array of countries influencing Japanese culture; describing the period he calls "Classical Japan: 500-1156," Spayde writes, ". . . Japan entered the stage of history as a junior participant in a brilliant composite civilization that stretched from Iran to Korea and Vietnam; a civilization whose common denominator was Buddhism but which also included sculptural traditions

backward, tribal area into a full participant in the higher civilization of the Old World, modeled, even if imperfectly, on China, which at that time was embarking on what was to prove to be almost a millennium of leadership as the economically and politically most advanced nation in the world" (Reischauer, 1977, p. 44).

from Hellenistic Greece, the political legacy of Confucius, and the music of the Persian court" (p. 45). Again, there is no specific mention of China in Spayde's account of early Japanese history.

As we examine the evolution of the Fodor's descriptions about early Japanese history, then, it is clear that there occurs a marked revision between the 1982 and 1990 editions in the degree to which Fodor's authors are willing to inscribe Japanese cultural accomplishments to the influence of Chinese. From the wholesale dismissal of Japanese culture as borrowed from China in the 1962 through 1982 editions, in 1990 Fodor's abruptly changes to a description in which Chinese influence is resolutely excluded from the account of Japan's early history. This is perhaps due to the increasing authority commanded by Japanese, who by 1990 no longer are appropriately described (even in ancient times) as students of Chinese civilization.

In another example illustrating how the Fodor's guidebooks close reader perception of the Japanese by classifying them as cultural borrowers, Seidensticker uses a summarizing description to build an increasingly restricted picture of Japanese:

Insularity also helps account for the fact that the Japanese have not on the whole been as resourceful and original in matters intellectual as they have in matters artistic. Imported views of the world, Buddhist and Confucian, have seemed so imposing to the remote islander that he has generally taken them over intact. The Japanese has typically been a scholastic rather than a creative thinker. Today Western systems, notably Marxism, occupy a position similar to the older systems from the Asian mainland. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 62)

In the first emphasized portion, Seidensticker begins preparing the reader for a number of closures concerning perceptions of Japanese originality. The first underlined portion contains a number of challengeable classifications: one could ask what is meant by the terms, "resourceful," "have not on the whole," "matters intellectual," and "matters artistic." The meaning of each of these terms is debatable in its own right; moreover, each constitutes a separate attempt to limit perception of

Japanese ability. All four undefined terms in the same sentence, however, makes the closure even more significant.

Nevertheless, as suggested earlier, the summarizing of the four “closing” terms in the first underlined passage seems less to serve an identifiable end in itself than to prepare for more encompassing attempts at closure later in the passage. One of these attempts occurs in the second emphasized portion, where Seidensticker talks about two major philosophies “imported” by the Japanese: Buddhism and Confucianism. Again, one sees Fodor’s playing down the role of the Japanese in adapting these philosophies to Japanese cultural life: Seidensticker implies that the reason Japanese adopted Buddhism and Confucianism “intact” (an occurrence impossible on the face of it, if only for the reason that both philosophies possess numerous diverse manifestations and were originally formulated in languages different from Japanese) was that both philosophies were found to be too “imposing” (the implication apparently being that Japanese, as “remote islanders,” lacked the intellectual ability to modify either philosophical system).

By most accounts, this assertion is highly questionable. Reischauer (1977), for example, offers a brief summary detailing the number of different manifestations of Buddhism which resulted from the spread of the religion following its introduction into court circles in the eighth and ninth centuries:

These concepts gave rise in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to new sectarian movements that were in time to become the largest Buddhist sects of Japan. One of these, which emphasized the Pure Land, or Western Paradise, of the Buddha Amida, championed the congregational, instead of monastic, organization of the church and the marriage of the clergy, a custom that in time spread to most sects. Another sect, which emphasized the Lotus Sutra as the central object of faith, is popularly known by the name of its founder, Nichiren. His thinking also took a peculiarly nationalistic bent, emphasizing that Buddhism had declined in India and China in turn and that Japan was now the central land of the religion. These sects in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries developed religious congregations which in some

places contended with the feudal warriors for local political power.
(p. 60)

These varied manifestations (to which could be added others, such as Zen Buddhism) hardly suggest that the Buddhist religion could have been adopted “intact.” Of course, it could be argued—and perhaps even has been argued by Seidensticker—that, at first, Buddhism was adopted “intact,” but that later it developed these various branches. Therefore, the argument might run, both Seidensticker’s and Reischauer’s statements could, in some sense, be true.

The position of the Bakhtin circle, however, is that it is precisely because of the chronological imprecision in Seidensticker’s statement that his closure of reader perception is suspect. By refusing to specify either the time of the “intact” adoption or when the religion ceased to assume its “intact” form, Seidensticker deliberately removes his assertion from the realm of sociohistorical specificity and places it into the realm of abstraction. Imprecision, in other words, permits him to avoid accounting for certain facts. Moreover, as confirmed by other authors (see, for example, Varley, 1984), the same diverse applications of Confucianism are to be found following its entry into the Japanese culture, making it equally unlikely that Confucianism can be said to have been adopted from China (or Korea) “intact.”

Why, then, would Seidensticker, as a successful translator of Japanese literature and in possession of a considerable amount of knowledge about Japan, wish to make such easily contestable claims? In other sections, we have ventured to answer this question by attributing the character of certain evaluations to the genre (tour guidebooks), speculating that perhaps Western readers of guidebooks might not care to know more than the most rudimentary summaries of complex philosophies. If true, that might absolve Seidensticker of some of the responsibility for his broad characterizations. However, all that has occurred in the previous passage seems merely preparatory to the extension of Seidensticker’s thesis into other areas of

Japanese life, as shown in the passage below (which immediately follows the previously quoted passage):

From this situation derives a number of subsidiary situations. With the Japanese, ideas sometimes seem to take precedence over facts, so great was once the authority of Confucius and is now the authority of Marx; and at the same time ideas, not produced by dint of arduous intellectual labor, often seem to rest lightly upon the Japanese, and do not much bother him even when simultaneously held opinions seem to contradict one another. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 62)

Here one encounters what is perhaps Seidensticker's real agenda for pursuing his escalating closures of reader perceptions of Japanese competence. Apparently, from the first underlined portion of the above passage, Seidensticker means to use his observations about the borrowing of religious systems "intact" as a scaffold upon which to speculate about Japanese intellectual pursuits as a whole. Having observed this pattern in previous analyses, we are in a position once again to confirm its inertial quality: the reader is presented, not with a carefully crafted argument bolstered by evidence, but rather with an increasingly bold series of closures of the world of reader perception of Japanese, beginning with assertions about whole systems of thought "imported" to Japan and ending with a gratuitous criticism of the whole of Japanese intellectual activity.

Thus, one is not permitted the luxury of assuming that, in his style of expression, Seidensticker is simply conforming to the requirements of the genres of touristic writing. There are too many other ways that this same information could be conveyed in terms considerably less critical of Japanese accomplishments. Again, the more one probes these samples of touristic discourse using the dimension of open and closed perception, the less defensible does the author's apparent agenda become.

Remember, too, that each closure of the world of the Other automatically implies the opening of the world of the author. This is evident in all of the passages

analyzed in this section, but most noticeably so in those passages relating to Confucianism and Buddhism. These two philosophies are among the most complex and varied in all of human knowledge, and yet they are treated by Seidensticker in a single phrase, and then only as verification of a stereotype about Japanese people (that Japanese “merely borrow” other peoples’ ideas). At the same time, coming upon this passage, without knowing the complexity of either Buddhism or Confucianism, and impressed by the favorable biographical notes about Seidensticker which open the chapter, the reader might simply assume that Seidensticker knows what he is talking about and that he is simply expressing his informed opinion. Unfortunately, the reader making this assumption would probably never question whether Seidensticker might have a hidden agenda to promote. Through application of the lens of open and closed perception, however, the existence of hidden agendas is revealed by explaining authorial discourse in terms of the sociohistorical circumstances in which it exists.

The closure of reader perception of Japanese initiative is also to be found in Fodor’s descriptions of Japanese achievements in literature and the arts. In the example passage quoted below (also by Edward Seidensticker), closure is accomplished by depicting the evolution of Japanese literature as relying on anachronistic predecessors:

Having discarded the florid literary language of the Tokugawa Period and adopted instead something very close to colloquial speech, the Japanese novelist began looking for Western models. He thought he had what he wanted in a naturalism that was already becoming slightly antiquated in the West. When he set about reproducing it in Japan, however, he came up with something curious. Japanese naturalism leans very strongly toward autobiography, diary, and confession, and so is likely to remind one far more of Rousseau than of Zola. Modern Japanese literature is essentially romantic, a somewhat ironic fact, given its view of itself as deriving from the French naturalists. Somehow the Japanese continue to be Japanese in spite of themselves. [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, pp. 86-87)

Here again one finds the technique of providing a blanket explanation which limits perception of Japanese achievement in an important area of artistic endeavor (in this case, literature). After abandoning a native literary form from the Tokugawa period, the “Japanese writer” (a figure who comes to stand for all Japanese writers, regardless of their field of specialization) “. . . began looking for Western models,” finding a suitable replacement in a “Romanticism” that Seidensticker classifies as something of a cast-off genre (“already becoming slightly antiquated in the West”¹⁵). Thus, Japanese writers are depicted in this passage as settling for an outmoded form of literature, which they nevertheless attempt to emulate. Here, closure of reader perception is accomplished in the author’s depiction of Japanese invention. A series of statements implies, first, that Japanese had outgrown their own forms of literature (thus casting doubt on the viability of these forms), second, that they were willing to settle for a defective form from Western nations, and third, that they were unable even to emulate the defective Western genre very well, being forced to “be Japanese in spite of themselves.”

Once again, notice the successively more constrictive closures of reader perception of Japanese ability to create. At the same time, the successive closures of the reader perception of the cultural Other simultaneously work to open the world of the Fodor’s author. The narrative of the tour guidebook is a platform upon which Seidensticker can scaffold increasingly broad assumptions about the artistic abilities of Japanese. In few venues other than the tour guidebook would it be possible for an author to cover the range of description found in this Fodor’s narrative. Because Seidensticker is not answerable to the demands of having to back up, prove, or cite sources for the assertions he makes, the opportunities presented for opening the

¹⁵ The suggestion that the West abandoned this particular literary form further implies the West’s modernity, while the assertion that the Japanese were willing to try an “already antiquated” genre reinforces the view of Japan as “backward.”

author's world are expanded. At the same time, the opening of the author's world must be accomplished at the expense of closing perception of the world of the cultural Other, which is closed further with the pronouncement of each successive opinion.

In another example, one sees further evidence of the effect of closing perception of the world of the cultural Other; here, Seidensticker relegates Japanese artistic tradition, not simply to a lower status among other traditions, but potentially to a position from which it is questionable whether Japan could ever be "pre-eminent" in any cultural tradition:

If the Japanese are to be granted pre-eminence in any of the arts, then painting, architecture, and landscape gardening must certainly be on the list. Indeed the three are closely allied, and with them can also be grouped certain pursuits in which art and handicraft merge, such as the making of textiles, and certain polite accomplishments, such as the tea ceremony and flower arranging. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 83)

One can see in this passage a clear strategy to minimize the accomplishments of Japanese artists, primarily through closing the perception of the world of Japanese arts, as this world is expressed in a number of specialized artistic activities. The initial phrase cues the reader to expect that Japanese will not be granted pre-eminence: Seidensticker uses the qualifier "if," suggesting that the three identified activities (painting, architecture, and landscape gardening) should be included on a list (of activities in which the Japanese are pre-eminent), provided it were possible for such a list to be drawn up. One can see how the world of the Japanese has been closed simply by asking oneself why the author did not say, "The Japanese are pre-eminent in painting, architecture, and landscape gardening." Instead, Seidensticker's strategy seems to be to cast doubt upon Japanese competence, and then grudgingly to admit that perhaps they may, after all, be competent in some limited areas.

The suggestion of stricturing or closing reader perception of Japanese is very strong in this passage. Following the initial qualifying phrase, the strategy seems to

continue in subsequent portions of the passage. After limiting reader perception of Japanese contribution to the arts, the author goes further, conflating even these three activities with those in which “arts and handicrafts merge” (use of the term “handicrafts” as distinct from “art” suggests that some of the activities cannot even be considered “art” at all). Finally, the author closes the passage with reference to the art/handicraft activities as “certain polite accomplishments,” thus hinting that they are more a matter of social form than the result of “serious” intent on the part of their creators.

At the same time, for both this and the previous example, one must not forget that the closure of the Other’s world is simultaneously an opening of the authorial world. By restricting the world of Japanese through verbal summarizing, the author of this, or any other cultural description assumes the right to make the description. Moreover, the circumstances surrounding the assumption of that right are dictated by differences in power. Who grants the author of the Fodor’s guidebook the right to make objectionably broad assertions? Many constituencies do: Fodor’s readers, the supervising editor, the CEO of the company, those involved in the author’s experience or lack thereof—the list is endless. Nevertheless, the process is still the same: each instantiation of the power exerted on the writer, being embedded in concentric groups, exerts more social force influencing the writing of the discourse.

To summarize, in this section, a number of methods utilized by the Fodor’s guidebook series to question the creative and inventive abilities of the Japanese have been explored. In some ways, the legacy of Chinese culture has proved to be Japan’s greatest boon but at the same time the source of some of the most troublesome and limiting stereotypes about the country. Moreover, the stereotype, “Japan-as-cultural-borrower,” has seemingly been carried over to discussions of Japan’s adaptations of the cultural practices of other countries: Japanese are widely believed to have borrowed significant portions of their culture from Western nations during the Meiji

modernization of the late nineteenth century, as well as from the Allies following World War II (see Gibney, 1979, p. 32).

One must remember, however, that whether a nation is said to “borrow” or to “adapt” a given cultural practice may often come down to a question of whether that nation has sufficient power to dictate the terms according to which it will be represented. One notices a marked change in the representations of Japanese dependence on other cultures in the Fodor’s editions from 1962 through 1982, as compared to the representations in the 1990 Fodor’s guidebook. Whereas the earlier Fodor’s editions seemed quite eager to subscribe to the stereotype that Japanese are unoriginal in their cultural practices, the 1990 edition firmly avoids reinforcing this stereotype.

Have Japanese done “more” cultural borrowing than other “developed” nations? Whether such a question can even be sensibly posed is debatable; on the other hand, the “cultural borrower” stereotype certainly seems to be applied differentially to different nations. The United States, in its comparative infancy as a nation, but never having been burdened with the stereotype that it is a “cultural borrower,” often claims its authority based on the fact that it attracts people of many different cultures to its shores to contribute their cultural practices. In other words, perhaps because of its political and economic prestige, the United States appears to be perceived as a place where “borrowing” is done through voluntary contribution of immigrants, rather than as a result of the United States having had to approach other cultures and be taught by them.

Japan, on the other hand, has never fully escaped the perception that it owes much of its culture to other nations. On its face, this picture of Japan seems suspect. It hardly seems reasonable to suppose that Japan, over its long and complex history, has merely “adapted” cultural practices of other nations without making significant modifications in those practices. To take just one example, some descriptions

(particularly those in tour guidebooks) talk about the “borrowing” of the Chinese language as if the Japanese, at some time in the remote past, came upon classical Mandarin Chinese and decided it might “work” for them. Few languages rival Chinese for sophistication and difficulty; hence, the “borrowing” of Chinese must have presented the Japanese with a great deal of difficulty, particular in the early stages of its history. Yet the Japanese persevered, even though they are today burdened with a writing system that many believe inappropriate to their spoken language. The same is almost certainly true of any cultural practice Japan has “borrowed” from another country. Perhaps this is why the 1990 Fodor’s guidebook seems to be so firmly committed to dispelling the stereotype of “Japan-as-cultural-borrower.” It is probably a mistake to summarize long, involved, and often painful adaptation of foreign cultural practices as, in the words of Edward Seidensticker, “more or less straight borrowing.”

Elements of temporal change in open and closed perception of Fodor’s descriptions. While Japan’s classification into the categories of “traditional nation” and “cultural borrower” are significant, this comprises only a part of the picture of Japan painted over the course of the successive editions of the Fodor’s guidebook. To fully understand the Fodor’s perspective, it is necessary to look at some elements of change concerning open and closed perception which have emerged as the Fodor’s series has evolved over time. In the following, I discuss the three topics relating to temporal change in open and closed perception in the Fodor’s series: (1) the unchanging theme of the superiority-inferiority dichotomy between West and East; (2) assignment of more positive connotation to the label, “traditional”; and (3) granting more recognition to Japanese religious traditions.

Unchanging theme of superiority-inferiority dichotomy between West and East. Through long historical contact, the dichotomy between “West” and “East” has become conflated with other conceptual divisions: “we” and “they,” “present” and

“past,” “modern” and “traditional.” These remain the parameters according to which Asian countries are evaluated. Throughout the Fodor’s series, these dichotomies remain virtually intact. The Fodor’s editors, on the other hand, seem to believe that they have opened their perceptions of Japan, giving Japan (and other Asian countries) a “new” identity. In advising its readers of the desirability of understanding the “mysterious Orient,” the 1962 edition of Fodor’s states,

Does this mean that it is hopeless for us to try to understand the Orient? Of course not. The end of the colonial era has dropped or destroyed many barriers to understanding. We have learned to deal with Asians as equals. Their inferiority complexes and mistrust are disappearing fast while our superiority complex, which made us deaf and callous in the past, is gone forever . . . we hope. (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 5; identical statements are to be found in 1969 edition on the same page)

In the 1976 and 1982 editions, this statement appears with some revisions:

Their inferiority complexes and mistrust are disappearing fast (and many Japanese are repolishing their recently inflated egos, in fact) while our superiority complex, which made us deaf and callous in the past, is gone forever . . . or should be. (Fodor’s, 1976, p. 9; identical statements are found in 1982 edition on p. viii)

The latter version is revised in three important ways: (1) the descriptor, “the Orient,” an ideologically loaded term suggesting mystery and exoticism (Said, 1978) is replaced with the more neutral, “the East”; (2) the phrase, “recently inflated egos,” has been inserted to describe Japan; and (3) the phrase describing the Western “superiority complex” has been changed from “is gone forever . . . we hope,” to “is gone forever . . . or should be.” In the complete revision of the 1990 Fodor’s edition, these statements are of course excised; in fact, in the 1990 edition, Chapter 1 (“Essential Information”) contains no direct references to hierarchical comparisons between “East” and “West” (although one does find that the anonymous author of this chapter

manages to make the point more circumspectly¹⁶). Rather, the chapter is comprised of more-or-less straightforward presentation of information, with comparatively less opinion, except where the author offers an evaluation of the “best” sites to see or the “best” times to see them.

In its earlier editions, however, the Fodor’s guidebook apparently prefers to describe East and West as rivals. First, note the use of the term “we”—in this case, the Fodor’s guidebook and its English-speaking, Western readers—as well as the fact that “we” are described as having a “superiority complex,” whereas the “East” or the “Orient” is said to possess an “inferiority complex.” Second, the earlier Fodor’s passages suggest that the “inferiority complex” of the “East” (or the “Orient”) is “disappearing fast,” whereas the “superiority complex” of the West has not yet disappeared. Third, in the 1976 and 1982 editions, Japanese are said to be “repolishing their recently inflated egos.”

While the Fodor’s guidebook seems prepared to grant the East the possibility of becoming confident about itself, use of the terms “we” and “superiority complex” are indicators of Fodor’s habitual assumption of Western preeminence. The disappearance of the Western superiority complex is offered in the 1976 and 1982 editions as an example of the way things “should be,” while this outcome is only to be “hoped” by the authors of the 1962 and 1969 editions. According to the Fodor’s guide, therefore, in twenty years, the West’s superiority complex has yet to be changed.

¹⁶ The following example illustrates how it is possible for the author of the 1990 Fodor’s chapter, “Essential Information,” to use indirect phrasing to place Japanese in the lower position: “It is best not to travel at times when most Japanese are vacationing. For the most part, Japanese cannot select when they want to take their vacations; they tend to do so on the same holiday dates. As a result, airports, planes, trains, and hotels are booked far in advance and are extremely crowded” [Emphasis added] (p. 4). The implication is that Japanese are not free to vacation when they want to, but that Westerners are (they are advised to arrange their trips to avoid the periods when Japanese vacation). On the other hand, few employees, Japanese or otherwise, are permitted very much freedom in arranging vacations. Americans, for example, often travel during the holiday seasons and the summer, leading to an increase in the use transportation and lodging facilities during those times. Nevertheless, in this passage, the Japanese are depicted as constrained and Westerners as free to choose.

Indeed, since the 1982 edition does not assert that the "superiority complex" has disappeared, from the Fodor's description, readers may legitimately wonder whether Western perceptions of superiority to Asians will ever go away.

Through this and similar linguistic devices, the Fodor's guidebook emphasizes the superior position inscribed to the West, leaving the East to be, at best, a beneficiary of the West's generosity. In effect, readers of the earlier editions of the Fodor's guidebook are permitted to have access to the world of the "Easterner" only through the unbalanced power dichotomy which establishes one hemisphere as "superior" and the other as "inferior." The Fodor's guidebook thus closes reader perception of the characters it describes: not only is the East to be looked down upon, but the West is simultaneously elevated through the process of making its judgments.

This view, of course, is only one among many alternative interpretations of East and West. Reading the Fodor's passages out of context, one would have no doubt that the authors are of Western origin. However, what if the relationship were to be described by Easterners? Perhaps the interpretations would be opposite Fodor's: Eastern nations, with their sophisticated and ancient civilizations would have the superiority complex, whereas the West, particularly America, where Fodor's guide is published, would have an inferiority complex based on their limited history and their dependence on "cultural borrowing" from the immigrants who founded their nation. Perhaps the East would not even use the category of "superiority" and "inferiority" to describe the differences between nations in the East and the West. Rather, they might define the East as "spiritually-oriented" and the West as "materially-oriented." Perhaps Easterners would make no distinction at all between East and West, particularly given the intellectual traditions of many Eastern philosophical schools that tolerance and mutual respect are the principles which govern both the universe and interaction among human beings.

These various alternative formulations illustrate the differing vantage points according to which the situation may be examined. The authors are allowed to describe their own versions of reality in specific ways and thus to close the perception of their readers. Interestingly, throughout the four editions of Fodor's series, few changes concerning the distinction between East and West are made.¹⁷ Although much of the travel information is of course updated, the superiority-inferiority dichotomy remains after two decades. Apparently, among the many ways to conceive the differences between the East and the West, Fodor's has chosen one which is particularly dismissive of the East and flattering to the West.

Once so described, the East and Japan are fixated into the "inferior" category. The reader perception of the characters of the guidebook's narrative, the people of the East, is closed.¹⁸ By implication, in the 1976 and 1982 Fodor's editions, Japanese who might dispute this categorization are said to have "inflated egos" that are presently being "repolished." This reference doubly constrains reader perception of the Japanese people, implying not only that they once had inflated egos, but that their egos have become inflated once again.¹⁹

¹⁷ The most notable exceptions to this pattern are the removal of Edward Seidensticker's introductory chapter from the 1976 and 1982 editions and its replacement with the more neutrally-phrased chapter by Douglas Moore Kenrick (Kenrick's chapters are far less dismissive of Japanese cultural integrity than Seidensticker's), together with the inclusion of a chapter devoted to religion (also by Kenrick). On the other hand, not only do Seidensticker's chapters on the arts and history remain through 1982, but the 1976 and 1982 editions also see removal of Francis King's more respectful chapter on Kyoto and its replacement with the caustic description of Richard Leavitt. On balance, then, it can be said that the Fodor's tone in describing Japan as inferior to the West never really disappears or even abates through its 1982 edition.

¹⁸ It might also be pointed out that the longer Fodor's clings to the "superior West"/"inferior East" dichotomy, the more firmly does it declare its intention to close reader perception of Asian people. Particularly in the case of Japanese, Fodor's maintains its original comparisons virtually intact for two decades, in the face of mounting evidence that the comparison is untenable. In effect, not only does Fodor's maintain the dichotomy, but it does so by resolutely ignoring other systems of meaning. Thus, as one compares the depictions over the years, Fodor's appears not simply to invest belief in its own viewpoint, but its commitment to that perspective is made even more evident by its refusal to abandon or even significantly revise the original dichotomy.

¹⁹ Although there is more than one way to interpret this statement, the suggestion of the Japanese defeat in World War II and its subsequent recovery are strongly intimated. Whether Fodor's is in fact saying

In fact, it is not until the 1990 edition that the Fodor's guidebook series begins to assume a more tentative stand toward descriptions of the Japanese:

I do not put faith in analyses that attempt to explain the Japanese character and personality. Of course, in some ways the Japanese are different from us because their history and their culture are different, but human beings are human beings, and we have much more in common than we have differences. (Fodor's, 1990, p. xxvi)

Compared to earlier Fodor's descriptions, this passage by Oliver Statler seems formulated from a less superordinate position. For one thing, notice that there is no reference to "Asians," "the East," or "Orientals." Instead, consistent with the focus of the 1990 edition (which describes only Japan, not Japan and other countries), Statler refers only to Japanese. Moreover, there is no overt attempt to restrict reader perception of Japanese through appeal to the stereotype of Japan as a "traditional" and hence "inferior" country. Instead Statler is apparently aware that thumbnail sketches of "Japanese character" do exist (perhaps he is even aware of those that appear in the earlier editions of the Fodor's guidebook) and he thus seems compelled to position his own description in opposition to these other accounts. Finally, Statler places more emphasis on the similarities, not differences, between Japan and the rest of the world. Statler's declaration in this passage seems unambiguous: he deliberately counterpositions himself against most prevailing views of the Japanese.

At the same time, one should note that the assumption of Western superiority has not entirely disappeared from the 1990 Fodor's guidebook, but rather tends to be expressed less overtly. For example, elsewhere it has been noted that the opening paragraphs of Statler's narrative are framed almost exclusively in terms of his experiences as a member of the Allied Occupation forces following World War II, and

that the Japanese were taught a lesson in World War II that they have now forgotten, the phrase is an ominous one and should either be elaborated or withdrawn.

that his depictions of Japan are of a ruined, defeated, and devastated country: "As far as the eye could see on both sides of the highway, the flat earth was black. The only structures standing were the chimneys of factories the firebombs have consumed" (p. xxiv). These depictions—which occur, one must remember, among the very first descriptions in the guidebook—reveal the perspective from which Statler approaches his subsequent descriptions, and thus are likely to frame subsequent information presented to his readers, giving them the impression that Japan is not a modern nation, but one which is in the process of becoming modern following its humiliating defeat in World War II. Moreover, there are noteworthy instances in which Statler appears to have summarized Japanese character based, not upon behavioral evidence, but upon the fact that they are a "neat-looking crowd" whose members for the most part have black hair:²⁰ "Still, the Japanese do have their particular hang-ups and idiosyncrasies. They explain many of these by the fact that they are a homogeneous people. Certainly just about everybody has black hair (unless henna or age has intervened), which, as a friend has remarked, makes for a neat-looking crowd—no confusion of sundry variations on blond, red, brown, and black" (p. xxvi). In passages such as this, Statler's perspective belies his declaration that he does not "put much faith" in descriptions of "Japanese character." It may be going too far to suggest that Statler's earlier declaration is more or less formulaic,²¹ included primarily because in 1990 travel writers are not expected to indulge in facile summaries of "national character"; on the other hand, at the very least it seems opportunistic for Statler to claim on the one hand that he has no faith in such summaries and then to employ them himself at his convenience.²²

²⁰ This passage is also analyzed in discussion of the dimension of ownership, Chapter Four, pp. 203-205.

²¹ At the same time, touristic discourse is comprised of many such formulaic statements, perhaps indicating that the control of the description is less a matter of authorial choice than of editorial policy.

²² The reference to "neat-looking crowds" is not the only example of Statler's summarizing of "Japanese character." Other examples include the following: (1) "The Japanese themselves have always been avid

Assignment of more positive connotation to the label, "traditional." As noted in earlier discussion, the concept of traditionality is important to the Fodor's strategy of portraying Japan. The introductory chapter by Seidensticker (1962, 1969), "Japan and Its People," which presented a very negative view about Japan, is replaced with a chapter by another author, Douglas Kenrick, who presents a far more positive image of Japan (1976, 1982 editions).

In Kenrick's chapter, although the main structure remains essentially the same as Seidensticker's, the contents, particularly the tone of the narrative, are entirely different. Unlike the earlier version by Seidensticker, there are no complaints about the ugliness of Japanese buildings, the lawlessness of the taxi drivers, the traffic jams, and expressions of the author's disgust at the combination of Eastern and Western elements exhibited in Japanese cities. Although Kenrick's chapter still contains some discussion of the problems associated with life in rural environments, the "countryside" is portrayed much less deprecatory terms than in previous editions. In the country, for example, Kenrick asserts that at least one can "breathe fresh air and picnic on mossy banks under spreading trees by the side of clear running streams" (Fodor's, 1982, p. 27).²³ In other words, while Japan is still seen as traditional, the image of "traditional" has nevertheless become more positive in the later editions of Fodor's guide.

tourists: you must not be surprised to find yourself outnumbered at any popular spot." (p. xxv); (2) "It is true enough that the Japanese are a homogeneous people, but what that means is that the mix occurred so long ago that it is past remembering." (p. xxvii); (3) "Most Japanese are indifferent to sectarian differences and cannot accept the view that any one religion monopolizes the truth." (p. xxx); and so on. References such as these can be puzzling; for example, why does Statler assume that the fact that one is "outnumbered" at a tourist spot is evidence that Japanese are "avid tourists." Perhaps a more self-evident reason that there are more Japanese at a given location is that one is, after all, in Japan.²³ Seidensticker's introductory chapter in the 1962 edition of Fodor's asserts, first, that "... the countryside is being drained of its youth..." (p. 57), second, that "... the countryside can seem quiet almost to the point of sadness." (p. 57), and third, that "... the Japanese countryside is lovely if a trifle wanting in variety..." (p. 60). His portrayal of those who live in rural environments is no more flattering: "... the country is the land of infants and those approaching middle age, and a resentful residue of youth—oldest sons and nubile daughters who have not been allowed to depart for Tokyo and have not quite had the courage to set out on their own" (p. 57).

Granting more recognition to Japanese religious traditions. Through its successive editions, it is clear that Fodor's displays increasingly more evident recognition of the integrity of Japan's religious traditions. One clue to this revision is the inclusion of Kenrick's chapter on religion in the 1976 and 1982 editions, as compared to the 1962 and 1969 editions which contain no chapter on religion. Another clue that Fodor's perspective toward Japanese religion changes over time can be found in various descriptions of Shinto.²⁴ As one compares the successive editions, one perceives the "opening" of the writer's view about this native Japanese religion, from early attempts to associate Shinto with military activity, to later attempts to take a more sophisticated perspective toward Shinto religious beliefs. In the 1962 and 1969 Fodor's editions, Edward Seidensticker describes the impact of the Shinto religion on the Japanese military in the following terms: "The Shinto cult of the divine imperial ancestors, led by the Sun Goddess, and of the emperor as head of the family state made the religion a most valuable tool steeling the nation to the military adventures of the recent past. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 64)

Seidensticker's account contains no suggestion that Shinto aids in spiritual development; rather, Shinto is cast exclusively in terms of its role in the deification of the Emperor as a factor leading to World War II. Moreover, Seidensticker intimates that advocacy of Shinto was somewhat insincere (it is portrayed simply as a "valuable tool" to prepare the nation for war), and indeed, that Shinto cannot even be considered

²⁴ Reischauer (1970) provides this succinct summary of the Shinto religion: "The religious beliefs and practices of uji times have also continued as one of the main religious streams of Japanese history. While nameless at first, these beliefs were subsequently called Shinto, 'the way of the gods,' to distinguish them from Buddhism. The worship of the Sun Goddess and other uji ancestors and deities was part of a much broader worship of the wonders and mysteries of nature. A waterfall, a mountain crag, a mysterious cave, a large tree, a peculiarly shaped stone, an unusual person, or even some lowly thing like an insect, notable only for its capacity for irritation, might inspire a sense of awe. Such objects of worship were called kami, a term somewhat misleadingly translated as 'god,' but obviously not comparable to the Judeo-Christian concept of God. This simple Shinto notion of deity should be borne in mind in trying to understand the 'deification' in modern times of emperors and of soldiers who died for their country" (p. 15).

a religion but is rather a “cult.” By these and other restrictions of reader perception of this native Japanese cultural practice, Seidensticker not only prevents his readers from achieving a more sophisticated awareness of Shinto, but suggests that its practitioners are primarily interested in making war. This latter implication is particularly questionable: it is difficult to escape the impression that Seidensticker is playing to the fears of his Western readers.²⁵ This process of closure prevents readers from perceiving Shinto as a religion and channels their perceptions into perceiving the religion as a tool of statecraft.

Kenrick’s chapter on religion in the 1976 and 1982 editions shows a marked transformation in the Fodor’s approach to depicting Shinto. In the passage below, notice how Kenrick takes care to explain some of the rationales underlying Shinto:

Shinto stresses inward mystical experience. Purification rituals have a twofold significance, external and internal. The body is taken to represent the spirit so that physical purification also symbolizes spiritual purification. Total immersion in sea or river has given way to the symbolic rinsing of mouth and hands when visiting a shrine. The waving of a wand over worshippers or objects by a Shinto priest symbolizes an inward cleansing from all sin and pollution. The prayers read are highly stylized and rhetorical, permeated with praise for the kami and incorporating petitions for protection and blessings, dedications to the divine will, and vows to persevere diligently in this life. (Fodor’s, 1976, p. 75)

²⁵ Seidensticker’s chapters in the 1962 and 1969 editions include several examples illustrating his readiness to appeal to the fears of Westerners, such as the following taken from the 1969 edition: (1) “And so the visitor landing at Haneda Airport or Yokohama may at first feel that he is trying to pierce the impenetrable, and fears he is likely to be crushed for his troubles. [Emphasis added] (p. 56); (2) “Nature has a gentle surface in Japan, but it can be cantankerous and violent. The climate is perverseness itself.” [Emphasis added] (p. 60); (3) “Yet in few places is the foreigner kept more firmly in his place, forever a foreigner and apart.” (p. 62); (4) “Despite the national reputation for politeness, the urban Japanese tends to be a rather inconsiderate person, thinking nothing of the old ladies who are dealt glancing blows as he dashes single-mindedly for his train. . .” (pp. 65-66); and (5) “. . . the young people who populate the Ginza are extreme examples, admitting no obstacle, it would seem, to their pursuit of the moment’s pleasure. Their dress and their actions are most provocative, and the accepted facial expression is evidently the sneer” (p. 66). Particularly in the emphasized portions of the above passages, Seidensticker appears to portray Japan as a very threatening place. Hence, his willingness to depict Shinto in threatening terms is hardly surprising.

Obviously, Kenrick's description, which covers nearly three full pages, contains much more detailed information about Shinto and is moreover less judgmental concerning Shinto religious beliefs. The most dramatic confirmation of the difference between the accounts of Seidensticker and Kenrick, however, comes in their descriptions of the role of Shinto in World War II. Whereas Seidensticker portrayed Shinto as a tool that was used, possibly deliberately, to delude Japanese into supporting the war, Kenrick's description uses a greater level of detail to set the relationship between Shinto and the Imperial house in perspective. Moreover, notice that Kenrick's description does not explicitly mention World War II:

From 1895 to 1945, the Japanese government interpreted the constitution administratively to require all religious groups to receive official authorization for existence within the law, and their doctrines and rituals were subject to government regulation. Devotion to the emperor became, through State Shinto, a foundation of the new Japan and the yardstick by which all religious organizations were judged. (Fodor's, 1976, p. 77)

Because the period of "State Shinto" extended "through 1945," it is implied that officially-sanctioned "devotion to the emperor" ended in the same year that World War II ended. However, Kenrick does not specifically state that there is a connection between the war and official "devotion" to the emperor, in contrast to Seidensticker who not only implies such a connection, but intimates that Shinto was used deliberately to mask Japanese plans to make war ("a most valuable tool steeling the nation to the military adventures of the recent past").

In the 1990 edition readers are presented with an account of Shinto which is more thorough than Seidensticker's 1962 and 1969 descriptions, though somewhat more cursory than Kenrick's more extensive explanations in the 1976 and 1982 editions. As Oliver Statler describes Shinto:

Shintoism is native to Japan. Its belief can be described as awe in the face of nature and reverence for the ancestral spirits of the nation, the clan, and the family. It expresses these feelings simply and directly; it has no elaborate doctrines or hierarchies that lay down dogma. Buddhism, one of the great world religions, is highly organized, profound, and complex.

The arrival of Buddhism raised no conflict with Shintoism. They complemented each other and found it easy to coexist. Mutual accommodation set in—and a slow process of fusion. Buddhist temples and Shinto shrines were built side by side. People worshipped at either or both, as they chose; they saw the two religions as two paths to the same goal. Most Japanese are indifferent to sectarian differences and cannot accept the view that any one religion monopolizes the truth. (Fodor's, 1990, p. xxx)

Given the general trend toward greater sensitivity to Japanese cultural practices exhibited by the Fodor's series, one might wonder why the 1990 edition is less informative concerning Shinto than Kenrick's portrayal in the 1976 and 1982 editions. One possible answer to this question may be found in the dimension of open and closed perception. I have noted a number of times that the 1990 edition of Fodor's represents a complete departure from earlier editions in style, content, tone, and approach. One important structural revision which characterizes the 1990 edition is that the format of the first section of the guidebooks from 1962 through 1982 (which dealt with various topics related to Japanese cultural life, such as history, food, shopping, and the arts) is abandoned in the 1990 edition. Only two topical chapters remain, one on history ("Japanese History," by Jon Spayde, pp. 44-63) and the other on food ("The Discrete Charm of Japanese Cuisine," by Diane Durston, pp. 64-77); these chapters are combined in a section titled, "Portraits of Japan."

Specialized information on other topics are treated in the introductory chapters, not as items of interest in and of themselves, but in relation to the activities of tourists. For example, while there is no specific discussion of material on sports (which occurs in the chapter, "Arts and Lesser Pleasures" in the earlier editions), the section "Staying in Japan" (pp. 24-42) does contain a subsection, "Sports" (pp. 32-33), which deals

primarily with activities in which the tourist can engage, as well as information on how to attend spectator sports. Any information about a given sport's background is offered only incidentally to the main goal of providing "useful" information to the tourist. For example, consider this description of sumo wrestling: "The earliest recorded sumo matches were held around AD 200, and it is a sport that is deeply steeped in tradition." This brief historical account is followed by a description of a typical match, and then by information on how to obtain tickets.

The tone of the description of cultural events in the 1990 edition seems to be generated by a more consumeristic viewpoint than is found in the earlier editions. For all the limitations on the depiction of Japanese culture found in the Fodor's editions 1962 through 1982, one must admit that there was at least an attempt to provide some detailed information on topics that might be of interest to those who were simply curious about Japanese life. The 1990 edition, on the other hand, despite frequent references indicating increased sensitivity toward Japanese cultural integrity, nevertheless appears to cast most of its information toward the activity of tourism. One manifestation of this altered approach was found in the more overtly consumeristic perspective exhibited by the 1990 edition (discussed under the dimension of ownership²⁶); another is the pragmatically oriented chapter structure in which background information is relegated to the status of being supplemental to more "practical" material. Both these manifestations serve to close reader perception of Japan. Instead of treating certain key cultural elements as being interesting in and of themselves, these elements are instead treated as subsidiary to consumeristic and pragmatic aspects of the touristic transaction.²⁷

²⁶ See Chapter Four, pp. 217-221.

²⁷ Notice that the less pragmatically-oriented structure is in fact more similar to the JTB's style of presenting information, a format that has been retained by Japan, the Official Guide for more than seventy years. Ironically, it is the earlier editions of the Fodor's series which seem more prepared to offer visitors information for its own sake about cultural topics, rather than the 1990 edition which—

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Open and Closed Perception of JTB's Descriptions

Discourse is always open to new interpretations due to the interaction between the author's perspective and the evolving contexts in which his or her discourse is presented. At the same time, the world of the readers will remain closed to each unique presentation. Touristic discourse, such as that which is found in the JTB's guidebook, is a good example of this general rule.

As noted earlier, the writing of the JTB's and other tour guidebooks is conducted, not in abstract, value-neutral environments in which descriptions are fashioned freely and without interference. Rather, guidebooks are located in sociohistorically specific time and space, so that writers must utilize available resources to address issues specific to the contexts in which their representations are presented; furthermore, presentations must be fashioned in specific ways, reflecting the author's position in the broader sociohistorical environment. More importantly, given the sociohistorical specificity involved in the various elements of the representational environment, the goals to be achieved by any written touristic discourse will be unique to the author who writes such discourse, to the touristic discourse which confines the author's available resources, and to the imagined responses of readers. In other words, it is a matter of authorial preference which resources to choose, as well as which contextual factors to respond to, in fashioning a unique version of reality. This is the "openness" referred to in the dimension of open and closed perception. As sociohistorical contexts change, and as the author's position relative to such contexts alters, the writing of the touristic description changes accordingly.

though it states its desire to be less dismissive of Japanese cultural integrity—nevertheless excludes important information in the name of expediency.

Among the elements of sociohistorical context to which the JTB finds it necessary to respond is a perceived confinement of Japan to the “traditional” side of the “modern” / “traditional” dichotomy. From admitting in earlier editions to the “traditional” character of Japan, to its more recent portrayal of Japan as embracing both traditionality and modernity, the JTB has seemingly tried to respond to sociohistorical forces by depicting Japan in the most positive fashion.

The struggle to define Japan within the “modern” / “traditional” dichotomy.

The manner in which a tourist site is described is often left to the decision of the authors (and editors) of the tour guidebook; once described, however, perception and orientation of readers becomes more or less constrained. In the following discussion, I examine how differences between past and present, as well as between “East” and “West,” are conceived and inscribed in the various editions of the JTB guidebook. In the 1955 edition, one finds very few references to the present and the past, and to East and West, though there are more such references in the later editions. Specifically, the following topics will be addressed: (1) “modern” and “traditional” as parameters; and (2) consistent equation between “Western” and “international.”

“Modern” and “traditional” as parameters. In the 1975 edition, Tokyo is said to be “. . . a unique amalgamation of the tranquil past and the boisterous present. . . .” (p. 318; a similar statement appears on p. 360 of the 1991 edition). This description fixates the potential tourist’s view of Tokyo. First, Tokyo is conceived to have gone through an artificially discontinuous progression through time: there is a distinction between the “past” and “present,” rather than depiction of a continuous flow of change. Although potential visitors might wonder about when the dividing line between past and present occurs, this issue is unanswered in the text of the JTB guidebook. Second, in the quoted passage, the “past” is associated the state of being “tranquil,” whereas the “present” is said to be “boisterous.” It is also possible that the past could be “boisterous” and that there are certainly some “tranquil” elements in the

“present” Tokyo; however, the JTB guidebook chooses not to elaborate these linkages. The discursive strategy of making more complete explanations is open to JTB, but is not incorporated. By relegating tranquility to the past and boisterousness to the present, the author limits potential reader perception by excluding the possibility that Tokyo can be seen as embracing these two distinctive cultural characteristics in other ways.

While Tokyo’s past is perceived to be distant from its present in regard to “tranquillity” and “boisterousness,” Kyoto, in the distant past a capital of Japan, is said to embrace past and present harmoniously. All three editions of the JTB’s guidebook assert that Kyoto’s material progress coexists harmoniously with its “old-world atmosphere.” Instead of being like Tokyo, an “amalgamation of the tranquil past and the boisterous present,” Kyoto’s “old-world atmosphere” exists “apart from the busy world” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1955, p. 673; similar statements can be found on p. 655 of the 1991 edition and p. 627 of the 1975 edition). To further emphasize Kyoto’s “old-world atmosphere,” frequent reference is made to the history of various industries—one presumes in the “boisterous” present—in Kyoto. For example, Nishijin Silk Weaver is said to date back to 794, dyeing to have been invented in the late 17th century, ceramics to have gained national fame in the 17th century, and so on (see pp. 657-659 of the 1991 edition).

Of course, Kyoto’s present is not completely lost. To describe Kyoto’s industrial accomplishments is to remind readers not to be overwhelmed simply by Kyoto’s ostensibly “old-world” atmosphere. Here, the author seems to want to accomplish two goals simultaneously: to introduce Kyoto’s industry in order to emphasize the city’s modern quality, and to introduce the history of industry in order to emphasize the city’s traditionality. In other words, the cross-referencing and intertwining of modernity and traditionality shows Kyoto as a location at the crossroads of past and present, a city where tourists will be able to explore old traditions and exotic cultural

practices, while at the same time admiring and being comforted by Kyoto's modern conveniences.

This dichotomy between the past and the present, and between the traditional and the modern, further perpetuates the perception of the distinction between the East and the West. In the JTB guidebooks, Tokyo is also said to be a city which blends East and West: “. . . a city where the integration of East and West is most advanced . . .” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1975, p. 318) and again, “. . . the city where East and West blend most harmoniously . . .” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 360). Again, this description closes the perception of potential visitors. First, the dichotomy implies that aspects of Eastern and Western cultures belong to two different categories; hence, it becomes necessary for them to be integrated or blended. Second, Tokyo does not simply represent a unique “Eastern” culture, but is said to be a “blend” of East and West. Readers will not be permitted to perceive Tokyo on its own terms, but must situate the city with regard to the influence of the West. Third, granted that East and West are legitimate categories, characteristics of the past and present are said to “blend harmoniously” or at least to be in their most advanced state in Tokyo. What precisely constitutes “Eastern culture” and “Western culture”? Are there problems of cultural integration or conflict between the two cultural systems? Taken on its face, the JTB accounts seem to suggest that such problems may not exist in Tokyo, since the blend is “harmonious” and “advanced.” Like Fodor's, the JTB's guidebook series also performs restrictive closures on reader perception of Tokyo and other cities as well.

If one is to classify Tokyo as an “international city,” however, this reference to East and West may be necessary. As noted in earlier discussion, “modern,” “Western,” and “international” are often used interchangeably in the JTB's guidebooks. While the 1955 edition states this point directly and unambiguously, in both the 1975 and 1991 editions, JTB classifies Tokyo as an international city: “As an international city, it ranks topmost in Asia and most nations of the world have their

diplomatic delegations here" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1975, p. 318; similar statements can be found on p. 360 of the 1991 edition). This tendency to define a city in relation to other cities in the world can also be observed in the description of Kyoto. Kyoto has "... won the admiration of the world ... [and] retains a unique position among the great cities of the world" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 655; similar statements can be found on p. 627 of 1975 edition).

Tokyo and Kyoto, then, must be perceived by JTB's readership through the perspective utilized by the JTB guidebook. Both Tokyo and Kyoto are said to be situated between the past and the present, between the traditional and the modern, and between the East and the West; moreover, both are viewed as "international cities." While another author might have chosen to describe the two cities in terms of what they are at the present moment (rather than make explicit reference to the past), or in terms of what they are locally (rather than mentioning influences from the West), or in terms of how they compare to cities in Japan (rather than describing them as "international"), these are options apparently not selected by the author and editors of the JTB guidebook. In these, as in other cultural descriptions, no definite conclusion can be reached as to how Tokyo and Kyoto should be viewed. Rather, it is in the texts of their descriptions that meanings for these cities are defined and their identities are created and fixated.

Consistent equation between "Western" and "international." The negotiation of the meanings of "modern" and "traditional" are further complicated by the meanings assigned to the term "Western." Earlier, I noted that hotels and restaurants are often categorized according to whether they belong to the "Western-style" or the "Japanese-style." "Western-style" hotels are said to have "modern accommodations," and "Western-style" restaurants are said to have "modern facilities."

Even though, in the 1955 edition, some hotels and restaurants are described as "foreign-style," in the 1975 and 1991 editions, the term "foreign-style" has been

replaced with the more specific “Western-style.” Interestingly, the word “foreign” is used as a generic term to describe visitors throughout all three editions of the guidebook. In other words, it is only when reference is made to food and accommodations that the word “foreign” is modified to “Western.” Visitors can be designated as “foreigners,” but the standard of living must be designated as “Western.”

The interchangeability of these two terms carries specific symbolic connotations, serving to close perception of what it means to be “Western.” What elements of Japanese culture should the reader view as being “Western”? Certainly not all Western-style restaurants and hotels are high quality; moreover, not all Western-style restaurants and hotels qualify as meeting “international” or “modern” standards. However, by equating “Western” with a higher standard of living, the JTB guidebook closes the definition of the West, excluding many facets associated with “being Western.” This fixation of the Other in one’s own description apparently also serves another goal: to fashion a more elevated perception of Japan’s own identity. JTB is free to define itself with reference to the West, selecting from among an indefinitely broad array of descriptors which may further define what it means to be “Western-style,” while at the same time choosing to confine and close the symbolic space of the term “Western” in the service of its own agendas.

Even in the JTB’s description of food, there seemingly remain elements suggesting the equation between “Western” and “international.” That the Fodor’s guidebook is not the only source to equate these descriptors is indicated in the following passage describing Japanese food in relation to the cuisine of other countries. The point apparently being made—that Japanese food occupies a premier place among the cuisines of the world—would, one suspects, require some evidence before audiences are likely to be convinced. Therefore the JTB author seems obliged to carefully choose data which will position Japanese cuisine in the best possible light.

This is done through a well-crafted series of closures of cultures of other countries, together with the simultaneous expansion of the author's perceptual horizon regarding Japanese cuisine as defined by the JTB guidebook.

Japanese cooking is one of the most pleasing. In addition to the wide range of locally raised produce, foodstuffs are imported from all over the globe. Japanese agricultural cultivation methods are highly advanced and ensure that many farm products are available all year round. In addition to such traditional Japanese favorites as sukiyaki, sashimi, sushi and kaiseki ryori, there are many foreign restaurants specializing in French, Italian, German, Russian, and Spanish cuisine as well as spicy Indian and Mexican food, and Chinese and Korean delicacies, etc. Japan is proud of the high quality of its fresh water, and there is never any need to worry about drinking tap water or the availability of commercial mineral water. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 46)

In this passage, the JTB author manages to convey the impression that every eventuality which could possibly impact one's experience dining in Japan has been anticipated and accommodated: the reader is given information on cultivation of food, on its transport, and even on the quality of water. Moreover, there is a clear ordering of foreign cuisine by country: beginning with French and Italian, one goes down the list through German, Russian, and Spanish cuisine, next encountering "spicy" Indian and Mexican food, until one comes to the end of the list, with Asian cuisine, which is not even referred to as "food," but as "delicacies."

The listing of the cuisines of various countries in this way looks somewhat like the list one might obtain if one asked a Westerner to rank order, most highly regarded to least regarded, the gourmet cuisines of various countries (since they are known to have engendered long traditions of gourmet cooking, French and Italian are of course first, followed by some of the less well-known European cuisines, and so on down the list). However, the one ranking that does not seem to fit is the placement of other Asian food (or, rather, not "food," but "delicacies") in the lowest position. Indeed, most visitors to other Asian countries (particularly Chinese countries such as Hong

Kong, Taiwan, or Singapore) cite food as a primary source of enjoyment during their trip.²⁸ JTB's reasons for listing the cuisines in this order may be another manifestation of its eagerness to align itself with the "more developed" European nations, while at the same time distancing itself from the traditional, more "ethnic" countries of the Pacific Rim. Given its desire to be seen as a "modern," "world-class" nation, most of the effort JTB puts forward is directed toward exhibiting itself less like an Asian country and more like an "international" center of trade and commerce.

One should note, however, that the effect of placing Japanese in the international community is attained through a series of closures of the worlds of various cultural Others, achieved in several ways throughout the JTB guidebook, but here by references to food. By placing national cuisines in order, and moreover, by limiting the contributions of other Asian countries to the realm of "delicacies," the JTB elevates (opens up) its own right to make judgments about cuisine through closing the perception of the cuisines of the countries it describes. However, the signs of the effort remain: one wonders, if Japanese cuisine is of such high quality, why it is that, even as recently as 1991, it is still necessary to convince potential visitors of the safety of the water and the quality of food production, transportation and preparation.

Inscription of Japan's positive image. A second important task to be accomplished by the JTB is to convey a positive image of Japan. In the previous chapter, I elaborated how, given the broader sociopolitical context within which East and West are defined, guidebooks about Japan seem consistently oriented toward stereotypes: while the accounts in the Fodor's series have been shown to support many stereotypes about Japan and the Japanese, the JTB seems compelled to answer these same stereotypes. As we examine the process of JTB's struggle through the lens of open and closed perception, it becomes clear that these stereotypes have another

²⁸ Even the Fodor's guidebook admits as much: "The culinary achievements of this region of the world surpass those of any other in the world. . ." (Fodor's, 1962, p. 8).

function: they serve to close perception of the Japanese, while allowing authors of the descriptions to select from among resources available to them to fashion an image of Japan. Among the options available to answer stereotypes about Japan, the JTB consistently and frequently uses one specific method: it provides excessive amounts of factual information, apparently as a way of declaring its control over representations of Japan. The excess of information advances two implicit messages: first, it implies that the JTB is privileged to have access to information not available to others, but second, that its use of the available information is for the purpose of establishing itself as an authority. On the basis of these two messages, JTB appears to be able to rest its more favorable depictions of Japan.

Providing an excessive amount of information. The chief means by which JTB conveys a positive image of Japan is through the amount of data contained in its guidebook series. JTB is free to choose the amount of information it wishes to incorporate in Japan, the Official Guide. Tour guidebooks inevitably contain information about subjects such as daily life, customs and culture, sociohistorical matters, and sites and locales. However, as I have noted, the information contained in the JTB guidebook far exceeds the breadth and depth of that contained in most other tour guidebooks. For example, in addition to travel information, the JTB guidebook also contains an extensive section on "General Information" which concerns facts about various aspects of Japanese life, whether directly related to travel or not. In the 1955 edition, the "General Information" section encompassed 256 out of a total of 1015 pages; in the 1975 edition, 316 pages out of a total of 1088 pages; and in the 1991 edition, 268 pages out of a total of 968 pages.

The decision to incorporate such an extraordinary amount of information in the JTB guidebook results from choices made by the Japan Travel Bureau; according to JTB, Japan, the New Official Guide is not merely a travel guide, but also is to be viewed as a reference for anyone who is interested in any aspect of Japanese life. JTB

could have followed the pattern established by the genre of tour guidebooks by providing a less detailed, less seriously purposive account, but it chose not to do so. JTB could have deleted the section on "General Information," but chose not to do so. Moreover, in these editions of the JTB's guidebook, the section titled, "General Information" is always presented first, followed by "Travel Information." JTB could have reversed the order of presentation to highlight the utilitarian value of Japan, the Official Guide, portraying it primarily as a travel guidebook, but it chose not to do so.

These choices made by JTB function to close reader perceptions about Japan. Even without carefully reading the contents of the JTB guidebook, one would find it difficult not to be impressed with its completeness, level of detail, and elegance. Certainly there are aspects of Japan which may not seem as favorable as they are portrayed in the JTB guidebook; there may be difficulties and problems which the JTB guidebook chooses to ignore. The depiction of Japan which is presented, however, is not a random or unimportant image. Moreover, readers can hardly see Japan as merely a potential site to visit without first noticing the existence of various aspects of Japanese life. If the JTB guidebook is the first contact readers have with Japan, it is likely that they will be impressed with Japan's efforts in producing the book, and will have little doubt that Japan is a modern, economically successful nation. Cued by the guidebook's orientations, readers will be less likely to treat Japan lightly or contemptuously.

In the JTB guidebook series, on the other hand, many aspects of Japanese life are closed to reader perception. Thus, JTB cleverly inscribes a unique point of view about Japan for its readers: it provides a careful, serious depiction of a land and a people suffused with life and culture. As readers are invited to review the book, Japan is portrayed as a country struggling to be the best, rather than a country stereotyped as militaristic or as "cultural borrowers." It is depicted as a country with superior and

ancient traditions, rather than a barren, insignificant, repository of the cultural practices of other nations.

Elements of temporal change in open and closed perception of JTB's descriptions. The situation created by the JTB guidebook, on the other hand, more consistently attempts to advance a single version of "reality" out of many, often conflicting, representations. Readers participate in the particular version advanced by the JTB guidebook because of its characteristic rendering of "reality." Through a multiplicity of architectonic systems between author and reader, as well as other alternative discourses, the meanings of the JTB guidebook can be interpreted, contemplated, and revised. Seen in this way, readers' perceptions of the world are closed by the JTB authors and editors: such perceptions are influenced by the ways in which the subject is written, by the position taken by the author, and through the context in which meanings are assigned and interpreted. The world described in each successive edition, therefore, provides a unique way for readers to understand the objects of cultural description.

As has been noted, the evolution of the JTB series is marked by a noticeable increase in JTB's confidence in describing Japan. JTB's evolution toward more confidence entails both the realization of Japan's increasingly more powerful role in the international community, and simultaneously the need for JTB to become less uncomfortable with Japan's well-established reputation as a "traditional" country. Specifically, one can trace the evolution of the JTB perspective through examination of three issues: (1) recognition of the category "traditionality"; (2) asserting Japan's political power; and (3) indications of increasing self-assurance.

Recognition of the category "traditionality." In each successive edition of the JTB guidebook, the corporate author—the Japan Travel Bureau—chooses to describe Japan in various ways. The rise of Japan in the international arena, together with its emergence as a superpower in the world economy following World War II, are

referenced in all three editions of the JTB Guide, such descriptions changing from the portrayal of Japan as relatively uncertain to its depiction as self-assured and self-confident. For example, overall there is a change from defining tradition as part of the nation's image, to seeing tradition as a sign of the remote past (thus to be contrasted with Japan's modernization). The tone of the presentation also changes, from apology to self-assurance to arrogance, as JTB describes its transportation, accommodations, and many other aspects of Japanese life.

In the 1955 edition, JTB hardly portrays Japan as a superpower. In the 1991 edition, on the other hand, the reader is provided with a vivid picture of a modern, dynamic Japan and may even be uncertain as to whether Japan has ever been classified as anything other than a "modern" country. Although readers, from their own unique viewpoints, engage different readings of the "same" JTB guidebook, the picture of Japan that emerges nevertheless serves to condition reader understanding.

Indeed, using the word "edition" as a descriptor implies openness to the possibility of revising one's perspective. While the JTB guidebook could have maintained its 1955 or 1975 editions until the present time, JTB chose to offer a revised version for 1991. Of course, one can legitimately argue that new information should be included to "update" travel descriptions. However, beyond these specific revisions, such as references to new buildings (for example, the New International Airport), or the number of restaurants registered with the government, there also appears to be an 'updating" of Japan's image in the JTB narrative, as reflected in the revised tone of many descriptions. The consequence of such revisions is an altered presentation which portrays Japan in more favorable terms with each successive edition. While JTB is free to choose different ways to describe Japan, once the choices are made and the text written, reader access to alternative representations is, to a degree, more limited.

The category of "traditional" Japan, as contrasted with the category, "modern" Japan, emerges clearly in the 1991 edition. The concept of "traditional Japan"

subsumes many of the ideas advanced by JTB's guidebook in its previous editions. For example, in the 1991 edition, Japanese tray landscaping is discussed under a common subsection titled, "Bonkei, Bonseki, and Bonsai," in the chapter "Traditional Japan." In the 1955 edition, these topics are discussed as part of Japanese gardening, in a chapter titled, "Landscape and Other Gardening" (pp. 243-249). In the 1975 edition, however, these practices have become more important, having achieved status sufficient to warrant an independent chapter of their own. By the 1991 edition, a new category, "Traditional Japan," has subsumed all three aspects of tray landscaping: in the 1991 edition, bonkei, bonseki, and bonsai are designated as belonging to the "traditional" dimension of Japanese life.

With each successive description of Japanese tray landscaping, the meanings and importance associated with these three practices are transformed: from a less important position, to a more important position, and finally, to a "traditional" aspect of the culture. Clearly, there cannot be one definite, "correct," way to describe these practices: one cannot, for example, argue that the essence of tray landscaping is best captured by the descriptor, "traditional Japan." The system of description is open to the author's own interpretation of how best to abide by sociohistorical specificity. Since JTB perceives these topics to be of interest to potential visitors, it chooses to highlight them by placing them in a more significant position. As JTB perceives the emergence of the dichotomy between traditionality and modernity, tray landscaping is then reassigned to the traditional aspect of Japanese cultural life. Indeed, one can only speculate where tray landscaping will be placed in future revisions of Japan, the New Official Guide. Perhaps it will no longer prove important to JTB or its readers, or perhaps it will be assigned to the "modern" aspects of Japanese life, or perhaps it will become so important as to transcend the traditional/modern dichotomy. The author's own system of perception and hence the freedom to fashion descriptions of these and other cultural practices remains open and forever unfinished.

On the other hand, once bonkei, bonseki, and bonsai are declared to be part of “traditional Japan,” it will be more difficult for readers to conceive of them as “modern”; once they become a category separate from “Landscape and Other Gardening,” they are no longer subsumed as topics related primarily to horticulture. Thus, reader perception of these practices remains closed: their importance, their relation to other touristic discourses, as well as the meanings defined and associated with such practices and the viewpoints occasioned by their introduction in the social stream of discourse, will all to a certain extent have been specified and fixed through the discursive mechanisms by which the descriptions are fashioned and presented.

Asserting Japan's political power. In addition to giving rise to the perceived necessity for Japan to portray its cultural practices as sufficiently “traditional” not to require apology, the dichotomy between “traditionality” and “modernity” also engenders an imbalance of political power between East and West which JTB apparently feels necessitates an assertion of Japan's political authority with respect to the international community of nations. One example of this perceived need is indicated in descriptions of the Ryukyu Islands²⁹ as found in successive editions of the JTB's guidebook. As will be evident, these accounts may be viewed as reflecting varying degrees of open and closed perception in describing the ambiguous status of the Ryukyu Islands. The Ryukyu Islands became part of Japanese territory as the result of an agreement with the United States in 1971. In order to further affirm Japan's claim on the Ryukyu Islands, JTB uses several linguistic devices to close the perception of potential tourists, leading the reader to the conclusion that the islands are unambiguously the property of Japan.

²⁹ The Ryukyu Islands are comprised of an arc of more than sixty islands dividing the Pacific Ocean and the East China Sea, extending nearly to Taiwan. The best known of the Ryukyu Islands is Okinawa at the chain's northernmost end. The islands were occupied by the United States in 1945; the northern islands were returned to Japan in 1953, and the southern islands in 1972.

In accounting for the culture of the islands, the 1991 JTB guidebook states: "In terms of culture, Okinawa used to have unique Japanese manners and customs mingled with Chinese elements, but today the islands are completely assimilated with Japanese culture" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 888; there is no reference to the Ryukyu Islands' political status in the 1955 edition). First, reference to the past ("used to") is employed to imply difference from the present ("today"); this distancing device serves to highlight the current, "uniquely Japanese," culture, as contrasted with the past, which is characterized as having been influenced by Chinese "elements." Second, Chinese influences are referred to as "elements," not as "manners and customs," whereas Japanese influences are not only referred to "manners and customs," but are also characterized as "unique."

Beyond defining the present as purely and uniquely Japanese, JTB relegates possible Chinese influence to the past, thus making it an element of ancient "tradition": "However, the past mores are retained in its ancient religion and traditional arts" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 888). Beyond the fact that the "past" may not necessarily have been equated entirely with Chinese culture, the "past" is also said to have produced "unique Japanese manners and customs mingled with Chinese elements." Hence, although past culture is not to be confused with contemporary culture, it may nevertheless be discussed under a different category, the history of art. Moreover, perhaps as a reflection of JTB's opinion about the erosion of cultural influences from China, the Chinese name for the islands, Luchu, is dropped from the 1975 edition, leaving the islands with a Japanese name, the Ryukyu Islands. Through this seemingly direct and simple linguistic manipulation, the perception of Japan's political authority is elevated while the perception of the Chinese political status is correspondingly diminished. In later editions of the JTB guidebook, the Ryukyu Islands are said to belong to Japan not only politically, but also culturally.

If indeed the Ryukyu Islands are influenced both by Japanese and Chinese cultures, one might legitimately ask what is meant by JTB's claim that residents of the islands have been "completely assimilated" to Japanese culture? In what cultural state must one be before one can be referred to as "completely assimilated"? Does the "past" become part of the present or does it completely disappear without a trace? How these questions are answered remain the choice of the author, and must, according to authorial choice, simultaneously represent a closure of reader perception of the culture so described.

Statements about assimilation do not appear in the 1975 edition of the JTB's guidebook. Instead, tourists are allowed to decide for themselves whether Chinese culture has had any influence on the Ryukyu Islands: "As far back as the 14th century, Okinawa imported its culture from China and Southeast Asia which was later developed to form a unique Okinawa culture" (p. 839). This statement, contrasting with the assessment in the 1991 edition, does not deny the continuation of both Chinese culture and Southeast Asian culture up to the present time. Nevertheless, as Japan has increased its political and economic power, JTB's perception of sociohistorical circumstances has changed accordingly. The 1991 edition does not hesitate to utilize available resources to assert an entire range of claims made by Japan concerning the Ryukyu Islands. How, then, is one to account for the influence from other cultures? Through a careful choice of symbolic devices, JTB allows itself the freedom to frame the status of the Ryukyu Islands in different ways, while at the same time constricting perception of these islands in the minds of potential visitors. JTB is free to include in its description whatever element of the Ryukyu Islands—its culture, legal status, and so on—that it deems best suited to persuading its audience of its viewpoints. Each choice, however, at the same time to a certain extent closes reader perception.

Indications of increasing self-assurance. The dimension of open and closed perception is also employed in the JTB's guidebook series to build up a progressively more self-confident depiction of Japan. For example, in describing how the Japanese movie industry has been influenced by European countries and America, the 1955 edition of JTB's guidebook explains:

European films have had considerable influence upon Japanese films in the past. This was partly because the Japanese people have ample opportunity to become familiar with various branches of European art. But it seems that the most cogent reason was that it was easier for Japanese motion picture products to follow the examples of French and German productions, conducted with relatively small capital, than to imitate the American method, backed with colossal capital. (p. 210)

One need only contrast this passage to its phrasing in the 1975 JTB's guidebook to see how this situation can be described somewhat differently:

So when the movie industry was transplanted in those days from France and America, it very soon took root and acclimatized itself in Japanese soil, rapidly developing into a big modern industry. Those who chose to cast their lot with the Japanese movie industry were diligent, enterprising businessmen who did not hesitate to adopt the latest, up-to-date cinematographic equipment and techniques of the most advanced countries. (p. 237; similar statements can be found on p. 262 of the 1991 edition)

The opening of the author's perception of these issues can be observed by the discrepant ways in which the past is described. First, while the 1955 edition emphasizes the role of European films on Japanese films—it identifies a "considerable influence" of European on Japanese films—the 1975 edition shifts the focus of attention toward the ability of Japanese to transplant European films. Second, in describing how Japanese have learned from European countries and America, the 1955 edition assumes a more subordinate role than the 1975 edition. While the 1955 edition devotes a great deal of attention to how Japan has learned from others, the 1975 edition shifts

the focus of attention to how the Japanese themselves contribute to their own movie industry, thereby downplaying the impact of other countries. In the 1955 edition, Japanese people are said to have had “ample opportunity” to learn European film techniques, and Japanese are said to have “followed” the examples of French and German filmmakers. These references are deleted from the 1975 edition, to be replaced with a thorough description of the contributions made by Japanese businesspeople.

Through these various verbal reformulations, the 1975 edition apparently creates a picture in which the Japanese themselves can be granted more credit. Indeed, one only need understand the implications of the descriptor “in those days” in the 1975 edition to see how different perceptions have been generated. Once the impact from Europe has been classified as belonging to “those days,” the past becomes less important, and Japanese consequently may claim more authority to emphasize their own contributions. The development of the Japanese film industry is comprised of a series of events that can be recounted. One may choose to focus upon the role played by European films, or upon the role played by the Japanese themselves, or one may choose to emphasize or to ignore both influences. How history is presented often depends upon the perspective taken by the author of cultural description; since there is no way to decide if any one presentation is more accurate than others, selected elements of description must be incorporated according to the author’s choice.

Moreover, the descriptions contained in each narrative are also based on selected elements of support. For example, in the 1975 edition, those in the Japanese film industry are depicted as hardworking businesspeople. On the other hand, there are surely people in the Japanese movie industry who are neither diligent nor enterprising. Nevertheless, the choices made by the JTB results in “characters” who are described in certain ways, becoming defined and limited within the words of the text. The adoption of foreign film techniques may or may not be pleasant or voluntary, and yet, the JTB asserts unambiguously that Japanese “did not hesitate” to adopt film

techniques from foreigners, thus implying a sense of eagerness on the part of the Japanese. By choosing to describe the Japanese film industry from this particular vantage point, giving great credit and confidence to the Japanese themselves, reader perception is closed to other depictions of the process.

JTB's increasing self-assurance can also be observed in the description of restaurants in Japan. In the 1975 edition, restaurants which offer a "tourist menu" are described as "invariably equipped with clean and excellent facilities suitable for use by foreign visitors" (p. 59). Here, the descriptors "clean" and "excellent" are said to be applied only to "foreign visitors." This closure of perception, however, is changed in the 1991 edition: "Member restaurants of the Japan Restaurant Association are always equipped with clean, excellent facilities" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 59). By 1991, "excellent" facilities are no longer only for "foreign visitors" but are asserted as characteristic of restaurants in general, provided such restaurants are supervised by the government (cued by use of the qualifier, "always").

A third example illustrating JTB's increasing level of self-confidence concerns Japanese nightlife and how geisha are described. In the 1955 edition, the description is relatively straightforward: "The high-class ryori-ya can receive hundreds of guests and entertain them with the songs and dances of geisha, the professional girl-entertainers whom it is customary to summon to all banquets given in the Japanese style" (p. 28). This association between geisha and the more highly regarded ryori-ya is removed from the later editions; hence, in the 1975 edition, one finds, "A high-class ryori-ya (Japanese style restaurant) can accommodate hundreds of guests in tastefully decorated rooms usually looking out on exquisitely designed gardens" (p. 59; identical statements are found on pp. 59-60 of the 1991 edition). In the 1975 edition, "girl-entertainers" are associated with nightclubs: "Hostesses are available for about ¥2,500 per hour to serve as dancing and conversational partners for the guests" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1975, p. 59).

But even this relatively innocent reference is evidently considered to be in some way inappropriate for the official JTB guidebook. In the 1991 edition, geisha are relegated to an element of "tradition": "In addition, there are, of course, the traditional "akachochin" (red lantern bars) and yakitori (skewered barbecued chicken) bars" (p. 61). The 1991 edition contains no reference to prices charged or services provided by the "girl-entertainers."

Certainly Japanese night life will continue to change. However, these various descriptions are evidently motivated by more than simply the desire to reflect changes in service and price. More importantly, such revisions of cultural description serve to inscribe different points of view regarding Japanese nightlife. There is no way to decide whether "girl-entertainers" are "really" part of tradition; instead, it is the statement of the JTB guidebook which consigns them to the realm of tradition. The "girl-entertainers" are considered an element of tradition in the 1991 edition, but not in the 1955 or 1975 editions. The communication system is thus opened to JTB, allowing it the freedom to assign members of Japanese society to different categories of Japanese life. On the other hand, the perception of the "girl-entertainers" described in this way is fixed within the narrative of each successive edition.

A fourth example illustrating how JTB becomes increasingly self-assured in the latitude it grants itself to close reader perception of Japanese culture is in its descriptions of the activities of Japanese businesspeople after hours in the bars and lounges. While such activities may cause serious problems in family and married life, this possibility is not mentioned in the 1991 edition: "Some of these [night spots] are quite expensive and cater only to businessmen with inflated expense accounts, while others are patronized by average company workers looking for a few drinks and some laughs after a hard day at the office" (p. 60). The reasons for these "average company workers" to visit night spots are said to be that they are "looking for a few drinks and some laughs," even if it is possible that these same people may drink to excess.

Moreover, it is implied that such places offer relaxation after “a hard day at the office.” But surely not all “average workers” have a hard day and, moreover, it is questionable whether such establishments actually help people to relax. The JTB guidebook does not choose to explore these issues. The stated reason for JTB to have chosen to describe the after-business-hours nightlife is also open to question: no such information is to be found in either the 1955 or the 1975 editions.

Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Open and Closed Perception in Fodor’s and JTB’s Descriptions

Fodor’s—Stylistic mechanisms. In addition to its characteristic approaches to content and temporal changes, the Fodor’s series also exhibits a number of idiosyncratic stylistic mechanisms related to the dimension of open and closed perception. In this section, I will explore four such mechanisms: (1) pseudo-specification; (2) use of extravagant closures to set perceptions of locales; (3) applying the proven closure to more than one situation; and (4) closure by comparison with the familiar.

Pseudo-specification. As we have seen, the level of detail employed by Fodor’s authors can be misleading. Despite the apparent presence of detailed support for a given conclusion, closer analysis of some Fodor’s passages often reveals that the support offered by the author constitutes simply another generalization which itself is in need of support. An example of this stylistic mechanism is provided in the quotation below, in which Edward Seidensticker is discussing what he perceives is a flight of younger people from the countryside to the cities. In the emphasized portion of the passage, Seidensticker employs three successively restrictive descriptors to “support” his contention that most of the young are migrating to the cities:

But if the great cities are the province of the young, the country is the land of infants and those approaching middle age, and a resentful residue of youth—oldest sons and nubile daughters who have not been allowed to depart for Tokyo and have not quite had the courage to set out on their own. [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1969, p. 57)

Here the process of closure of the world of the described Other is achieved by a technique that might be called "pseudo-specification," that is, the listing of specific elaborations of a general metaphor which, taken on its face and by itself, would be immediately suspect. In this case, the general metaphor is "a resentful residue of youth": encountered alone, that descriptor would hardly be acceptable, even in touristic discourse. Therefore, to bolster this metaphor, Seidensticker chooses to provide "pseudo-specification" by offering three other metaphors, more specific, but still unsupported: first, "oldest sons," second, "nubile daughters," and finally, all those "who have not quite had the courage to set out on their own."

Notice, however, how these successive restrictions bind reader perception of Japanese youth with ever-tighter limitations. They are first a "resentful residue," then they may be either "oldest sons" or "nubile daughters," and finally they are rendered as those who lack the courage to try to move out on their own. At the same time, as suggested by the dimension of open and closed perception, such restrictions of reader perception simultaneously open the world of the describer. In this instance, each successive elaboration seems to increase the believability of Seidensticker and to reinforce the reader's perception of the breadth and depth of his knowledge of Japan. Through applying the lens of open and closed perception, however, one is allowed to see how the surface perception of Seidensticker as a knowledgeable commentator cannot be sustained once his discourse is examined as a moment in the stream of socially enacted speech.

In another example illustrating how the Fodor's guidebooks close perception through elaboration of a vague descriptor, Seidensticker describes the tea ceremony, situated in the passage below in the context of what the author calls "the Japanese spirit." Notice, particularly in the emphasized portions, the limits placed upon

perceiving the cultural practices of the Japanese, beginning with the metaphor to which Seidensticker returns repeatedly, the “Japanese spirit”:

In all of these [note: handicrafts, tea ceremony, and flower arranging] much that is best in the Japanese spirit finds expression: a keen sensitivity to the changing moods and lights of nature, an exquisite awareness of the passing moment, a confident sense of color, bold yet refined. Although today a tea ceremony is likely to be a rather debased commercial affair and an occasion for conspicuous display . . . [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, pp. 83-84)

Notice the inertial quality to this series of assertions. It is almost as if the undefined descriptor “the Japanese spirit” is a signal, touching off a series of increasingly overdrawn limitations on reader perception of this Japanese cultural practice. Reading the passage to the end, it is difficult to remember that the author was originally talking about three specific activities. Instead of keeping to these activities, the author seems intent on extending his or her observations to the whole of Japanese cultural life, drawing back only at the last moment to criticize the “debased commercial” version of the tea ceremony.

It is the sense of gathering force in this series of characterizations that provides the first clue to its analysis. One can begin with the phrase, “the Japanese spirit.” This phrase occurs repeatedly throughout the Fodor’s guidebook, but it is never defined and its meaning is only hinted at in general terms. When one speaks of the “spirit” of an entire people, one is talking not just about all of its present individual members but all of its history as well. This act of summarizing so much in a single metaphor constitutes severe closure of the world of the cultural Other.³⁰ It is dangerous because of the limitations that it places on perceptions of a given culture, particularly a culture which is being portrayed as a potential site to visit. Suppose one encounters a

³⁰ Perhaps this is one reason why Oliver Statler, in the 1990 Fodor’s edition, feels it necessary to declare, “I do not put much faith in analyses that attempt to explain the Japanese character and personality” (Fodor’s, 1990, p. xxvi).

Japanese individual who does not seem to show the proper “Japanese spirit,” whatever that might mean, and having been influenced by the guidebook as a sole source of information, one refuses to see the Japanese person as a legitimate representative of the culture. How could one then form an opinion based on experience, rather than prejudice?

However, the descriptor “the Japanese spirit” is followed by a number of characterizations which purport to exemplify the author’s position: “. . . a keen sensitivity to the changing moods and lights of nature, an exquisite awareness of the passing moment, a confident sense of color, bold yet refined.” While listed for the stated purpose of elaborating what is meant by the term, “the Japanese spirit,” each phrase in fact raises even further questions about the author’s meaning: each phrase constitutes another limitation on perception of the Japanese people as individuals. This is why this series of descriptors is designated as “inertial.” The passage seems to amplify meaning, but in fact raises more questions with each elaboration, primarily because the author refuses to abandon the mode of expression with which he or she began.

This stylistic mechanism is also interesting because the series of descriptors closing the world of the Other seems, even to the author, somewhat excessive, apparently leading him to feel justified in making the negative evaluation in the closing words of the passage: “Although today a tea ceremony is likely to be a rather debased commercial affair and an occasion for conspicuous display . . .” In discussing the dimension of specificity, this passage was seen to function as a bridge to construct a world of unreality related to the tea ceremony.³¹ Viewing the passage preceding the final criticism as a sequence of closures of reader perception of the world of the Other, one sees the justification for a negative evaluation. However, it is the style, not the

³¹ See Chapter Three, pp. 133-135.

substance, of the author's comments which makes it appear that a negative evaluation should be offered as a counterweight to the excesses of the previous closures.

Use of extravagant closures to set perceptions of locales. The dimension of open and closed perception is often particularly evident in touristic descriptions of sites and locations. As we have seen, the combination of the author's need to strongly express an opinion (thus declaring whether the site is worthy of claiming the tourist's limited time), coupled with the differences between the author's opinions and those of the cultural Other, leads to frequently contestable claims about sites and locations.

An example is provided below. An anonymous Fodor's author is describing the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area as a whole. Note the declaratory style evident in the emphasized portion of the passage.

There is no doubt that a tour of the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area will bring an appreciation of Japan, the Japanese people, their way of life and an understanding of the peculiar character and almost indescribable beauty of the countryside. Much like the mood and mellow atmosphere of the Scottish highlands with the added beauty of the green and brown traditional Japanese colors, the pleasant upland area southwest of Tokyo provides a welcome respite for even the most jaded travelers. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 252)

The author of this passage has evidently reached a firm conclusion concerning the ultimate result of visiting the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area; in fact, the conclusion expressed encompasses a number of specific outcomes whose precise nature cannot be known to the author. Moreover, the author expresses his or her opinion about the likelihood of these outcomes in phrasing that permits no argument: "there is no doubt . . ." that any visitor will come to share the opinion of the Fodor's author.

This passage seems somewhat extravagant, particularly given this same anonymous author's previous negative evaluations of the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area in this chapter. It was in this chapter that this same author referred to the Izu town of Atami

as a place solely for eating lunch or catching a train³² (see the discussion of the dimension of specificity in Chapter Three), and the historically significant town of Shimoda as a locale capitalizing on its “erotic memories” and “lurid past.” How is it, then, that the author can so easily discount the negative data about the area and end by saying that visiting it will eventuate in all of these positive outcomes?

One can answer this question by applying the lens of open and closed perception. Here, the attempt at closure of reader perception could hardly be more encompassing. The author summarizes not only the perspectives of all who would express an opinion about Japan and things Japanese, but the opinion of every potential visitor to the country. Since the totalizing description is uniformly positive, one should look for evidence that the author has discounted previous negative evaluations. Apparently, this author feels that historical factors (such as significance of Townsend Harris) are less valuable than recreational factors (such as the parks in the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area, with their outdoor sporting activities and impressive scenery). Thus, by closing the described world of the cultural Other to the possibility of being valued for reasons other than recreation, the author is really saying that he or she is in a position to define what is important about the area, based upon the perception of those who are likely to be reading the guidebook. Again, notice how this procedure also enables a number of facets of the describer’s world to be opened: not only does the author become empowered to influence potential perception of the area, but apparently to be able make specific, highly negative, comments, while at the same time conveying a positive image of the area overall. Indeed, the tone of the earlier, more negative, comments, as well as the later, more positive, comments, are both seen to function at a level of vividness which makes it seem as if the author is really taking two equally strong, though contradictory, positions simultaneously.

³² See Chapter Four, p. 172.

Applying the established closure to more than one situation. Given the constraints of space for making descriptions in a tour guidebook (it is impossible to analyze every tour site), authors are frequently required to limit their analyses to certain key sites or locations. Unfortunately, this sometimes means that they are willing to extend what they have analyzed regarding one site to their opinions about another site. In the following example, from the anonymously authored chapter on Nikko in the 1962 edition of Fodor's, closure of reader perception concerning Japanese culture is accomplished, first, by negatively evaluating a specific location and second, by implying that an unspecified number of other locations share the same negative qualities as the described location.

As is the case with many other places in Japan, the first introduction to Nikko is depressing. The town of Nikko is a dreary place of grimy wooden and lath-and-plaster houses. Happily, it requires only a few minutes' walk before the glories of Nikko come into sight. The first landmark to come into view is the Sacred Bridge over the Daiya River at the end of the main street of the town of Nikko. The bridge is built like two arching snakes, recalling a tale that recounts how the priest, Shodo, crossed the river when it was in full flood by stepping on the backs of two huge serpents. Today, it is used only on ceremonial occasions. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 259)

In this passage, the author pursues a strategy we have seen elsewhere, particularly in Seidensticker's introductory chapters to the 1962 and 1969 editions. The author chooses to focus upon one specific visual impression of Nikko and then uses that impression to fashion a description of the entire area. However, since the initial visual impression is condemnatory, the derived description is equally censorious in portraying the site. This closure of perception of the Japanese world is obviously highly selective. What, for example, does the author mean by the phrase "first introduction"? What if one's first introduction to Nikko in fact occurs at an area that lies "a few minute's walk" from the author's imaginary vantage point? The author has

apparently selected the site of the first introduction precisely so that it permits the more negative evaluation to be advanced.

However, the author then extends this evaluation to “many other” sites in Japan. Beginning with the closure of the potential visitor’s perception of Nikko itself, in other words, the author uses a successive closure to express similar misgivings about other places in Japan. Nevertheless, because the author neither specifies the sites which might seem “depressing” nor even indicates an approximate number (the author says there are “many”), the reader is not in a position to refute the guidebook’s claim. Does the author mean that “many” of Japan’s sites are depressing overall, or that there is some point at which the introduction to the site might seem depressing, or that the tourist may find many sites depressing, or even that the author of the guidebook finds many sites depressing? Given the imprecision of the author’s position, these and many other interpretations are possible.

Recall, too, that the latter, more inclusive closure is made possible by the specific reference to closure of the perception of Nikko in the first part of the passage. In none of the other descriptions of sites in Japan is a similar specific judgment made (though Seidensticker, as we have seen, makes several condemnatory claims about the “countryside” as a whole in the introductory chapter³³). Thus, the use of a negative judgment about Nikko (which is in any case questionable) may be a stylistic device to permit the author to negatively evaluate the entire country of Japan. This may be another example of the inertial quality of general evaluations, with an objectionably broad assertion serving merely to pave the way for similarly broad assertions in the latter portion of the utterance. Moreover, these closures of reader perception claim for the author the right to make such judgments in print (and thus expands or opens the world of the author).

³³ For example, “So it is that, viewed from a train window, the countryside can seem quiet almost to the point of sadness” (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 57).

Closure by comparison with the familiar. Because the unfamiliar is so often explained by comparison with the familiar, touristic writers often compare locations assumed to be new to the reader with those they are presumed already to know. In the passage below, authored by Francis King, Kyoto is described through selective points of comparison with Florence, Italy:

Kyoto has sometimes been called the Florence of the East, and the comparison is apt. Both cities were once capitals; both are surrounded by hills which produce a climate at once bitterly cold in winter and intolerably hot in summer; both regard themselves as the cultural centers of their respective countries; and both possess an inexhaustible store of treasures for the visitors. In Japan, as in Italy, the tourist is often astonished to discover, not a sleepy relic of the past, but a thriving center of industry and trade. To be specific, Kyoto now has a population of nearly 1,300,000, covers an area of 210 sq. miles and ranks as the fifth largest city of Japan. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, pp. 274-275)

To a certain extent, the tendency to express the unknown in terms of the known is unavoidable; indeed, this is precisely what the Bakhtin circle had in mind when they suggested that all language simultaneously possessed elements of opening and closing perception. However, in making comparisons of locations, one must be very cautious, because of the inertial quality of subsequent comparisons: one begins the comparison with a commitment (the unfamiliar site is like the familiar site) and so must seek out points of comparison which support one's initial claim. Sequences of comparisons are inertial because, with each instance of the comparison, one becomes further committed to the original analogy.

Similarly, each subsequent comparison is accompanied by a further closure of reader perception of the object of description. Thus, in touristic descriptions using comparisons to describe sites, the inertial quality of the series functions increasingly to limit reader perception of the site. In the initial comparison (one site is like another) the possibilities for perception of both locales is relatively open and free; with each successive comparison, however, the possibilities for "escaping" the basic comparison

become less evident, as the author of the comparison commits him- or herself more firmly to the validity of the proffered analogy. With each subsequent commitment, in other words, retraction becomes less feasible, since the author would then sacrifice a more credibility. Of course, one could dispense with the problem by citing exceptions to the comparison, but as noted previously, such stylistic complexities are rarely encountered in touristic discourse.

At another level, site comparison restricts perception because it is a form of discourse which may be actively sought by readers of touristic materials. In other words, it is difficult to dispense with a form of discourse which is popular with readers. The popularity of the form, “__ has been called the __ of the __” (I noted five examples of this form in the 1962 edition alone) confirms its usefulness as a means of making the unfamiliar familiar. Nevertheless, there is a danger that a reader may be left with a mistaken impression, even while attempting to understand the visited country in familiar terms. The general rule, one supposes, is to link the familiar with the unfamiliar, but to leave open the possibility that the reader may form a different opinion after encountering the site.

JTB—Stylistic mechanisms. JTB also exhibits a number of idiosyncratic stylistic mechanisms based on the dimension of open and closed perception, including the following: (1) establishing the illusion of extended activity; (2) closure through elevation; (3) closure through extended analogy; and (4) closure through selective use of evidence.

Establishing the illusion of extended activity. Throughout this discussion, we have often encountered examples in which the author uses narrative devices to fix cultural description in the “timeless present,” that is, to describe in general terms some cultural feature which is portrayed as characteristic of the culture as a whole, while in fact being based on only one incident or even on the author’s imagination. Often, this illusion is sustained by a process of closure of reader perception, as in the example

below, in which the dimension of open and closed perception is manipulated to allow the author to construct a picture of Japan as more or less continuously involved in some form of celebration. This form of narrative, in which the reader is placed in some abstract, more or less omniscient position, to experience all of the excitement of a location, as if each event occurred in the same geographical space, is quite common in touristic literature. However, it is analyzed as a characteristic JTB stylistic mechanism primarily because it is used much more frequently in the JTB's than in the Fodor's series.³⁴ Since this effect is achieved at the expense of specificity, and hence constitutes a closure of those features of Japanese life which fall outside of holiday or celebratory activity, it is worthy of attention.

Japan offers a variety of unique attractions to the tourist. All of the months and seasons are blessed with their own special features. January brings three days of lively New Year's celebrations. This is the most important holiday of the year on the Japanese calendar. In February, the blooming of the plum trees begins the succession of flowers that continues all year round. Excursions to famous locations offering picturesque floral scenery mark the beginning of the outdoor recreation season. In summer, the beaches, mountains and hot-springs resorts are at their best. In autumn, people head for the country to see the blazing colors of the changing leaves as well as the chrysanthemums. The crisp autumn air is perfect for outdoor athletic activities. Spring and autumn are the most popular seasons for travel in Japan. However, there are many fine winter and summer resorts, making Japan an ideal vacation spot all year. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 26)

Only the most intrepid, energetic traveler could experience all that is described in the passage above. For one thing, one would have to be in the country for a much longer period of time than most tourists are prepared to spend. Yet the passage is

³⁴ In contrast, the Fodor's series prefers the stylistic mechanism of the imaginary narrator or scene (see discussion of the dimension of specificity, Chapter Three) in which a generalized narrator evaluates elements of Japanese culture, in the process excusing the "real" narrator from being responsible for particularly censorious comments.

written as if readers were actually capable of ranging over the country, as well as experiencing all the seasonal changes.

One might object that this is a stylistic device only, and that the real purpose of the passage is to convince people that, whatever they want to do, whatever season they prefer, whatever activity they favor, there is a time and place in Japan to do it. However, if this is “merely” a stylistic device, it is certainly a common one. Touristic writing contains many examples in which the reader is placed in the imaginative present, letting the wonders of the location unfold, one after another, until the reader is left with the impression that the described location is a virtual paradise. That impression would in any case be difficult to deny, since the reader is provided only positive images.

Apart from fostering a mistaken impression of the location, however, one should note that there is a more subtle problematic at work in this passage. One becomes so accustomed to seeing the effects of closure of the world of the cultural Other that one sometimes forgets that it is also possible to perform closure on the world of one’s own culture. This appears to be what has occurred in the quoted passage: JTB, by implying that Japan is a land of continuous celebration, has claimed the right to close perception of the country to other audiences who might be less enamored of constant enjoyment and activity (what, for example, of the person whose stereotypes of Japan might run more to calm, passivity, contemplation, and meditation?).

In effect, what one sees in the JTB passage is the further division of “Japanese” culture into Japanese culture as viewed by a government agency and the culture of the people of Japan, with the former, by means of its inscriptions in the JTB guidebook, closing the perception of the latter (the people of Japan). Moreover, the agenda of the JTB is neither more nor less commercially oriented than the agenda of the Fodor’s guidebook. In both guidebook series, there is an attempt to define, limit, and render

into narrative form the complex processes of a given culture, with the resultant opening of the authorial world by the closure of the world he or she describes.

Closure through elevation. Unfortunately, it is often the more exotic aspects of a given culture that most attract the attention of both the tourist and the guidebook author. Moreover, the more exotic the cultural feature, the less likely is the author who is a “cultural outsider” to be able to describe the practice: the very unfamiliarity of the practice renders it more opaque. This is the reason that so many of the Fodor’s descriptions seem deficient when counterpositioned against the highly detailed “textbook” portrayals of the JTB guidebook. It is not that either of the contrasting descriptions is “correct,” but rather that, compared to the JTB descriptions, the Fodor’s descriptions seem less informed. At the same time, as we have seen, the agendas of both guidebooks can seem equally suspect when it comes to the cultural integrity of the Japanese individual. When reference is made to the “other culture” by the JTB guidebook, however, the tendency to close perception of the world of its Western readers can be quite striking.

For an example of this type of closure, consider the following passage describing the general practice of religion in Japan and in Western nations. This passage—particularly when contrasted with the tone of other passages in the guidebook—is interesting: it manages to convey an air of “talking down” to the members of the “other culture,” based on the JTB’s apparent judgment about their lack of religious sophistication.

Thus, Japan is unique in the history of world religions, with several different faiths—one original and others borrowed—flourishing side by side with apparent equanimity. This religious “parallelism” may very well be beyond the easy understanding of Westerners, who are primarily devoted followers of monotheistic beliefs. Indeed, there are many scholars who claim that it is a sign of religious immaturity to hold more than two faiths. It is true that jumping from one religion to another on the slightest pretext is not exactly admirable, but there is a way of thinking in the Orient based on the idea that “two is one and one is two.” This

philosophical concept also applies to religion. There is always a way of tolerantly understanding one religion in terms of another. Blessed from the start with this religious magnanimity, the Japanese people have steadily developed it, especially in regard to primitive Shinto. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 112)

Let us begin at the first of the passage. Syncretism—the holding of ideals of more than one faith simultaneously—is hardly a practice which makes Japan “unique in the history of the world’s religions.” Not only is it a feature of many cultures (more the rule than the exception, in fact), but some scholars (see, for example, Varley, 1983) believe that it was Japan who first borrowed it, along with the Buddhist religion, from the Chinese. Thus, to claim that Japan is “unique” in the practice of syncretism constitutes an extreme closure of perceptions about religions of every country in the world. At the same time, as should be evident by now, JTB’s closure of the worlds of other religions constitutes a simultaneous broadening of the perception of JTB’s authors and editors concerning Japan’s status.

Given the range of its initial foray, it is less surprising to find that JTB continues to assume a tone of superiority throughout the entire passage. Another closure enables the JTB author to claim, not simply that the Westerner might not agree with its perspective toward religion, but that grasping Japan’s perspective is beyond the “easy understanding of Westerners.” The passage continues in this condescending tone, quoting an enigmatic proverb which is not explained, and concluding with this puzzling statement: “Blessed from the start with this religious magnanimity, the Japanese people have steadily developed it . . .”

Even a less critical reader, encountering a passage such as this, might find it necessary to wonder why JTB seems compelled to praise itself at the expense of the religious practices of other cultures. One might also legitimately ask why, if religious life in Japan is so open and free, it is necessary for JTB to declare that fact in such

extravagant terms (and by implication, why JTB must limit the contributions of other world religions to the degree that it does).

The obvious answer is, Japan does not have a reputation for religious freedom: quite the opposite. Japan, one should recall, is the country which gave the world the worship of the Emperor as direct descendant of the Sun Goddess in the Shinto religion which played such a central role in World War II (in the quoted passage, notice how clearly JTB distances itself from the Shinto religion by referring to it as the “primitive Shinto”). Japan is also the country of Nichiren, held by many religious experts to be one of the most intolerant and iconoclastic figures in religious history. Nichiren founded the Buddhist sect which today has become one of the most powerful religious cults in the world, Soka Gakkai, whose members have, even since the time of Nichiren, been criticized for their fanaticism and bullying conversion tactics (Dumoulin, 1976; Melton, 1986). Japan, too, is the site of the persecution and virtual destruction of Christianity by the Hideyoshi and Tokugawa governments of the early 1600s.

While it is true that one could certainly find similarly embarrassing incidents of religious intolerance in any country’s history, one must remember that the JTB description invites criticism because of its declaration that Japan’s tolerance is “unique among world religions.” Moreover, notice that JTB’s praise of Japan is somewhat disingenuous in not even hinting of its well-known instances of religious intolerance. Nor is it legitimate to excuse JTB by laying its closure of perception to the need to promote its image, in much the same way that it boasts its food or shopping facilities. With food and shopping, there is an immediate commercial value associated with promotion of Japan, whereas with religion, there is no such value. Hence, JTB’s closure of the religious realms of other nations, which permits it to open a contestable picture of Japan’s religious freedom, is a tactic for which the critical reader must remain alert.

Another example illustrating how the JTB guidebook employs the dimension of open and closed perception in the service of elevating a particular element of Japanese culture is to be found in the following passage from the 1991 edition, describing how the entrance to a Japanese house can be concealed by clever gardening techniques:

Care was taken to invest such gardens with an air of solitude by cultivating moss on the ground and stones, thus providing the necessary patina. It should be noted that the path to the chashitsu is always curved so as to conceal the entrance until the instant it is reached, a result also obtained by planting clumps of trees to cut off the entrance from view. This principle is followed in traditional Japanese homes of any pretension, provided there is sufficient ground in front of the house. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, pp. 206-207)

In this passage, the author pursues an early general impression about gardening techniques which may be contradicted by the latter portion of the passage. In the first portion of the passage, closure of reader perception of the "typical" Japanese homeowner is achieved by the suggestion that the gardening technique described is characteristic of most Japanese homes. The initial impression conveyed is that Japanese homes, as a rule, are of sufficiently high quality to merit landscaping. This impression is accomplished by use of the word "the" ("the path," "the chashitsu," "the entrance," and so on), implying specificity while in fact marking the reference as extremely general.

It is not until the final portion of the passage that one realizes that the author is in fact talking about a limited number of Japanese homes. With the introduction of the phrase, ". . . traditional Japanese homes of any pretension, provided there is sufficient ground in front of the house," it becomes clear that the author is probably referring to wealthy Japanese (those who can afford to own homes of "any pretension"). This constitutes a further closure of the field of description, narrowing the field of people being described from homeowners in general to wealthy homeowners.

One possible reason for the author to have adopted this strategy is that, had the more narrow field been introduced first, it would have been more difficult to claim the gardening technique as a typically Japanese practice (hence its inclusion in this portion of the guidebook—the section, “Gardening,” in the chapter, “Traditional Japan”—might seem less justified). Moreover, the earlier introduction conveys the impression—which may be maintained should the reader choose not to proceed to the end of the passage—that the practice is more widespread than the evidence would support.

Closure through extended analogy. Earlier, a passage from the Fodor’s guidebook comparing Kyoto and Florence was examined. In that analysis, the point was made that comparisons of the familiar with the unfamiliar constitute closures of both, particularly when the author uses a sequence of comparisons to successively restrict reader perception. In a similar way, the JTB guidebooks sometimes use a technique which might be called “extended analogy.” This stylistic mechanism, instead of using the familiar to explain the unfamiliar, compares two elements of Japanese culture which are presumed to be unfamiliar to its primarily Western readership. In the passage below, the JTB guidebook describes the historical relationship between the Shinto and Buddhist religions:

In the Heian period, the idea gradually gained strength that Shinto gods and Buddhas were essentially identical, with the result that the Japanese national tendency toward reverence of the gods became more completely harmonized with Buddhism than ever before, thus contributing still further to its popularization. As in the Nara period, the study of Buddhism was eagerly pursued, and many famous scholars versed in the Chinese classics flourished. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 87)

The comparison here is drawn between Shinto, a native Japanese religion, and Buddhism, imported from China. One first notices that, although the author asserts that these two religions in some way came into contact with one another, there is no intimation, at least until the final sentence, of Chinese influence on the importation of

Buddhism, perhaps leading the unwary reader to wonder whether Buddhism might not also be a native Japanese religion. If one knows the origins of Buddhism, then one can proceed to the assertion that, according to an idea which had “gained strength,” the “Shinto gods and Buddhas were essentially identical.” Identical in what ways? The author does not say, but does go on in the next phrase to imply that the equivalence of the deities of the two religions permitted the greater popularization of Buddhism, in line with the “Japanese national tendency.”

There are a number of acts of closure in this short passage. To begin with, the phrase about the Shinto gods and Buddhas being essentially identical is problematic. The author does not explain this provocative utterance, but instead moves on immediately to say that the equating of the deities of Shinto and Buddhism contributed to the spread of Buddhism’s influence. Thus, the reader is left to wonder why such a comparison would be made. One clue to a possible reason for these stylistic choices is to be found in an earlier passage³⁵ (see the section, “Closure through elevation,” above) in which Shinto was described as a “primitive” religion. Perhaps the JTB author is attempting to allow the sophisticated aura of Buddhism, with its suggestions of the classic Chinese civilization, to take some of the rough edges off the naturalistic practices of Shinto (a conclusion that seems to be suggested by the reference in the final sentence to the study of “Chinese classics”). Another reason for these stylistic choices may be that the author wants to suggest that the spread of Buddhism to Japan from China should not be seen as example of cultural borrowing by Japanese; by implying that it was the correspondence of Buddhas with native Shinto gods that permitted the widespread acceptance of Buddhism, the JTB guidebook seems to suggest its native religion was responsible for aiding the spread of Buddhism, not that Buddhism’s influence assumed control of Japan’s native religions.

³⁵ See this chapter, pp. 427-429.

By manipulating the closure of reader perception, the JTB author manages to convey the idea that Shinto coexisted in serendipitous harmony with early Buddhism, even though some scholars feel that Shinto did as much as it could in Japan's early history to distance itself from Buddhism (see, for example, Reischauer, 1970, p. 15)

Closure through selective use of evidence. Although all cultural description selectively uses supportive data to some extent, the generally greater level of detail contained in the JTB's guidebook series often compels its authors to pursue characteristically complex strategies for presenting factual data in ways that promote a more favorable image of Japan.³⁶ Just as in the selection of holidays and celebrations, or food, or accommodations, the authors of touristic materials often utilize selectivity in making the "facts" about facets of Japanese life into persuasive narratives which further the agendas of its writers, editors and publishers.

As an example, consider the following passage, in which the JTB author performs a number of convoluted stylistic moves in order to convey to the reader the impression that Japan's "mature" population is not as old as is popularly supposed.

At present, the average remaining life of people 60 years of age is 19.94 years for males and 24 years for females. It might be interesting to note that at the time these people were born (from 1926-1930) the age groups which could expect the same number of remaining years were 48-year-old males and 47-year-old females. In other words, it follows that men in their 40s about 60 years ago and men in their 60s of today are the "same age" physically. Viewed in this way, it might be said that Japan's aging society will be one in which those aged people who are "as young as" the people who were in their 40s in the early 20th century account for a high percentage. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 238)

³⁶ Although the Fodor's series employs selective renderings of history, its less detailed level of support means that historical matters are often selectively managed by leaving out key details. Given its decision to provide a "comprehensive" account, the JTB often seems to find it necessary to include many details, but to combine these details in unusual ways.

Here, the JTB author has seized upon perhaps the only statistic which will permit him or her to draw the conclusion which is apparently consistent with the JTB's agenda. As a statistic, this piece of evidence is somewhat less than convincing. What difference would the remaining number of years make as an implied response to the stereotype that Japan is an "aging society"? Surely, one might argue, the increased number of years available to Japan's elderly would be even more evidence of the "aging" of Japan.

However, proceeding according to the assumption that indications of excessive authorial effort to fashion a description implies the existence of definite goals, one should look for other purposes which might explain why this unusual statistic is used. One possible reason is that Japan, as an eager participant in the company of "modern" nations, wants to portray its elderly as "active," thus leaving the reader with the impression that the benefits of life in Japan have led, not only to an increased lifespan for Japanese, but also to the expectation that Japanese are living longer, the better to enjoy the benefits of life in their later years.

Whether this is in fact the reason for using the statistic in this way is a matter that can be debated. Undeniably, however, the focusing on this unusual statistic closes off other statistical means of understanding the aging of Japan's population. JTB apparently does not want reader's perceptions to proceed under the influence of a simpler and more straightforward statistic, such as the number of people above a certain age in Japan. Not only does JTB find it necessary to search out and settle on an unusual measure of aging, but then is compelled to explain and justify it at length in the guidebook.

Another example showing how the dimension of open and closed perception can be used to selectively suppress some details and accentuate others can be seen in the comparison of the Fodor's and JTB's reactions to the common saying, "Don't say

[kekko] until you've seen Nikko." In discussion of the principle of ownership³⁷

I analyzed the highly negative reaction of the Fodor's author to this saying. The saying was described as a "maddening jingle"; however, even while appearing to distance itself from the saying, the Fodor's guidebook nevertheless admitted that it "contained a great deal of truth." The JTB guidebook author proceeds in opposite fashion, listing the glories of Nikko, and ending his or her description with the "jingle." Notice how, given the strategies for framing perception of both the author and the described cultural Other, the saying takes on a very different appearance.

Besides its magnificent mountain scenery, complete with rivers, cascades, waterfalls, lakes and ancient trees, Nikko also has the finest handiwork of man in the mausoleum of Tokugawa Ieyasu (1542-1616), founder of the Tokugawa Shogunate, and that of his grandson, Iemitsu. One scarcely knows which to admire more, the mausoleums themselves or the setting in which they are placed—a bold essay by Nature in landscape gardening. It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that foreign visitors should regard Nikko as by far the most interesting spot in Japan. The Japanese have a saying, "Never say kekko (magnificent) until you've seen Nikko," which is indicative of their own appreciation of one of the wonder spots of their land. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 532)

In this passage, there is a visible attempt by the JTB author to open the perception of the foreign visitor to Nikko. Specific details which verify the site's historical importance are offered, together with the customary touristic hyperbole ("the finest handiwork," "a bold essay by Nature in landscape gardening," "the most interesting spot in Japan," and "one of the wonder spots of their land").

At the same time, every attempt to persuade the reader in touristic description of a location is inevitably accompanied by a closure of other means of perceiving the location. Here, for example, the superlatives, while leading the reader to expect a great deal from a visit to Nikko, may in fact be preparing him or her for a disappointment.

³⁷ See Chapter Four, pp. 251-253.

As was made clear in the comparison between the impressions of Francis King and Richard Leavitt concerning Kyoto, the “same” locale can impress two different people in vastly different ways. At the first level, then, one should realize that the JTB author is restricting some of the possible perceptions of Nikko.

Yet it is difficult to escape the feeling that the intention of the JTB author is to extend reader perception of Nikko. A clear pride shows through in the authorial voice, giving the reader the sense that JTB holds Nikko sacred (compare the JTB’s narrative tone with the abrupt and perfunctory subtitle of the 1962 through 1982 Fodor’s chapters on Nikko, “Pavilion for a Dead Commander”). In the JTB passage, the details chosen reflect not simply pride, but a feeling of nationalism, since two important leaders of the Tokugawa era are buried in the mausoleum. That the agenda is nationalistic is revealed by the phrasing concerning the mausoleum as it relates to the landscape: one hardly knows “which to admire more.” As if to cue the critical reader of this underlying message, the author employs one of the more extravagant examples of hyperbole in the text, coupling an obvious source of national pride (the gravesites of the Tokugawas) with a bizarre formulation which describes the setting of the mausoleum: “a bold essay by Nature in landscape gardening.” One must be left to wonder how nature could be responsible for the careful planning that goes into landscape gardening, as well as what the descriptor “bold essay” could mean. The conjoining of the two descriptions is perhaps indicative of the need by the JTB to try for a description to match what it obviously feels is the special quality of the mausoleum. Nevertheless, if the goal is to provide descriptors which will clear up questions in the reader’s mind, one finds it difficult to see how this strategy could succeed. On the other hand, if the author feels that hyperbole better suits his or her purpose, then the closure of the perception of Nikko through this mechanism may be perfect for the task.

One interesting feature of the passages is the placement of the “maddening jingle,” resulting in a different effect because it occurs after the closures describing the glories of Nikko rather than before. By preparing the reader to experience the wonders of Nikko, the “jingle” is offered as the logical culmination of successively more emphatic descriptions of the location. In the Fodor’s passage, on the other hand, the act of abruptly introducing the “jingle” to the unwary reader and then pretending to be annoyed by it (“Before one has been in Japan for more than about 24 hours, a tiresome cliché will have been drummed into one’s ears with maddening repetition by those in the travel trade. . .” [Fodor’s, 1969, p. 253]), constitutes a manipulation of the closure of perception, seemingly implying that the author—like everyone else—has heard the saying, but that he or she is too sophisticated to use it, except, of course, the author has used the saying, used it earlier in the passage than the JTB author, and placed it in a more prominent position. Examining the perceptual worlds of the two authors, the critical reader might be led to conclude that it is the Fodor’s author who is more dependent on the “maddening jingle” than the JTB author. After all, the JTB description could stand on its own without the saying, whereas the Fodor’s description depends on the saying being placed at the first of the passage. In other words, the inclusion of the saying is an integral part of the structure by which the Fodor’s author closes the perception of the site, whereas for the JTB author, it is not.

Conclusion

To a certain extent, Bakhtin and his colleagues argued, all language is to some extent both defined and undefined: defined, in that it must be expressed in terms familiar enough to be understood by readers, yet undefined, in that all language (intrinsically and by being situated in the ongoing stream of social discourse) possesses some meaning which is new to whoever reads or hears it for the first time. By applying the principles of the Bakhtin circle to the micro-analysis of selected passages,

by continually reorienting these analyses to the broader cultural theories of the Bakhtin group, and by linking micro-analyses to each other, one is permitted to provide a useful and informative picture of the approaches taken by the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE DIMENSION OF UNCOMPLETEDNESS AND THE CORE CONSTRUCT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION

General Overview

The dimension of uncompletedness was introduced as the fifth of the five dimensions derived from the work of the Bakhtin circle. As an element of cultural representation, uncompletedness links cultural description to related discourses. The dimension of uncompletedness is defined as follows: "All communication is fashioned in the awareness of a potential response from those for whom it is fashioned, and in the awareness of previous and subsequent communication on the same subject—hence, no communication can ever be said to be the 'last word' on a subject." Cultural description is made meaningful by reference to other discourses; to be sensible, descriptions must make reference to what has been said previously on the subjects it describes, must be fashioned with respect to relevant discourses from other sources, and must anticipate the discursive responses of others.

As with the other four dimensions, application of the dimension of uncompletedness to cultural description entails some uncertainty: not only is the number of discourses potentially related to a given description virtually endless, but the critical reader can only speculate about the discourses authors may be responding to in writing cultural description. Nevertheless, analysis of selected passages of the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series reveals a number of descriptions which appear to have been written in response to, and/or anticipating response from, other readily identifiable discourses. In the following discussion, I analyze these passages and attempt to identify discourses related to the passages and their possible effects on how these cultural descriptions were written.

The dimension of uncompletedness takes us to the heart of the Bakhtin group's divergence from most theories about language. Most linguistic models, Bakhtin and his colleagues argued, tended to fix actual, sociohistorically grounded discourse within model parameters. Over time, the users of language models come to view discourse more in the terms of their models than as "living" discourse, derived from and contributing to real, sociohistorically grounded circumstances. Bakhtin's group thought that by and large linguistic theories tended to ignore the relationship of discourse to other discourses. They were concerned, for example, that many such theories ignored discourse which preceded and followed a given example of discourse spoken or written in actual sociohistorical circumstances.¹

At the same time, writers and speakers must frame cultural descriptions by referring to other discourses. Since thought acquires meaning through language and since all language is sociohistorically specific, a given utterance may conceivably be related to an endless number of other discourses, even though some will be related more directly and immediately than others. To obtain an example to illustrate this notion, I opened the 1991 edition of the JTB's guidebook, taking at random the first sentence I saw: "The 14th and 15th centuries brought further improvements in the art, especially in gold lacquering and raised gold lacquerwork" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 191). The following is a very limited listing of discourses upon which the quoted sentence depends for its meaning:

(1) the English language; (2) discourses related to the translation of Japanese into

¹ It should be noted that language occurring prior to and after key linguistic segments has been a central concern of sociolinguistics. For example, several scholars have focused upon the phenomenon of adjacency pairs; as Jacobs (1986) notes, "Schegloff and Sacks . . . argue that these are the basic constructional units for creating sequentially implicated turns at talk. They are familiar to any natural language user: question-answer, greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance/refusal, request-acceptance/rejection" (p. 326). However, while such approaches do acknowledge that language units should be seen as preceded and followed by other language, to classify "pairs" as, for example, "offer-acceptance/refusal," is to make of them an abstract entity for the purpose of satisfying a theoretical model.

English (because the guidebook was originally written in Japanese); (3) a shared discursive system for reckoning time by centuries which requires that one know, for example, that the “14th century” refers to the 1300s; (4) discourses which define key terms in art (“lacquering”); (5) discourse immediately preceding the quoted sentence (“the art” in the quoted sentence refers to a phrase in the preceding paragraph specifying the subject of the discussion as “lacquerware”); and so on. Even the cursory analysis of this single sentence through the lens of uncompletedness demonstrates that, far from being understood simply on its own terms, the sentence depends on other discourses to acquire meaning.

No communication can ever be considered “objective,” not because authors necessarily intend to show bias, but because writing itself is situated within the sociohistorical context, is aimed at specific audiences, and follows a specific pattern in which authors, readers, and those who possess other architectonic systems, can participate in constructing other interpretations of the text, in the process collaborating with, competing with, or supplementing such interpretations. The writing and reading of cultural description are not performed irrespective of social circumstances. Authorial awareness of potential responses from those for whom cultural description is fashioned influences how issues are phrased, how reality is presented, and how the writer intends the reader to be oriented toward the symbolic world created by the description.

In writing a tour guidebook, the task of fashioning utterances is in large measure conditioned by the imagined responses of tourists and others who will read the book. The author tries to anticipate what readers need to know, what they want to know, how they will respond to the information presented, whether they will like or dislike a particular description, and so on. Moreover, authors write in awareness of other messages previously published in tour guidebooks from the same or other publishers. The author is concerned with the appearance of tour

guidebooks in general, as well as with accepted or standard ways of organizing information as established by the genre of tour guidebooks. Finally, authors write in the awareness of how guidebooks published by their own and other publishers will be seen in the future. The author must be concerned with content in later guidebooks, how far he or she can extend description in the current edition, whether there are plans for developing other guidebook series in the future, and so on.

These and similar considerations set the trajectories taken by tour guidebooks from inception to publication. Tour guidebooks can be viewed as constantly “uncompleted”: since the guidebook can be seen as a continuous, dynamic response to all other discourses, no representation in a tour guidebook can ever be said to be the “last word” on its subject. In this chapter, I examine both the Fodor’s and JTB’s guidebook series through the lens of uncompletedness. I analyze example passages from both series, discussing their relationship to other related discourses, particularly the manner in which the passages appear to respond to antecedent and subsequent discourses.

Yield of Comparative Analysis of Uncompletedness—An Overview

Comparing the Fodor’s and JTB’s guidebook series under the lens of uncompletedness, one can see a number of distinct differences in the actual and anticipated discourses to which the series seem to be responding. However, because the tour guidebook constitutes a distinctive genre of cultural description, it may be useful to first look at how each guidebook series is both similar to, and different from, cultural descriptions which are commonly classified as “tour guidebooks.”

While the Fodor’s and JTB’s series are quite distinct from each other in many important ways, the two series share a number of features in common. First,

the two series, along with other tour guidebooks, share a preoccupation with providing information and opinion on topics of interest to tourists. Comparing the Fodor's and JTB's series, for example, one sees many virtually identical subject headings: history (both in general terms and histories of specific sites); food (particularly some form of rating of restaurants according to price, location, desirability of food, and so on); accommodations; currency exchange; customs inspections; and so forth. Second, most "standard" tour guidebooks² share a common organizational format. Comparing the chapter arrangement in the Fodor's and JTB's series, for example, one can see remarkable similarity: both begin with sections on "general information," followed by a section discussing specific elements of Japanese culture,³ followed by detailed explanations of specific sites and locations in Japan. Third, tour guidebooks evaluate the country being described. In both the Fodor's and JTB's guidebook series, there is consistent presentation of the authors' and editors' opinions: certain sites are "better" to visit than others, certain foods are more "edible" than others, certain goods and services are either too expensive or are "bargains," and certain cultural practices are more "authentically Japanese" than others. These three characteristics, and many others as well, are shared by "standard" tour guidebooks, particularly if they are published in series form. The dimension of uncompletedness influences standard touristic discourse in at least two important ways. First, standard "guidebook discourse" is expressed in formats which are widely understood by readers. Information presented in the standard format is thus directly targeted to wide-ranging segments

² By "standard," I mean guidebooks which are not clearly formulated to be "alternative" guidebooks (that is, written specifically to be distinct in style and content from the "standard" guidebook). As noted in Chapter Two [see particularly pp. 15-22, p. 29, and pp. 29-30], the 1980s saw the publication of a large number of alternative guidebooks to Japan which did not share the chapter structure and content of industry staples such as the Fodor's and JTB's series.

³ However, as noted previously (see Chapter Six), the 1990 edition of Fodor's tends to frame its information on cultural topics in more pragmatic terms which emphasize tourists' need to engage in activities.

of the potential audience who have had some experience with reading touristic writing. Second, however, the standard format anticipates its audience's responses because—as has been often demonstrated in this discussion—writers of tour guidebooks appear to permit themselves considerable latitude to make assertions in the absence of cited evidence. They would not be likely to do so if not for the expectation that the audience would not object to their assertions.⁴

However, there are also many important differences in the Fodor's and JTB's approaches to describing Japan, due in part to the need for each guidebook to respond to different discourses. To probe the multiple discourses which appear to be addressed in the writing of Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks, we need to first consider the elements of the corporate milieu (that is, the Fodor's and JTB's publication enterprises) of which each series is a product and which mark its descriptions in characteristic ways. The Fodor's series makes frequent reference to its status among other guidebook series:⁵ not only has the Fodor's series on Japan published continuously from 1961 (making it the oldest yearly guide to Japan published by a Western organization), but Fodor's Japan series is part of the internationally-recognized Fodor's set of guidebooks, perhaps the most widely-known and best-selling guidebooks in the world. Applying the lens of uncompletedness, one can speculate that perhaps it is the international status of the Fodor's series that in part explains the tone of superiority one so often sees in

⁴ The frequency of unsupported claims in touristic discourse confirms that such claims do little harm: despite the fact that unsupported claims are the rule rather than the exception in tour guidebooks, such guidebooks continue to sell increasing numbers of copies each year. Of course, there may also be at work a gradual establishment of the tour guidebook genre over time; with each successive edition, authors and editors will note whether sales seem to be hurt by such factors as descriptive style, and will modify their guidebooks accordingly. However, if one guidebook seems to be doing well with a certain format, style, or content, other guidebooks may follow suit. Over time, then, a style of expression may become expected by readers of tour guidebooks. Indeed, not only may readers expect unsupported claims, but they might be repelled by a guidebook that did not make such claims.

⁵ For example, in its extensively revised 1990 edition, the editors state in the foreword, "This is an exciting time for Fodor's, as we continue our ambitious program to rewrite, reformat, and redesign all 140 of our guides" [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1990, p. vi).

the writing of Fodor's contributors such as Edward Seidensticker. If Fodor's Japan series is considered to be one among other reputable guidebooks in the Fodor's line of products, the Fodor's reputation must be taken into account in the fashioning of descriptions. On the other hand, based on the overall reputation of the Fodor's publishing enterprise, the Fodor's Japan series can be presumed to gain some credibility regardless of its specific contents: in other words, the Japan series may seem more believable simply because it is a Fodor's series. In this way, the discourse contained in the Japan series is defined in relation to other past and present discourses in other Fodor's series through its characteristic linkages to Fodor's corporate structure.

The JTB series, on the other hand, unlike other guidebook series which are published by private commercial concerns, is published by an official agency of the Japanese Government, the Japan Travel Bureau (in association with another government agency, the Japan National Tourist Office [JNTO]). Moreover, the JTB guidebook series that is the focus of this study (the Japan, the Official Guide series) is only one of several such series published by Japan Travel Bureau. JTB also publishes a number of guidebooks to specific cities (for example, Guide to Kyoto, Nara, Osaka, Kobe [1964], Must See in Nikko [1985]), guidebooks for specific audiences (for example, The Salaryman in Japan [1986] and Living in Japan [1987]), and other "general" series (for example, Today's Japan [1988]).⁶ Under the lens of uncompletedness, one can see that the character of the JTB publishing enterprise may also play an important role in the fashioning of discourse in the Japan, the Official Guide.⁷

⁶ One should note that Fodor's also publishes other guidebook series on Japan; however, the alternative titles in the Fodor's line of guidebooks focus not on specialized subject areas, but on the cost of touring Japan: (1) Fodor's Budget Japan [1980, 1981, and 1983]; (2) Fodor's Budget Travel Japan [1986, 1987]; (3) Fodor's Great Travel Values [1988].

⁷ Beginning in 1964, the title Japan, the Official Guide was changed to Japan, the New Official Guide.

For example, I have several times noted the extraordinary level of detail which characterizes Japan, the Official Guide. It is not unreasonable to assume that the level of detail may be dictated by the fact that Japan, the Official Guide has always been the centerpiece of JTB's line of other guidebooks to Japan; in some ways, Japan, the Official Guide might be considered the symbolic summation of JTB's authority, while the more specialized publications are given the role of addressing narrower domains of cultural description. Viewed from the perspective of uncompletedness, then, Japan, the Official Guide orients itself toward other discourses sanctioned by the JTB corporate structure, just as the Fodor's guidebook to Japan gains authority from the other products in the Fodor's line of travel publications. The discourse in the JTB series, then, is seen to derive its meaning from other publications of the JTB publishing enterprise.

In both the Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks, there are a number of clues indicating that writers write in awareness of previous and subsequent discourse on the subject of Japan. In the Fodor's series, for example, the following indications can be seen: (1) in offering information about the cost of accommodations or restaurants, the Fodor's guidebook uses a rating system which is based both on qualitative evaluations ("expensive," "moderate," "inexpensive") as well as reports from the facilities about the prices they charge; (2) apparently in response to the growing popularity of Japan as a tourist site as well as to greater numbers of tour guidebooks about Japan, the Fodor's series increasingly highlights Japan as a primary touristic site in East Asia (from "Japan and East Asia" [1962 and 1969 editions] to "Japan and Korea" [1976 and 1982 editions] to "Japan" [1990]); (3) numerous references to "East" and "West" have been formulated in awareness of a previously established and accepted dichotomy separating Asian countries (the "East") from non-Asian countries (the "West"); (4) there are a number of specific

references to potential reader responses (for example, as we saw earlier,⁸ in the 1990 edition, Fisher stated that Fodor's ranked the Lake Kawaguchi and Lake Yamanaka areas as the third most interesting in the Fuji-Hakone-Izu area, "... though there are plenty of others who would disagree with us . . ."); (5) Jared Lubarsky, in his description of Nikko in the 1990 edition, cites the published opinions of two travel writers, one of whom was impressed with the mausoleum of the Tokugawas and the other of whom was not; and so on.

There are also numerous examples of author awareness of previous and subsequent communication on certain subjects in JTB's series, including the following: (1) throughout the series, frequent references are made to governmental designations ("national treasures," government-sanctioned hotels or restaurants, official standards of hygiene or cleanliness, and so on); (2) particularly in the earlier editions, there are frequent references indicating that writers are aware of the need to reassure potential visitors that facilities conform to some form of quality control (for example, in the 1955 edition, one finds, "... inns registered by the Minister of Transportation in accordance with the Law for Improvement of International Tourist Hotel Facilities . . ." are designated with an asterisk [Japan Travel Bureau, 1955, p. 20]); (3) descriptions of Japanese cultural practices are often explained by comparing them to practices in Western nations; (4) JTB sometimes finds it necessary to justify cultural practices as distinct from the influences of other Asian countries (as discussed previously,⁹ for example, the guidebook asserts that flower arranging in Japan developed "independent of all outside influences"); (5) the Japanese version of the JTB's guidebook is translated into an English version for sale in Western countries; and so on. This very limited

⁸ See Chapter Four, pp. 209-213.

⁹ See Chapter Four, pp. 235-237.

listing¹⁰ of examples should demonstrate the pervasiveness of the Bakhtin circle's dimension of uncompletedness in the activity of cultural description.

In both the Fodor's and JTB's guidebooks, writers are seen to compose their descriptions in awareness of many different forms of communication about the subjects being described. Many of the references explicitly identify one primary form of discourse to respond to; other targets of the response are suggested by sociohistorical circumstances. In either case, it is impossible for any author in either guidebook series to express an evaluation without orienting such descriptions toward actual or imagined features of other discourses.

Yield of Longitudinal Analysis of Uncompletedness—An Overview

Fodor's distinctive background and its claim to authority in the travel industry is made particularly meaningful as we examine changes through the different editions of Fodor's Japan series. The Fodor's series on Japan has been marked by a seeming reluctance to change format and content for nearly two decades (1962 through 1982), in contrast to other guidebook series which often make thoroughgoing revisions in response to other discourses every few years.¹¹

For the editions from 1962 through 1982, not only does the format remain substantially unchanged, but the wording of key chapters is virtually identical. Some minor changes in structure, however, offer clues as to the discourses toward which the Fodor's descriptions may be oriented. First, some of the more

¹⁰ It is no exaggeration to say that virtually every passage analyzed in this dissertation can easily be recast both as a response to other discourses, while at the same time suggestive of the author's awareness of potential subsequent responses.

¹¹ Apparent resistance to the effects of other discourses (for example, other tour guidebooks to Japan) can also be seen as a response to such discourses. In the case of Fodor's, even though the series changed less noticeably than other guidebook series over the period 1962 through 1982, it cannot be said that the Fodor's series was written without regard to sociohistorical changes in touristic descriptions of Japan. Rather, the resistance to change may be seen as Fodor's responding more to the influence of its own earlier discourses than to the discourses which caused other guidebooks to extensively change their format and contents. In other words, as a leader in the field of touristic description, Fodor's may want to present itself as the standard for similar tour guidebooks to follow, not to look to other guidebook series to provide the standard.

intemperate characterizations have been revised. For example, from the 1962 to the 1969 editions of Fodor's, the title of the chapter on shopping (by Maggie Burrows) changes from "Shopping in Japan: The All-Asian Supermarket," to "Shopping in Japan: Folkcraft, Fashion, and Fad." While one cannot be certain of the reason for this change, it is perhaps a recognition that the earlier description—"the All-Asian Supermarket"—might have been considered objectionable, portraying Japan simply as a place to buy things, and insufficiently cognizant of the integrity of Japan's native craftwork. In the 1969 revision, "folkcraft" is added to other descriptors ("fashion" and "fad") perhaps to suggest that Japanese are eager to be more modern. In fact, it is possible that the revision responds to two sets of discourses about Japan, one of which urges more respect for Japan's cultural integrity while the other compels Burrows to acknowledge the widespread adoption by Japan of consumer goods from other nations ("fashion" and "fad").

A second example illustrating revision of overly extravagant descriptions is the rewriting of the important introductory chapter. In the 1962 and 1969 editions, the introductory chapter is written by Edward Seidensticker, and is titled, "Japan and its People: A Crowded, Lonely Land." Perhaps recognizing that this title was too censorious, in the 1976 and 1982 editions, the chapter is retitled, "Japan and its People: Land of Contrasts and Contradictions," and is authored not by Seidensticker but by Douglas Moore Kenrick. As noted in previous discussion, Seidensticker's chapter (virtually unchanged from 1962 to 1969) is replete with negative depictions of Japan.¹² Kenrick's chapter, on the other hand, is noticeably milder in tone.¹³ Applying the lens of uncompletedness, one is aware that the

¹² See Chapter Three, pp. 81-82.

¹³ The difference between the authorial tones taken by Seidensticker and Kenrick is established in the first words of their respective chapters. Seidensticker (1969) begins, "Within seconds of his arrival, the visitor to Japan is immediately aware of one essential fact about the country. It is crowded. Whether he comes by ship or by plane, he finds himself immediately in the middle of the world's greatest jumble of humanity, the Tokyo metropolitan complex. Other cities rival Tokyo in size, but none approaches it in noise, in bustle, in the rip and swirl of its rolling sea of bodies" (Fodor's,

change must have been made in response to other discourses, possibly a set of discourses which registers objections to Seidensticker's somewhat autocratic style of expression.

A second change in the Fodor's series which may indicate response to other discourses about Japan is the addition to the 1976 edition of a chapter devoted specifically to religion: "Religion in Japan—Duality, Plurality, and Tolerance" (pp. 73-86), by Douglas Moore Kenrick. Recognition of some unspecified realm of discourses about Japan—perhaps the increasing interest in Asian spiritual traditions—may have caused Fodor's to make this significant change in the structure of its introductory section (in fact, this is the only addition of an entire chapter in the series, 1962 through 1982). Regardless of the specific source of alternative discourses, it is evident that the decision to include the chapter on religion has been provoked by some set of social circumstances. As the Bakhtin circle argued, struggles based on social forces are inevitably expressed as conflicting forms of communication.¹⁴

At the same time, the complete overhaul of the 1990 edition of the Fodor's guidebook is atypical: most guidebooks, despite revision, seldom change

1969, pp. 55-56). Kenrick (1976), on the other hand, begins, "Where Korea nudges towards Kyushu, a mere hundred miles of sea divides Japan from the Asian mainland. At today's jet speeds the distance is insignificant, but short water barriers have often changed the course of history" (Fodor's, 1976, p. 42). Regardless of the factual truth of Seidensticker's and Kenrick's statements, it is clear that the tone of each author is dictated by awareness of other discourses: Seidensticker addresses his remarks to the immediate experience of the modern traveler (contributing to an unfavorable image of Japan), Kenrick to those who might be interested in his commentary on history (contributing to a more neutral image of Japan).

¹⁴ Notice that Douglas Moore Kenrick, author of the chapter on religion, is also the author of the revised introductory chapter which makes its first appearance in 1976. To say, then, that the changes are due "simply" to a change in personnel does not preclude the influence of the dimension of uncompletedness. Changing writers (particularly when Seidensticker is the only writer changed) is also due to social circumstances (changing authors could be attributed, for example, to the editor's recognition of authorial incompetence, salary disputes, the author moving to a different publisher, and so on) all of which are expressed through a number of discourses. Indeed, Seidensticker's removal from Fodor's roster of contributors proves that the discourses of the 1969 edition are uncompleted: they remain in place until the 1976 and 1982 editions, only to be themselves replaced in the thoroughgoing revision of the 1990 edition.

appearance and content to the extent that the Fodor's series did. It is clear from the thoroughgoing revision of the 1990 edition that Fodor's considers its earlier editions as "uncompleted"; otherwise, it would have seen no need to revise the format and content that had proved successful enough to have been retained from 1962 through 1982. This sequence of events confirms the Bakhtin group's observations, first, that texts remain unfinished because they necessarily engage other discourse (in this case, other touristic writing about Japan), and second, that texts derive a portion of their meaning from previous and subsequent discourse (in this case, one is aware of the extent to which the 1990 edition is revised by comparing it to the previous format employed from 1962 through 1982).

On the other hand, as noted previously, the JTB series is published by an official agency of the Japanese Government, the Japan Travel Bureau. Previous editions of Japan, the Official Guide define the range of possible changes. For example, the JTB guidebook claims to provide information not only for tourists, but also for anyone who is interested in any aspect of Japanese life. This stated goal remains the same throughout the three editions examined in this study. Although the text has undergone several revisions—major and minor—the overall structure and organization of the JTB guidebook remain much the same as they have for over seventy years.

Of course, this does not mean that the contents have not been changed. Quite the contrary, in each successive edition, different images are created by different words to suit the current needs of both JTB and its readers. While the 1955 edition in some ways specifies the direction taken by the 1975 and 1991 editions, each successive edition nevertheless evolves from the circumstances of its own unique systems of architectonics. The 1955 edition claims, "In the present edition, therefore, revision has been made only in important facts . . ." (p. i); from a Bakhtinian viewpoint, however, it is impossible to revise only "facts." Any

restatement, any incorporation of new information, means that the author must resituate the discourse in a new perspective in response to new potential audiences and revised sociohistorical contexts. By replacing one word, an author in the JTB guidebook creates a completely different perceptual world for the reader. If an author promotes only positive images of Japan by emphasizing Japan's progress, or by ignoring problematic areas of Japanese life, he or she must choose among the resources available in the social milieu at the time the description is written.

While it is important to emphasize that these various editions of the JTB guidebook do little to revise their contents due to the constraints imposed by the established touristic genre, as well as the genre established by the JTB guidebook itself, it is more crucial to point out that, pinioned within this confinement, any revision is rendered more implicit, more tactical, more difficult, and at the same time more powerful. While the same information has seemingly been provided in substantially the same form from one edition to the next, how the information is presented remains the choice of the writer (as well as the editorial infrastructure of the publishing organization), and is governed to a great extent by anticipation of potential responses.

Another example demonstrating JTB's changing responses to extant discourses is to be found in its increasingly strong assertions that Japan, the Official Guide is to be considered the "authority" on Japan. With each successive edition, this assertion is advanced more overtly. As Japan emerges as a world power, it gains more authority to define itself, rather than waiting to be defined by some other nation. This is dramatically demonstrated by the fact that an extensive bibliography containing hundreds of references to Japan (in several languages) is included in the 1955 edition, but is removed from the 1975 and 1991 editions.

The dimension of uncompletedness allows the critical reader to place these facts in perspective with regard to the answering of discourses about Japan. The

JTB apparently felt that, in the 1955 edition, it was necessary to bolster its extraordinary level of detail with further references, that is, to explicitly acknowledge the wide range of other discourses about Japan. In the 1975 and 1991 editions, however, JTB no longer includes a bibliography, perhaps reflecting JTB's increasing confidence in its guidebook as a source of authoritative information about Japan. The 1975 and 1991 editions of JTB's guidebook, while acknowledging an upsurge in writing about Japan, do not explicitly acknowledge the sources of that writing. This seems to suggest that JTB may be less certain of its own authority prior to the 1975 edition. Hence, before 1975, it was important for JTB to include extensive references to support its claim as the "authority" for representation of Japan. In the 1975 and 1991 editions, since Japan has secured sufficient power in the international arena, JTB no longer needs to rely upon "references" to establish its claims to authority. JTB has grown in stature to become the final authority, the "last word" in defining Japan and the Japanese.¹⁵

In the next section, I turn to an analysis of themes and temporal changes relating to uncompletedness in the Fodor's and JTB's series. Specifically, I will show how the lens of uncompletedness describes Fodor's responses to the accepted discourse about the inferiority of the East, as evolved from the broader realm of discourses about contact between East and West. I will also demonstrate how JTB addresses its intended audience (primarily Westerners) as a means to renegotiate its international status. In particular, I illustrate how JTB's response to the concepts of "historicity" and "traditionality" are attempts to recast historical events in terms more favorable to Japan's image in the international community.

¹⁵ Here, too, as in the case of Fodor's resistance to changes in content and format discussed earlier, the fact that JTB does not include in its 1975 and 1991 editions bibliographic references is not to be taken as invalidating the dimension of uncompletedness regarding these references. Rather, the removal of the bibliography should be seen as an example of JTB giving greater emphasis to its own discourses than to the discourses of those listed in the previous edition's bibliography.

Comparative Thematic and Temporal Analysis Relating to Uncompletedness in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in Uncompletedness of Fodor's Descriptions

The dimension of uncompletedness implies that meaning cannot be found in a given description itself, but must rather be derived from considering how the description is situated with respect to other descriptions, expressed in other discourses. The Fodor's and JTB's series, each in an attempt to answer anticipated responses, have come to utilize available resources from various divergent descriptions of Japan in order to organize their presentation of topics relating to Japanese culture.

With these ideas in mind, I turn now to an analysis of the discourses to which the Fodor's series appears to be responding in its descriptions of Japan. Since the mid-nineteenth century, when Japan and the West first came into contact, their relationship has been dictated in large measure by political discourse, which in turn has directed how travel to Japan is approached. In response to political and other discourses about interaction between Japan and the West, the Fodor's guidebook orients its readers toward discourses which reflect the difference in international prestige between Japan and Western nations.

Orientation toward the discourses reflecting Western superiority are to be found early in the foreword to the Fodor's guidebook, where one finds the following statement:

More than 100 years after the West forcibly "opened" the doors of Japan, she and her "Hermit Kingdom" neighbor, Korea, still represent the epitome of the exotic in travel to all but the jaded. Distance shrinks, instant news and television breed familiarity, but even the common place knowledge of Japanese industrial competition has not removed the aura of mystery about "the Far East." Despite three recent

wars and their aftermath, which, paradoxically, have brought about greater understanding of some Asian nations on the part of foreign armies stationed or fighting there, the ways of life of the Japanese and Koreans remain unknown or hopelessly stereotyped.

To shatter this barrier of ignorance, then, is the primary reason you should visit these two lands. (Fodor's, 1982, p. v)

Since communication is formulated for specific purposes and in anticipation of predicted audience response, the Fodor's assertion that Japan remains unknown to the West even after the political and military events of this century is revealing. Even though tourism is often seen as a leisure activity indulged in by people who can afford it, the Fodor's guidebook nevertheless urges its readers to a higher goal: they should "shatter this barrier of ignorance" as the "primary reason" for their visit to Japan.

Applying the lens of uncompletedness, one can see that, far from merely pursuing the goal of writing a guidebook to be sold in the marketplace (thus supporting tourism as a commercial enterprise), the Fodor's guidebook wishes to situate itself in regard to other, more overtly political, discourses about Japan. In this passage, one sees that the Fodor's guidebook appears to be responding to non-touristic discourses about Japan, moving beyond its most obvious purposes to make a broad statement about the encounter between Japan and the West. By urging a better understanding of Japan, and by citing the need to break down stereotypes about Japanese, Fodor's does more than simply satisfy the curiosity of potential visitors; Fodor's also adds its voice to other discourses arising out of a complex sociopolitical situation in which the contact between Japan and the West is made meaningful. As the West continues its interaction with Japan, it remains to be seen how the Fodor's guidebook, in its subsequent editions, will address the interaction between Japan and the West, confirming an essential point about the

Bakhtin group's dimension of uncompletedness: there will never be a final word on the subject.

Fodor's—Response to discourse about the "backward East" (Japan). So many stereotypes¹⁶ about the Japanese exist in the minds of many Westerners (Johnson, 1988) that it would be impossible to write about Japanese culture without referring to one or more widely-accepted beliefs about the country or its people. In descriptions of Japanese culture, one often encounters statements which seem to indicate that the author is aware that his or her readers likely will find a given description consistent with their stereotypes.¹⁷ According to the dimension of uncompletedness, the quality of stereotypes is often conditioned by the expressed awareness of the author that the potential response of the reader, firmly situated in stereotypical thinking, must be taken into account in the writing or revision of a given cultural description. In the following discussion, I examine three stereotypes the Fodor's guidebook appears to acknowledge in the construction of its touristic discourse: (1) Japanese as superstitious; (2) Japanese as violent; and (3) Japanese as passive.

Japanese as superstitious. To Westerners, perhaps one of the most intriguing qualities of Asian cultures can be found in their religious traditions. For example, while Western religions are generally assumed to be monotheistic, Eastern religions are generally viewed as polytheistic. However, until its 1976

¹⁶ See particularly Chapter Three, pp. 69-79.

¹⁷ Notice, for example, the encumbrance of stereotypes in this brief summation of Japan in the 1982 Fodor's guidebook: "The Japanese are obsessed with the idea of being Asians, but they cannot escape the knowledge that their culture is a deviant one, a pattern all its own. Onto a basically tribal-clan social organization and a temperament with a deep streak of puritanism and taste for militaristic discipline, they have grafted Chinese religion, architecture and writing. And over this, in the last hundred years, a violent and often garish layer of Western technology and politics. The result is a curious mixture indeed, and it is no small tribute to the Japanese spirit that it has kept its integrity, its own stubborn ways of thinking and, more important, ways of feeling, throughout its successive vicissitudes" (Fodor's, 1982, p. xi). This extraordinary statement is presented as a "capsule comment" on the country of Japan, one presumes as a convenience to the reader who needs information to supplant more time-consuming explanations. However, such "capsule comments" only work to further confine the potential visitor's perception of Japan by appeal to stereotypes.

edition, the subject of religion in Japan is treated only briefly in the Fodor's guidebook series (as noted in earlier discussion,¹⁸ both the 1976 and 1982 editions contain a chapter titled, "Religion in Japan—Duality, Plurality and Tolerance," by Douglas Moore Kenrick). Earlier in the series, in the 1962 edition, Seidensticker¹⁹ dismisses many Japanese religious practices as "superstitions":²⁰

And there are superstitions, far too great a variety of them to be introduced here. It is enough to say that they make much of the perverse habits of badgers, foxes, and river sprites, that ghosts are diverse and plentiful, and that the horoscope and the soothsayer are remarkably influential even in the most modern cities. For someone somewhere in Japan, every day is a Friday the thirteenth. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 65; this identical passage can be found in the 1969 edition)

Seidensticker makes such assertions because, according to the dimension of uncompletedness, his discourse anticipates the responses of his readers; his description of Japanese religion is written for readers who are likely to use Western standards to make judgments about Japanese religious beliefs. First of all, from the Western perspective (particularly Christianity), polytheism must be designated as "superstition" because polytheism posits the existence of more than one god. Moreover, Seidensticker chooses to depict polytheism in its least favorable light (at least to Christianity) by providing examples of lower animal and spirit forms such as badgers, foxes, river sprites, and ghosts, emphasizing how significantly Japanese beliefs diverge from mainstream Western discourse on religion.

Second, it is likely Seidensticker's statements have also been fashioned in reply to the discourse on "modernity," as contrasted with "traditionality." Seidensticker's narrative suggests that "horoscopes and soothsayers" can be found

¹⁸ See Chapter Two, p. 33.

¹⁹ A portion of this quotation is also analyzed in Chapter Five, p. 275.

²⁰ Seidensticker's perspective toward these religious beliefs is perhaps indicated by the title of the subsection from which this quotation is taken: "Visible Gods for Every Taste" (p. 64).

“even in the most modern cities,” implying that practices such as divination are ordinarily thought incompatible with life in a modern city. Hence, the fact that Japan claims to be a “modern” nation and yet still widely practices these “superstitions” is treated as a source of concern by Seidensticker. Seidensticker’s assessment would make less sense if the discourses on “modernity” and “traditionality” were not already part of the present-day discussion of Japan. Seidensticker’s passage reveals his awareness of these discourses, and it is in relation to such discourses that his somewhat controversial evaluation of Japanese religious beliefs derives its impact.

Japanese as violent. Often, one sees the dimension of uncompletedness revealed in touristic descriptions in which the author acknowledges heightened awareness of the audience to whom he or she is writing. Although this is not the only way in which the principle of uncompletedness may manifest itself—the author could exhibit awareness of other, more distant, audiences, even the members of the other culture themselves—one most often sees this other-awareness in phrases which suggest that the author is consciously framing an utterance in a way which either plays to a stereotype firmly in place in the audience’s mind, answers an objection before it is asked, or retreats from an assertion which appears to take too strong a position.

Let me offer an example from the 1962 Fodor’s guidebook to illustrate how authorial association with audience stereotypes might function in determining how readers are to interpret a given description. Edward Seidensticker is discussing the Noh and kabuki forms of theater, while perhaps unwittingly reinforcing a stereotype that Japanese are inordinately fond of violence.

What the Noh makes known by suggestion and withdrawal the kabuki makes known by accentuation. If there are no angry assassins in the former, the Brutuses of the latter not only stab but give the dagger a

few extra twists, and no kabuki Caesar would think of dying after a mere six words. The costumes and settings quite dazzle. Yet none of this strikes one as being in bad taste, for the kabuki is art of extraordinary subtlety. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 84)

In the emphasized portion of the above passage, the author chooses to illustrate Japanese theater by reference to its violence and how this compares to similar violence in Western theater. In this chapter (titled, "Arts and Lesser Pleasures: Traditional Tastes for New Vogues"), there are several specific examples taken from Japanese theater: all but one are examples of violence. One is compelled to ask why, if it is necessary to make comparisons among various theatrical forms, one should choose almost exclusively examples related to violence.

One answer may be that references to theatrical violence play easily into stereotypes that Japanese are warlike, bellicose, and belligerent. This is a good example illustrating the dimension of uncompletedness: the Fodor's discourse may be written both in awareness of past-discourses on the subject of Japanese "character" (that is, the supposed historical foundations upon which the stereotype, "Japanese as violent," rests), as well as possible future discourses (that is, shaping the potential psychological schema into which "new" information about the theater is to be placed).

Obviously, it is impossible to know what was in Seidensticker's mind at the time he wrote this particular passage;²¹ certainly, to emphasize the stereotype of Japanese as warlike might be only one possible motivation. On the other hand, one cannot be sure that it was the author's intention to play into this previously held stereotype.

²¹ On the other hand, I have several times demonstrated the frequency and intensity with which Seidensticker disparages Japanese culture, which perhaps lends credence to an interpretation classifying his references to theatrical violence as derogatory.

However, authorial intention is not the basis on which the dimension of uncompletedness rests; rather, the dimension of uncompletedness involves the consequences which follow placing discourse into the realm of social interaction where it is conjoined to previous and subsequent discourse. Regardless of authorial intention to connect the present discourse to antecedent and subsequent stereotypes, the act of introducing cultural description into the public realm engages discourse through its inevitable conjunction to other discourses present in the social environment. Even if it was not the Fodor's author's intention to reinforce the stereotype, the consistent emphasis on violence contributes to the common belief that Japanese are violent.

Japanese as passive. In another example illustrating how the dimension of uncompletedness functions in relation to stereotypes about Japanese, Edward Seidensticker²² targets two contradictory expectations of tourists (both of which are based on stereotypes): that Japanese are sufficiently nonthreatening that they should not deter the potential visitor (reinforcing the stereotype that Japanese are passive²³), but that a visit to Japan will be speculative enough to be an adventure (reinforcing the stereotype that Japanese are "different" and "exotic"):

²² One might object that too much reference is being made to Edward Seidensticker and not enough to other identified authors in the guidebook. However, Seidensticker is not only the author of the general introductory chapter (which is the first contact many people have with the guidebook) but he is also apparently the author of two subsequent chapters, though he is not listed as author for either chapter, except in the 1969 edition (for a discussion of the process by which Seidensticker was determined to have authored the two chapters subsequent to the introductory chapter, see Chapter Six). Thus, of the five introductory chapters to the 1962 Fodor's guidebook, Seidensticker is solely responsible for the first three, the general introduction and the chapters on history and the arts. The introductory section is comprised of 52 pages (pp. 55-107); Seidensticker's three chapters occupy 36 pages, leaving only 16 pages in the section for the other two chapters on food and shopping (by Peter Robinson and Maggie Burrows, respectively). To put the matter perhaps more vividly, the reader could read through nearly seventy percent of the introductory section and not encounter any opinion other than that of Edward Seidensticker. Moreover, since Fodor's is willing to print chapters which are not explicitly identified as Seidensticker's work, it is possible that he wrote other chapters in the book which are not attributed to him.

²³ Even in the relatively less censorious 1982 edition, one finds many examples that Fodor's authors subscribe to the stereotype that Japanese are passive, including the following: (1) "Through the Tokugawa era down to the end of the Pacific War Japan was a police state, infiltrated by informers at all levels of society. 'The nail that sticks up' was always flattened. Generations-old penalties have

It also helps explain the Japanese when at their most puzzling. They can at times seem very paradoxical, a lumpier bundle of contradictions than most of us. Thus the visitor will find them at once friendly and aloof. They are extraordinarily kind to the stranger who has a look of being lost, as many do most of the time in confused, unlabelled Tokyo. Yet in few places is the foreigner kept more firmly in his place, forever a foreigner and apart. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 62)

It is in passages such as the emphasized portion of the above quotation that authors of touristic literature seem most clearly aware of the needs of their primary audiences. Recall that the dimension of uncompletedness says that communication is formulated in anticipation of specific responses of the audiences for whom it is intended. By appealing to the contradictory needs for safety and danger, Seidensticker displays a sophisticated awareness of his potential readers. He knows that the visitor, likely to be easily lost on Japan's city streets, would welcome a friendly Japanese native to help out in giving directions; this is the appeal to the tourist's need for safety. On the other hand, Seidensticker's previous descriptions of the Japanese (insular, suspicious, bellicose) hardly permit him the luxury of a too-favorable portrayal of the typical Japanese citizen, so it is necessary to suggest that perhaps the Japanese are somewhat distant in their treatment of foreigners,²⁴ keeping them "in their place"; this is the appeal to the tourist's need for danger.

been harsh on the intransigent, and yesterday's behavior provides a strict precedent for today. Law is respected and obeyed without question." (pp. 28-29); (2) "The politeness of the Japanese, so agreeable to visitors from less ordered lands, stems as a way of life from the suppression of individuality and the necessity of living together without elbow-room. Old rules enforced strict subservience to rank." (p. 30); (3) "Docile acceptance often masks stern self-control." (p. 30); (4) "Lifetime employment in a single firm, sometimes called 'lifetime imprisonment', emulated the feudal structure. Working people accepted a paternal pattern of industrialization, knowing that their jobs for life meant security as well as obligations." (p. 33); and so on.

²⁴ Seidensticker's 1962 chapter contains several examples of appeals to the stereotype that Japanese keep themselves aloof from foreigners: (1) "The country was withdrawn from the give-and-take of international intercourse for so long that non-Japanese are indeed more isolated than they are elsewhere in the world." (p. 62); (2) "The fact that the West should be viewed with so much suspicion can be explained by certain assumptions of Marx-Leninism about the origins of the war. . . ." (p. 63);

Notice how both of these characterizations in fact reflect commonly held stereotypes which tend to diminish perception of Japanese competence. As to the former characterization, many Westerners feel that Japanese are more passive than active (Johnson, 1988); thus, to say that they are willing to help foreigners around city streets is to reinforce the stereotype of Japanese passivity, placing more emphasis on the perception that Japanese are willing to go to extra effort to accommodate foreigners. On the other hand, the latter characterization plays to the stereotype that Japanese are xenophobes obsessed with hierarchical positioning, so that a typical Japanese citizen is said to find it necessary to keep foreigners "in their place."

Moreover, Seidensticker appears to signal his awareness of the future responses of his readers. Based on his estimation of what the potential tourist is likely to welcome and fear about a visit to Japan, Seidensticker (in collaboration with his corporate superiors and editors) shows his implicit concern with what his readers will think, both before they go to Japan and after they return. In fact, the tone of negative evaluation is seemingly expected of the competent tour guidebook writer; if the evaluation were too positive, readers might suspect that the writer is failing to do his or her job of analyzing the "exotic" country with the proper degree of diligence and "objectivity."

One can test the degree of negativity in Seidensticker's narrative by using the technique of rephrasing. For example, in the quoted passage, Seidensticker writes, "They are extraordinarily kind to the stranger who has a look of being lost, as many do most of the time in confused, unlabelled Tokyo. Yet in few places is the foreigner kept more firmly in his place, forever a foreigner and apart." Rather than

(3) "... while they are very kind about giving the visitor directions, he should not expect an apology when someone comes shooting down the street like a ricocheting bullet and knocks him down." (p. 67); and (4) "It has been said above that Japanese are good at keeping the foreigner in his place. . ." (p. 68). These phrases are retained intact in the 1969 edition.

reinforcing the two negative stereotypes identified in previous analysis, Seidensticker could have written: "Despite their willingness to help people not familiar with their cities to find their way around, Japanese nevertheless are conscious that it is their country and that the foreigners are after all merely visiting." This rephrasing manages to convey roughly the same information as Seidensticker's phrasing; one suspects, however, that Seidensticker (and other Fodor's authors) would avoid utterances like the rephrased example because it places too much control over the touristic encounter in the hands of the visited cultural Other (allowing the Japanese to choose whether to provide assistance in a familiar environment, or not).

In this discussion, I have focused on three of the most noticeable appeals to stereotypes evident in the Fodor's discourse: Japanese as superstitious, Japanese as violent, and Japanese as passive. It should be noted, however, that these are merely three of a much larger number of appeals to stereotypes in the Fodor's guidebooks.²⁵ Through applying the lens of uncompletedness, text passages from

²⁵ Other stereotypes repeatedly referred to in the earlier (1962 through 1982) Fodor's editions include the following: (1) Japanese as hierarchical ("The Tokugawa system required absolute discipline and conformity, and the father of the family and the head of the state were its effective gods." [Fodor's, 1962, p. 64]); (2) Japanese as dependent on China ("The chief characteristic of this era is that Chinese civilization exerted an immense influence on every phase of Japanese life." [Fodor's, 1962, p. 314]); (3) Japanese as obsessed with personal hygiene ("The Shinto cult of cleanliness combined with the country's hot springs has promoted a habit of daily baths." [Fodor's, 1982, p. 32]); (4) Japanese as exotic ("This quest will reveal to you the infinite diversity, intricacy and color spectrum of a unique corner of the world." [Fodor's, 1982, p. vii]); (5) Japanese as fascinated with Western popular culture ("Western pop stars are heroes in Japan; hippies thrive; the use of drugs has proliferated, though less than in some overseas cultures." [Fodor's, 1982, p. 33]); (6) Japanese as spiritual ("Ancestors are venerated in accordance with Buddhist temples; priests are asked to chant sutras on the occasion of funerals and on designated days related to deaths, while mortuary tablet (ihai) of departed family members are kept in the household Buddhist altars." [Fodor's, 1976, p. 74]; and so on. These expressions can be said to reinforce stereotypes because they each assert a general statement which cannot possibly be true of specific instances. Common sense tells us that Chinese culture cannot have influenced "every" phase of Japanese life, that the "habit" of daily baths (hardly unique to Japanese) cannot have been promoted solely from the combination of Shintoism and hot springs, and the Tokugawa system cannot have required "absolute" discipline and conformity (had it been able to do so, the Tokugawa regime would never have fallen). An important purpose of each of these statements is to serve as "evidence" that a general stereotype about Japanese is true. Each statement, then, is oriented toward previous discursive representations.

the Fodor's guidebook are more thoroughly described by connecting them to the broader universe of discourses on subjects similar to those described in the guidebook.

One should also note that it is not only the author's anticipation of the audience's direct response that is being suggested in these passages. In fact, there is never a direct line between what the author writes and the anticipated response of a potential reader. In the process of publication, there are many intervening steps between author and reader; at each step, contributors to the publication process must anticipate the responses of those other than reader or author. The author must reckon, for example, with the response of his or her editor(s) and publisher. Suppose the author personally feels that his or her description has too many references to Japanese belligerence, but is told by the editor or publisher that the description needs to be enlivened with more vivid examples, particularly with references to violence. Frequently, touristic discourse is characterized by attempts to bring the audience a little closer to threatening activities (by providing a hint of danger) but at the same time to shield readers (by, for example, placing violence in the context of the theater, where it is kept on stage, a safe distance from the audience). It may be that Seidensticker, in his description of theater violence, is simply responding to popular taste in making references to violent theatrical scenes, as popular taste is interpreted by the author's superiors at Fodor's (or its publishing house).

However, it is not simply the author who must write in anticipation of subsequent and previous discourse, but the consumer who must read the author's descriptions. Let us imagine a reader who encounters the text of a Fodor's author for the first time. Whether this imaginary reader finds the Fodor's guidebook believable will depend to a great extent upon the reader's previous experience with information about Japan. The reader's previous experience will be conditioned by

contact with a number of different discourses: the reputation of the Fodor's guide, previous knowledge about Japanese (which, for most American readers, will be colored by the experiences of World War II), artistic illustrations in the Fodor's guidebook itself (for example, the very first line-drawing illustration in the book depicts a menacing-looking samurai with his sword drawn back to strike), to name only a few potentially influential discourses. This imaginary reader may take all of these symbols of violence together and read through the Fodor's chapter, "Arts and Lesser Pleasures" (with the majority of examples of Japanese theater referring to violent acts), emerging with the impression that Japanese theater, like the Japanese people as a whole, are innately violent. The stronger the stereotype in the mind of the reader before encountering the Fodor's descriptions, the more effectively will the Fodor's narrative reinforce that stereotype through its connection to other discourses.

This brief discussion of the Fodor's approach toward describing Japan has touched only the surface of the scope and extent of discursive forces impinging on and affecting the writing and reading of the passages analyzed. However, even surface indications of extensive and powerful discourses—as suggested by the potential effects of cultural stereotypes, together with the evident awareness of Fodor's authors of the audience and influential forces within its corporate structure—reveal that touristic discourse is fashioned deliberately, not haphazardly. In the next section, there will be further exploration of discourses which likely affect the writing of the descriptions in the Fodor's guidebook; in particular, I will focus on discourses concerning the historical contact and relationship between "the East" (specifically, Japan) and "the West."

Fodor's—Response to the discourse of East-West contact. As noted earlier, the broader context of East-West contact provides a framework within which touristic discourse is fashioned. In the following analysis, I discuss three examples

to illustrate how previous communication on the assumed superior role of “the West” over “the East” serves to frame a particular account of Japan: (1) incursion of the West into the Japanese realm of influence; (2) Japanese economy as dependent upon the United States; and (3) Japanese art as influenced by the West.

Incursion of West into Japanese realm of influence. Historical accounts are written by specific agents. Though one might prefer to assume that historians are objective and that they maintain a nonjudgmental attitude, given the nature of the environment in which discourse exists—including at minimum the context in which it is written, the audience for whom it is written, and the response anticipated—objectivity is impossible. The author’s discourse is often constrained, not simply because the genres of history dictate the narrative, but also because the author must recognize previous communication on his or her subject. Previous discourse sets the parameters against which subsequent accounts will be judged. In discussions of history, the dimension of uncompletedness is often accented as the result of attempts by the author to anticipate audience response to a given reading of historical events. Since it is clear that the interpretation of history is highly subjective, and moreover that subjectivity implies a somewhat opportunistic selection of supportive material, the author must frequently tread carefully around what he or she reads as the audience’s preconceived ideas about events.

To illustrate the potential effect of previous discursive formulations on cultural description, consider the passage quoted below, in which Edward Seidensticker²⁶ summarizes a highly significant event in Japanese history: the “contact” initiated by Commodore Matthew Perry in Tokyo Bay, 1853. According to the 1962 Fodor’s guide:

²⁶ It is worth reemphasizing that at no point in the 1962 edition is Edward Seidensticker explicitly identified as the author of either this or the subsequent chapter.

Therefore when Commodore Matthew Perry arrived in Tokyo Bay on a summer day in 1853 and demanded commercial relations, the problems he posed were too much for the Shogunate, whose assumption that the merchant was beneath notice was hardly a good beginning for an attempt to govern a developing merchant economy (Fodor's, 1962, p. 73)

The wording of this passage remains identical through the 1969, 1976, and 1982 editions. The phrasing used in this Fodor's description is intriguing. One wonders how an outsider, Commodore Matthew Perry, with no relationship to the Japanese, could simply "demand" "commercial relations," and be viewed as making a reasonable request. The account continues, later stating that Japan had been unable to "... turn away Perry's four ships in 1853 ..." but had nevertheless "... stricken down a series of unequal treaties (treaties in which the Japanese were forced to give a great deal and received little in return) ..." (Fodor's, 1962, p. 74) If, as the word "demand" suggests, the response to "demand" should be a simple affirmation or denial, how could such a "demand" create problems that were "too much" for the Shogunate and cause it to be impeded by "unequal treaties"? These seemingly inconsistent descriptions suggest that the word "demand" may be a euphemism masking the real nature of this event. Even on the basis of the quoted passage, one suspects that the "demand" is not a request, but rather a form of coercion, and that this is why it posed "problems" for the Shogunate.

It is evident that these depictions are oriented toward discourses which express the superiority of the West over Japan.²⁷ At no point in the Fodor's description does the author acknowledge other discourses which might suggest that Perry's actions could be considered provocative or belligerent. The legitimacy

²⁷ It is of course not surprising that this event is described somewhat differently in the 1975 edition of JTB's *Japan, the Official Guide*: "Years of anxiety rolled on and passed into decades, until 1853 when Commodore Perry of the United States Navy, in command of a squadron, came to Uraga and demanded Japan to open its doors to trade. It was as if the entire Japanese nation heard the loud clanging of bells announcing the dawning of a new era" (p. 133). This passage also appears in identical form in the 1991 edition.

of Perry's "demand" is not questioned, nor is there any suggestion of resistance to his incursion into the Japanese sphere of influence. Yet, by applying the lens of uncompletedness, the Fodor's narrative is revealed to acknowledge that there was indeed resistance and that Perry's aggressive actions²⁸ have been masked by Seidensticker's depiction of the incursion as the natural consequence of inevitable sociohistorical conditions.

Another example of Fodor's orientation toward discourses favoring Western superiority in its descriptions of Western incursion occurs in the following passage describing the arrival of missionaries in Japan during the sixteenth century:

Coming at a time of civil wars, they [missionaries] found themselves involved in Japanese politics, and the ultimate victors in the struggle for power had cause to suspect both that the Christians had not been neutral and that religious penetration might be a prelude to political penetration. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 73)

According to the Fodor's account, missionaries did not try to intervene in Japanese politics; rather, they "found themselves involved." That the Christians "had not been neutral" or that their interests in political penetration were "suspected" by the natives, are facts not necessarily taken for granted by the author of this chapter, Edward Seidensticker. The statement seems to excuse the involvement of Western missionaries in Japanese political affairs, even though the overall tone of the passage suggests that the author is more neutral in describing the event.

²⁸ Reischauer (1977) is unambiguous about the belligerent nature of Perry's mission: "Repeated efforts had been made by various Western nations to persuade the Japanese to open their doors, before the United States in 1853 dispatched about a quarter of its navy, under the command of Commodore Perry, to force the Japanese to give American ships access to their ports. The Japanese had to bow to force majeure. Perry's ships with their more modern cannon could have destroyed Edo and could even more easily have cut off its essential food supplies by blockading the entrance to Edo Bay. The treaty signed in 1854 achieved only a limited success, but Townsend Harris, the American consul permitted by this agreement to reside in Japan, finally managed to negotiate a full trade treaty in 1858, using the threat of British naval power then engaged in war in China to persuade the shogun's government to comply. In each case, the principal European powers followed suit with similar treaties" (p. 80).

Why did Seidensticker choose to describe these events in this way? Who is the intended audience for this description? What is the previous communication about these events that sets up the framing of the description? The modern history of international contact, fortunately or unfortunately, has frequently been initiated by Westerners (Perry's incursion, according to Reischauer, occurred only after Japan's repeated refusals to open its ports to the rest of the world). With industrialization of their societies, many nations from the West, in the name of expanding their economies and religious beliefs, have forced many other, non-Western, nations to "open their doors." Perry's arrival in Japan is one of these early attempts to "open" the doors to the "mysterious Orient"; the efforts of the missionaries to promote Christianity is another.

The result of "contacts" such as Perry's naval incursion is that the West—in the terminology of a quotation analyzed earlier²⁹—has developed a "superiority complex" while the East has been forced to adjust to being depicted as having an "inferiority complex." Recall how the matter is phrased by Fodor's: "We have learned to deal with Asians as equals. Their inferiority complexes and mistrust are disappearing fast while our superiority complex, which made us deaf and callous in the past, is gone forever . . . we hope." (Fodor's, 1962, p. 5; this passage appears with minor revisions in the Fodor's series through its 1982 edition) Given the character of historical discourse about international contact, particularly throughout the first and second World Wars, it is unlikely that a narrative written from the Western perspective, and for Western readers, would place the blame for international conflict on Westerners. Nor are these accounts likely to examine the contact from the Easterners' point of view, particularly by acknowledging any difficulty Japanese might have had with aggressive "demands" from the West. Instead, the implied threat of military action underlying Perry's initiation of

²⁹ See Chapter Six, pp. 382-386.

“contact” between the East and the West is described, from the Western perspective, as simply a matter of Japan “opening its doors.” This overall perspective, engendered by the Western viewpoint, frames the context within which historical accounts are construed by readers. Discourses which support the disparity in power between the East and the West lead readers to reframe and reinterpret historical “facts” as presented by the Fodor’s authors. Likewise, descriptions in the Fodor’s guidebook are fashioned in response to previous representations. The fact that both the Fodor’s and JTB’s authors, deliberately or not, underplay the confrontational nature of Perry’s mission (Seidensticker makes no reference to the size of Perry’s force, while the JTB’s author states that Perry had a “squadron,” and Reischauer describes the force as one-quarter of the United States navy!) confirms that both the Fodor’s and JTB’s authors, as well as Reischauer, are responding to some perceived need to orient their descriptions toward specific discourses on the subject of East-West contact.

At another level, however, such discourse is further constrained by the nature of the genres of touristic writing. As I noted previously, to provide an historical background is to do more than simply offer the reader information. Rather, descriptions of history offer readers a means to orient themselves toward the author’s point of view. While history always possesses important implications, had Seidensticker chosen to emphasize the perhaps distressing experience of the Japanese in response to Perry’s “demands” or to appeal to the conscience of the potential visitor by highlighting the intrusive quality of contact with missionaries, he might have run the risk of seeming not to be consonant with the major goals of the tour guidebook. Indeed, in a more circumspect way, the tourist may find those who made incursions in Japan’s earlier history to be sympathetic figures: the visits of Perry and the missionaries may be perceived by tourists as being quite similar to the desire of the modern-day traveler to enter, in the words of the Fodor’s guide,

the “mysterious Orient.”³⁰ The Fodor’s descriptions of these events not only are consonant with previous Western discourses regarding contact between East and West, but they also serve to frame the interpretation of the cultural contexts in which the readers of the Fodor’s guidebook are likely soon to find themselves. The Fodor’s guidebook fashions its own version of reality in awareness of the discourses it expects will be familiar to its Western readers, as well as in the awareness of previous and subsequent communication on historical events.

Japanese economy as dependent upon the United States. Another realm of description in which the Fodor’s guidebook series responds to previous discourses concerning the contact between East and West takes place in discussions of Japanese economic performance and its alleged dependence on the economic well-being of the West. In the passage below, notice how Edward Seidensticker chooses the only persuasive option which will seem convincing to Western readers: to make it appear as if the Japanese economy cannot survive unless Western economies remain healthy.

The most the United States and the West can do to influence the course of affairs in Japan is to see that this situation continues. The Japanese economy is far more dependent on the economies of North America and Europe than it was before the war. A serious American depression would be quite certain to wreck Japanese prosperity, and so to bring a sudden end to the calm, phlegmatic habits of the Japanese electorate. [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 82)

This passage is interesting both because of its content and its positioning relevant to the rest of the narrative. Immediately preceding the quoted material

³⁰ Even in the relatively more culturally sensitive 1990 edition of Fodor’s, the all-important first sentences of the book’s introductory chapter (by Oliver Statler) refer to the author as a member of the occupying Allied forces: “I first came to Japan when it was an occupied country after World War II. My most vivid memory is of the industrial area between Yokohama and Tokyo. . . . Like everyone else in the occupying force, I was comfortably housed and amply fed. But for the Japanese, food and clothing were scarce, and housing was at a premium” (Fodor’s, 1990, p. xxiv).

one finds more or less grudging praise of the Japanese standard of living:³¹ "To the Westerner who arrives after having seen other Asian countries, Japan may seem like home, or at least an approach to it. . . . Japanese consumer habits fall somewhere between the bare subsistence level of continental Asia and the luxury of North America and western Europe. Indeed Japan is perhaps the one Asian country that has a standard of living, if by that is meant a level which permits of some luxury and which everyone deems it within his rights and powers to strive for" (Fodor's, 1962, p. 82). Specifically, in that earlier passage, the author states that the Westerner will find the Japanese standard of living "approaches" Western quality, particularly if one arrives after visiting "other Asian countries" first. The wholesale dismissal of all Asian economies as inadequate can be viewed as a response by the Fodor's author to the common view that most Asian economies are inferior to those of Western nations.³² The Fodor's author writes with the assurance that Western readers are likely to agree that Asian economies are deficient, so that the representation, even if advanced without supporting evidence, is likely to be accepted as true by the average Western reader.

As we apply the lens of uncompletedness to the passage, however, we can see that the Fodor's author may be facing a somewhat more complex representational task: how to account for Japan's remarkable economic growth in terms which will satisfy the need of Fodor's Western readers to perceive Japan's growth as non-threatening. In order to accomplish this, Seidensticker must link the "facts" of Japan's growth to systems of meaning (previously established discourses) whose inclusion in the interpretation of the narrative will make

³¹ Portions of this passage are analyzed in Chapter Three, pp. 69-71, and Chapter Five, pp. 332-334.

³² Even in the 1990 edition, Japan's economic growth is attributed almost entirely to America's intervention: "Ex-New Dealers in the occupation bureaucracy dismantled Japanese industry and rehabilitated the Japanese Left. With the escalating Cold War, and some careful prodding by Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida (1978-1967), however, the Americans were persuaded to use their economic might to build Japan up into a reliable ally in the Pacific" (Fodor's, 1990, pp. 59-60).

Japanese growth seem less impressive than a straightforward statistical comparison between the economies of Japan and the United States might suggest. To do so, Seidensticker must manipulate a number of discursive representations concerning what are taken to be the knowledge and beliefs—the assumed architectonics—shared by readers of the tour guidebook. Seidensticker, having identified these systems of meaning, relies on the dimension of uncompletedness to fashion a narrative which speaks to the likely responses of the audience. Let us now turn to a closer examination of these various systems of meaning.

For purposes of clarity, I reproduce below the passage which occurs immediately prior to the passage about Japan's dependence on America's economy (see above). As will become apparent, the meaning in each of the passages is dependent on the meaning of the other passage:

Japanese consumer habits fall somewhere between the bare subsistence level of continental Asia and the luxury of North America and western Europe. Indeed Japan is perhaps the one Asian country that has a standard of living, if by that is meant a level which permits of some luxury and which everyone deems it within his rights and powers to strive for. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 82)

The first system of meaning I want to consider is suggested by the reference to "other Asian countries": "To the Westerner who arrives after having seen other Asian countries, Japan may seem like home, or at least an approach to it." This reference sets up a theme which is to be pursued in the remainder of the paragraph: Japan is an Asian country, and the perception of Asia by Westerners is that, try as they might, Asian countries can never reach the living standard of Western countries. This view is further amplified two sentences later: Seidensticker suggests that Asian countries not only do not have an adequate standard of living (by Western criteria), but that Asian countries except Japan have no standard of living: "Indeed Japan is perhaps the one Asian country that has a

standard of living, if by that is meant a level which permits of some luxury and which everyone deems it within his rights and powers to strive for.”

Seidensticker assumes the perspective of the authoritative member of a superior culture judging the members, not simply of one, but of a number of other nations. This instantiates at least two systems of meaning: first, the stereotypic view of the ingroup (of the Western readers) as superior, but second, of the outgroup (“Asians”) as inferior. Moreover, the description remains “uncompleted” due to its dependence on other discourses which are necessary if the reader is to derive meaning from the Fodor’s passage. That no direct evidence of the systems of meaning (discourses) employed by Seidensticker are cited in the passage is beside the point: by making pronouncements about the economies of many nations in an authoritative tone, Seidensticker demonstrates his or her reliance on meaning systems which permit pronouncements to be declared and judged meaningful by readers.

As it is introduced into the public discourse space of the Fodor’s guidebook, Seidensticker’s representation picks up another system of meaning (accompanied by its own identifiable discourses) which support the idea that Western nations are dominant over the affairs of Asian countries in general. In the latter passage, one sees a number of clues that Seidensticker is proceeding under this assumption of Western dominance. The United States and the West (an interesting choice of phrasing which emphasizes the common Eurocentric origins of this viewpoint) must “see to it” that “this situation” (that is, Japan’s economic growth) continues; and yet no indication is given that either the United States or these unidentified “Western” countries has any control over the economy of Japan.

Again, this general assertion serves to set the tone for what is purportedly the factual phrasing which follows: “The Japanese economy is far more dependent on the economies of North America and Europe than it was before the war.”

Perhaps this statement is to some extent accurate, but could not the reverse also be said to be true? In other words, the development of economic interaction among nearly all nations since “the war” has been toward more interaction in general; hence, it is hardly news that the Japanese economy should have become “more dependent” on other nations, particularly if the comparison is made to the more isolated Japan of the pre-World War II period. The statement that the Japanese economy is “more dependent” than before the war, therefore, is merely self-evident, unless it is considered in its position subsequent to the phrase preceding it. The preceding phrasing, remember, was comprised of an assertion concerning the inferiority of all Asian economies. Thus, one must interpret this embedded sentence differently than one would if the sentence were encountered by itself. The subsequent phrase results from the accumulation of a number of preceding instantiations of discourses, so that its self-evident assertion takes on the character of something stronger, particularly if the reader absorbs the passage uncritically.

There are other confirmations of Seidensticker’s assumption that the West is culturally and economically superior. The final sentence, for example, brings the alleged dependence of the Japanese fully out into the open: “A serious American depression would be quite certain to wreck Japanese prosperity, and so to bring a sudden end to the calm, phlegmatic habits of the Japanese electorate.” This declaration, offered without support, invokes two systems of meaning which, though interconnected with the other systems of meaning mentioned previously, nevertheless possess their own unique flavor. In the first system of meaning (discourse), the Japanese economy is depicted as being so dependent on the American economy that the collapse of the latter would result in a similar catastrophe in the former.

However, the second system of meaning invoked by Seidensticker comprises an even more problematic judgment toward Japanese, implying that their

“phlegmatic” character prevents them from caring whether their economy fails or not. Through appeal to a set of previous discourses about Japan’s contact with the West, the Japanese have been inscribed as both powerless and careless. This characterization implies, at minimum, that the Japanese are lazy, uncaring about the future, and lacking in resources to provide for their own welfare (the unspoken implication being that the amorphous, all-inclusive “West,” is different from Japan on all three counts).

To return to the dimension of uncompletedness, this example demonstrates how far authors of tour guidebooks sometimes stretch their range of discursive invention to accommodate self-evident facts derived from commonly-held systems of meaning. In this case, Seidensticker has apparently had to accommodate what is commonly known about the economic successes of Japan, but then also seems compelled to fashion a narrative which would persuade the guidebook’s reader. Thus neither the writing nor the reading of the narrative can be considered the end of the process: cultural description is never completed, though the stated goals in the ongoing process are often to write and to read.

Japanese art as influenced by the West. Another example illustrating the ways in which the Fodor’s authors rely on previous discourses about the contact between East and West is indicated in the passage quoted below. This description of Japanese painting reflects once again the tendency on the part of Fodor’s authors to frame accomplishments of Japanese as being due to the influence of Westerners. In analyzing this passage, I focus on the fact that the author seems to anticipate a negative reaction on the part of his or her readers (thus the author, Edward Seidensticker, overstretchers the description in the first emphasized portion), only to draw back from that extremity (in the second emphasized portion). Awareness of potential response thus appears to have influenced the writing of this passage.

This is true even of painting, the art in which the West would seem to have emerged most triumphant. The traditional schools of painting looked tired when Perry arrived and today they look positively moribund; and yet the modern painter, so enthusiastically a convert to an international style emanating from Paris, has something—a feel for color, a feel for calligraphic line—that derives from his ancestors. Something of the Japanese spirit remains in his work. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 86)

First, Seidensticker casts the evolution of Japanese painting in metaphors of conflict and dominance, with the West emerging “triumphant.” In the first emphasized portion of the passage, Seidensticker criticizes more than an entire century of traditional Japanese painting, from the arrival of Admiral Perry (in 1853) up to “today.” As if realizing that this is an objectionably extreme claim, however, the author retreats, suggesting (in the second emphasized portion) that perhaps these schools of painting were not quite “moribund,” and that they may indeed have possessed some vitality due to the “Japanese spirit.”

According to the dimension of uncompletedness, there is perhaps a reason for making extravagant claims earlier in the passage. Both the first and the second portions of the utterance can be placed in perspective through application of the dimension of uncompletedness. To put it another way, it is the awareness of certain social factors (such as the need to sell books, or the awareness that readers of touristic discourse may have more tolerance for extreme claims) which may condition the first portion; on the other hand, these same factors, together with the phrasing of the first portion, conditions how the second portion will be phrased. In other words, the portions are connected to distinct systems of discursive meaning which mutually define one another.

The Fodor's series also contains more subtle attempts to frame Japanese art in terms of Western systems of knowledge. In the passage below from the 1990 Fodor's edition, for example, the anonymous author's suggestions may seem at

first glance to be more culturally sensitive to the integrity of Japanese art.

However, as we apply the lens of uncompletedness, it will be clear that the image of Japanese art which the reader derives from the Fodor's account is in some ways as constrained as in the passage from Edward Seidensticker, analyzed previously:

Not surprisingly, a wealth of literature exists on Japanese art. Much of the early writing has not withstood the test of time, but R. Paine and Alexander Soper's Art and Architecture of Japan remains a good place to start. A more recent survey, though narrower in scope, is Joan Stanley-Smith's Japanese Art. Japanese art can also be appreciated before traveling to Japan by making a trip to a local museum (for example, Boston, Cleveland, Kansas City, and Washington have excellent collections). Museum catalogues can also provide additional information. (Fodor's, 1990, p. 19)

On surface inspection, these recommendations are helpful and insightful. Rather than having the reader meet the unfamiliar world of Japanese art without sufficient preparation, the Fodor's author tries to prepare the reader by suggesting that he or she read about and encounter Japanese art in the collections of famous museums.

However, one should note that the recommendations in the passage are cast almost exclusively in terms of Western systems of knowledge and Western discourses. For example, no English translations of works by Japanese authors are included. The 1955 edition of the JTB's guidebook lists dozens of such works, but most of these were written in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. According to the 1990 edition of Fodor's, references from the 1955 JTB's guidebook would probably be considered examples of the "early writing" which has not "withstood the test of time" (the text does not elaborate on the meaning of this curious evaluation). Other Western discourses are also offered as recommended reading to provide frameworks within which to judge Japanese art. For example, the potential visitor is advised to view the "excellent collections" of several museums

in various cities and to consult “museum catalogs” for more information.

However, this advice subsumes the validity of at least three forms of discourse derived from Western architectonic systems: (1) Fodor’s judgments about which collections are “excellent”; (2) the process by which the recommended museums select Japanese art for their collections; and (3) evaluations in museum catalogues.

Applying the lens of uncompletedness to discover some of the discourses upon which the example passage relies to achieve its meaning, one is able to reveal the absence of reference to Japanese discourses about Japanese artwork. Considered from the perspective of uncompletedness, this omission may be seen as a more subtle form of discourse which reinforces the notion of Western superiority even though the passage seems ostensibly to concern itself with fostering an increasing respect for Japanese art.

Elements of temporal change relating to uncompletedness in Fodor’s descriptions. The Fodor’s guidebook operates from within, responds to, and takes a leading role in fashioning, an interwoven set of discourses which have, over the years, defined the relationship between East and West. While the implications of these discourses are varied and complex, they tend to reinforce the idea of the superiority of the West over the nations of Asia (particularly Japan) in the economic, political, social, and military spheres. Moreover, admission by Western countries of Japan’s emergent political and economic power has come very slowly and reluctantly. The delay in recognizing Japan’s accomplishments has been reinforced by a number of factors, including past history (for example, Western countries having successfully forced Japan to “open its doors” in the mid-nineteenth century and the Allies having defeated Japan in World War II), the widespread acceptance and reinforcement of stereotypes about Japanese (such as their reputation for cultural borrowing), and the inevitable assumption that people

of “advanced” or “modern” countries more frequently visit “traditional” countries (not the other way around).

To illustrate in more detail the process of change undergone by Fodor’s concerning its gradual recognition of Japan’s accomplishments, I turn now to one specific pattern of temporal change which seems particularly illustrative of the dimension of uncompletedness: the gradual abandonment of Japan’s “exotic” associations.

Gradual abandonment of Japan’s “exotic” associations. Beginning with its foreword in the 1962 edition, the Fodor’s guidebook has often sought to highlight the more exotic aspects of Japanese cultural life. To some extent this is to be expected: the touristic enterprise depends for its survival on its ability to “sell” an illusion. The illusion is often based on making as attractive as possible sites or locations that are in some dramatic way assumed to be different from the experiences of the Westerner’s “ordinary” life. One recalls, for example, Richard Leavitt’s outrage³³ at his initial visual impression of Kyoto as a modern and rather unattractive city: “. . . hardly the ‘ancient capital’ you came to see.” Leavitt’s reaction is common among tourists, even though they seldom seem to be aware of the constraints their expectations impose on the other culture.

As one traces key representations of Japanese cultural life through the Fodor’s series, one is able to see how it is that attempts in the earlier editions to perhaps over-dramatize exotic elements of Japanese life have given way to more realistic, though perhaps less vivid and interesting, representations in the later editions. As one examines such temporal changes, the dimension of uncompletedness is useful in suggesting which discourses the Fodor’s authors seem to be responding to, as well as what responses from their readers they seem to

³³ See Chapter Six, pp. 359-361.

be anticipating. In the following, two examples of temporal change are examined: (1) representations of Tokyo; and (2) representations of Sarusawa Pond in Nara.

In the first example illustrating temporal change in "exotic" elements of Fodor's representations of Japan, I turn to the center of Japanese cultural life, the capital city of Tokyo. In the editions from 1962 through 1982, Tokyo is described in the following rather fanciful personification:

If there is any one thing that can be said about Tokyo it is that eventually she casts a spell over nearly everyone who knows her for any length of time; thousands who come to visit either stay or wish they could. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 133; 1982, p. 109)

According to this anonymously authored passage, Tokyo is an extremely charming city, so charming in fact that it takes the initiative in "inviting" its guests. Regardless of who visits Tokyo, for whatever length of time, the city "eventually" wins over all visitors. Tokyo's power is mysterious: it is not guests who are attracted to "her" automatically, but rather "she" who "casts a spell." So powerful is Tokyo's character that regardless of how long visitors have been in the city, they wish they "could" stay. Throughout the four earlier editions of the Fodor's guide, apparently this is the favored image of Japan, since the wording remains precisely the same.

In this Fodor's description, there are strong elements of the dramatic and the exotic. The character of Tokyo is defined as mysterious, human, and female. Tokyo, as a city, is said to be able to "cast a spell," an implication not simply of power, but of magical power. The city's mysterious power is further enhanced by the statement that it "eventually" succeeds in casting spells on "almost everyone." On the other hand, visitors are portrayed as passive and powerless. Regardless of how long they have been in Tokyo, they are helpless under its spell. Moreover, even under the "spell," rather than as a result of their own free will, they choose to

stay in Tokyo. When one combines these images together, the international contact between Tokyo and its foreign visitors is infused with mysterious feelings, exotic experiences, and unforgettable memories.

Why is it necessary for the earlier four editions of Fodor's, 1962 through 1982, to have portrayed Tokyo in this light? Granted, every tour guidebook utilizes different resources to attract readers' attention. One is puzzled, then, as to why such resources seem to be available to the Fodor's authors and editors. To answer this question, one should attend to the sociohistorical grounding which underlies the meanings of contact between Japan and its foreign visitors. The image utilized here, while seemingly innocent, is in fact integrally connected to the idea of the "mysterious Orient." Tokyo is one of the largest and most modern cities in the world, and yet it cannot escape Fodor's depiction of it as an entity which finds it necessary to "cast a spell" in order to get visitors to stay. As with other instances of temporal change in the Fodor's series, this anonymous author's attempts to link the conception of Tokyo to such fanciful images is at least somewhat excusable in 1962. However, to have kept the same phrasing through the 1982 edition, even in the face of Tokyo's extraordinary development as a world-class center of commerce, is considerably more problematic.

By the 1990 edition of Fodor's, however, Tokyo is portrayed in Statler's introductory chapter in less fanciful terms:

The city has been called ugly, but I do not agree. It has grand vistas, spacious parks, inviting residential areas, and a giddy mix of architecture that ranges from the cheerfully vulgar and outrageously fantastic to the strong and innovative. It offers more to do than any resident can possibly keep up with, much less a visitor. Above all, Tokyo is exciting; it is never dull. (Fodor's, 1990, p. xxxv)

The 1990 edition marks a clear shift in the Fodor's strategy for describing Tokyo (like the 1962 depiction, the 1990 portrayal also indulges in hyperbole—is

there any location that can “never” be dull?), from emphasizing mystery to emphasizing the city’s mercurial qualities. While in the 1962 edition, one gets the feeling that Tokyo is more deliberate and even slow, in the 1990 edition, it is shown as a fast-moving and extremely active location. The earlier portrayal is linked to discourses which are typically expressed in abstract or exotic terms, while the later portrayal is linked to discourses which express themselves abruptly and kinetically. The change can be most evidently linked to the change in perception of the city: from the metropolis that Seidensticker claimed was the refuge for “farm boys” to the center of world trade that Tokyo has become today.

The second example illustrating temporal change in “exotic” elements of Fodor’s representations of Japan involves the technique of offering the reader/tourist a vivid and memorable anecdote to intensify perception of the site described. In the underlined portion of the passage quoted below (from the 1962 edition of Fodor’s), one can speculate about the qualities that the author may be imagining his or her audience to possess:

Soon the houses end and the field of vision opens. Now you will begin really to feel the atmosphere of ancient Nara, as you approach Sarusawa Pond (on your right) and then continue up into the park where the tame deer roam freely. On the east bank of the pond there is a famous willow-tree called *Kinukakeyanagi* (Willow of Hanging Clothes). Tradition has it that a beautiful court lady, desperate because her lover of high rank had ceased to be faithful to her, drowned herself here, having first hung her garments on the branches of this tree. There is a little shrine to her memory near at hand. [Emphasis added] (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 319)

In this passage, one can sense the anonymous author’s eagerness to describe this romantic and tragic story for the reader. As noted previously, one possible reason for providing memorable information is so that the tourist can have at hand interesting anecdotes to relate to others. Another reason for placing the story in this position may be to bolster a generally romantic view of Nara. Notice that,

earlier in the passage, the author states that, upon coming to a certain place, one really “begins to feel the atmosphere of ancient Nara.” Thus, perhaps the story may be offered as verification of that general statement.

In fact, it is difficult to imagine that the author could offer any evidence other than a mythic narrative to support this general contention. There are, after all, no specific indications as to why, through encountering this site, one should feel “the atmosphere of ancient Nara,” apart from the shrine which commemorates the woman’s suicide. While the assertion that one is being transported back in time by a walk through this particular locale is certainly romantic and appealing, it is not the sort of claim that is easily proven by immediate data. On the other hand, a tragic story serves to support the claim persuasively. Here, the dimension of uncompletedness works in the author’s favor, since to achieve the purpose of the passage, the author need only anticipate that the audience will find the story appealing, while at the same time not being unreasonably bound to the historical facts of the situation.

There is also a second way in which the dimension of uncompletedness functions in the quoted passage. By leaving open the precise period of time when the lady’s tragic love affair and suicide occurred, the author seemingly makes it possible for the event to have transpired in more than one era. One cannot tell from the passage whether the lady lived in ancient, Medieval, or modern times, and it is precisely this imprecision that lends to the story its timeless quality. In the Bakhtin circle’s terms, then, the author’s leaving open the period during which the events transpired may play to the audience’s preference for romantic stories that appear to transcend all temporality.

In subsequent Fodor’s editions, however, the romantic story is not even mentioned. While the story, along with virtually the entire chapter on Nara, is duplicated in the 1969 edition, not only is the willow tree not mentioned in the

1976 and 1982 editions, but the latter texts make no reference even to Sarusawa Pond. By 1990, the pond and presumably all of its romantic associations are relegated to the status of being merely a reference point through which the tourist is oriented toward a shopping district:

Before continuing on to the Western district and Horyuji Temple, take some time out from temple-viewing to walk along the quiet backstreets of Naramachi. Here, just south of Sarusawa Pond, is a maze of narrow residential streets lined with traditional houses and old shops, many of which deal in Nara's renowned arts and crafts. (Fodor's, 1990, p. 393)

Through representations in successive editions of Fodor's, one notices a decreasing willingness to suggest exotic or romantic ideas associated with Nara. With each successive edition, the Fodor's authors seem to feel that readers are less interested in romantic stories and more interested in "practical" information. In other words, with each successive edition of the guidebook, discourses associated with the romantic, exotic aspects of locations such as Nara are appealed to less and less, while discourses associated with saving time and consumerism are appealed to more and more.

In some ways, despite flawed representations in the earlier Fodor's editions, which were seen to reflect ethnocentrism and attempts to confine Japan into the "traditional" category, one noted at least attempts to provide the visitor with a more emotional understanding of Japanese cultural life. The later guidebooks, particularly the 1990 edition, may have been ill-served by the perceived commercial necessity of conveying to consumers information in more direct and unelaborated forms. The earlier editions of Fodor's do not seem to have exhibited the same awareness of political and social issues that characterizes the 1990 edition; on the other hand, many of these earlier characterizations are infused with a sense of warmth and light that seems to be missing from the more recent editions.

Content Themes and Temporal Changes in the Uncompletedness of JTB's Descriptions

In this section, I turn to detailed discussion of two major content themes—first, JTB's conceptualization of its audience, and second, negotiating Japan's international political status—together with a summary of temporal changes related to uncompletedness in the JTB's guidebook series.

JTB's conceptualization of its audience. The writing of the JTB guidebook is a task undertaken by the Japanese government to introduce Japan to foreign visitors. Obviously, this task is heavily laden with cultural and political implications which extend far beyond the immediate touristic transaction. To discover how this is accomplished, a number of approaches are possible: one might inquire about the identity of the JTB's authors and editors, ask what might be the purpose of the authors and editors for writing the text, or make inferences concerning the identities of those for whom the text seems to have been written. These questions are particularly intriguing given the JTB guidebook's role in presenting an "official version" describing what Japan is supposed to be like. Before turning to a more detailed analysis of the JTB guidebook's audiences, some general observations should be made concerning JTB's somewhat unusual approach to the writing of its guidebook.

Management of Japan's image is performed in anticipation of responses from others who communicate about Japan. Since the English version of JTB's guidebook is written mainly for the benefit of visitors from the West, the Japanese government, by utilizing the discourse of the guidebook, must orient itself toward the confinements imposed by Western images about Japan (see, for example, the discussion of Fodor's various forms of inscription of Japanese culture analyzed previously³⁴). The desire to resist inscription results in the need for Japan to

³⁴ See Chapter Four, pp. 162-205.

redefine its position. Responses can come not only from the JTB guidebook's readers based on their opinions about Japan prior to and after visiting the country, but are also conditioned by scholarly and other discourses, as infinitely numerous social actors think, describe, and revise their myriad conceptions about Japan.

Given its historical development, Japan is, like other Asian countries, often described in Western discourses as traditional, awkward, and underdeveloped.³⁵ There are other historical discourses which strongly shape how JTB must describe Japan. First, there is a many-faceted collection of related discourses concerning Japan's role in World War II. In describing the war and its aftermath, JTB must recognize Japan's military adventurism, which led to a great deal of suffering throughout the world, and must accordingly shape its own discourse in respect to these other discursive descriptions of Japan's role in the war. Second, JTB must orient its descriptions of Japan in recognition of Japan's extraordinary economic success. Readers will be curious about these and many other images they have obtained from other discourses describing Japan and the Japanese.

Actualized in the JTB's description will be a number of elements: how JTB views Japan itself, what JTB wants people to know about Japan, how JTB answers stereotypes about Japan and Japanese, and so on. Indeed, for any given description or item of information found in the JTB guidebook, one can trace the competing

³⁵ These Western viewpoints are expressed in typical fashion in four successive editions of the Fodor's guidebook, 1962 through 1982: "Usually, we are prepared and willing to admire Asia's ancient monuments, its temples and palaces, its sculpture and miniatures and even its teachings, but we also usually make the mistake of failing to link this past with the Asian present. This link is a strong one: Asia's marvelous heritage still governs its everyday life, if only on a subconscious level at times." This description, by appealing to discourses which describe "Asia" as being oriented more toward the past rather than the present or the future, reinforces the view that Asian countries are somewhat "backward." One should also note the extremely interesting fact that this statement remains exactly the same in the 1962, 1969, 1976, and 1982 editions of Fodor's. In other words, the blanket characterization of "Asian" countries never changes, even though Japan is considered together with thirteen other Asian countries in the 1962 edition, with twelve other Asian countries in 1969, and with Korea alone in 1976 and 1982. Apparently, so firmly entrenched is the stereotype of Asian countries as "traditional" that discourse employing the stereotype can be considered to describe Japan regardless of the range of "Asian" countries with which Japan is categorized.

voices which give rise to the need for providing information at that particular point and in that particular manner. Since tourists demand detailed information on travel and the cultural Other, the large audience conceived by the JTB guidebook expects other information to correspond with its preconceptions toward, and curiosity about, Japan. The JTB's guidebooks—indeed, all tour guidebooks—are too complex to be described simply as vehicles to convey useful information for tourists. Constrained by the genre of tour guidebooks, as well as by its previous editions, JTB's guidebook addresses the needs of its readers, while at the same time striving to advance positive images of Japan, portraying the Japanese people as serious and hard-working, Japanese culture as deep and rich, and Japan as a beautiful country deserving of the visitor's appreciation.

Specifically, to achieve the goal of promoting Japan's positive image, the JTB guidebooks have extended both the information they present and the audiences toward whom such information is directed. First, while the rules for writing a tour guidebook remain relatively consistent from one guidebook to another, the JTB guidebook is somewhat unique in that it has managed to go well beyond the confines of "travel information" demanded by the touristic genre, introducing various additional aspects of Japanese cultural life. JTB has exerted considerable effort to provide, not simply a tour guidebook, but an encyclopedic reference work for all interested parties, tourists or otherwise. Through its willingness to redefine the genre of touristic discourse, JTB aims at presenting the most positive image of Japan. To extend beyond information which is primarily "travel-related," the JTB guidebook incorporates discourse ordinarily belonging to fields such as anthropology or history, primarily in the form of in-depth descriptions of Japanese cultural life.

This extension is made possible in two ways: first, because the corporate author is in reality the Japanese government itself, and second, because touristic

and anthropological discourses are in some ways closely related (Crick, 1977). The JTB might argue that no one has more right to define Japan than the Japanese themselves, and among Japanese, no one more than the government. From JTB's perspective, the information provided in its guidebooks is the most "authentic" and hence the most "reliable": "The New Official Guide: Japan has been regarded as the most authoritative and reliable guidebook about Japan over the past half century" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 2).

In addition, the extension of touristic discourse is deemed appropriate in light of other related discourses. Since tourists and anthropologists are viewed by some as engaging in somewhat similar activities, it should be possible for a tourist to behave like an anthropologist. Hence, aspects of cultural life normally important to anthropology are frequently (even, to a more limited extent, in the Fodor's guidebooks) incorporated into discourse about "travel." On the other hand, merely because it is similar to some anthropological discourses about Japan, the JTB guidebook cannot be considered an exception to the genre of tour guidebooks. Potential objections to the incorporation of detailed information about Japan, from the JTB's perspective, is likely to be minimal, since the JTB guidebook, unlike Fodor's, does not seem to be motivated primarily by the desire to succeed as a commercial enterprise.

Second, JTB extends the category of its potential audience, fashioning its writing accordingly. As I mentioned earlier, it is not unusual for a tour guidebook to provide more than enough information for people who want to be informed about the visited country. Readers who need more information—whether one chooses to classify them as "tourists" or not—may have expectations different from the pleasure-seeking tourist who is not really interested in achieving an in-depth understanding about Japan. Although it is certainly possible that visitors who require more in-depth knowledge can read the Fodor's and other, less information-

rich, guidebook series, the point is that these tour guidebook series do not conceive of more “serious” readers as their primary audience. The JTB guidebook, however, with its goal of introducing Japan to anyone who is interested in the country, clearly does number serious readers among its potential audience. JTB’s willingness to include such an extraordinary amount of information may be seen as confirmation that it anticipates responses from individuals with an interest in Japan beyond what can be gleaned from perusing information ordinarily labeled as “touristic.” To put the matter in somewhat different terms, while most tour guidebooks have a more limited audience in mind, the JTB guidebook addresses a larger audience, including travelers, but also including anyone who is interested in any facet of Japan. With this broader audience in mind, the kind of information presented in the JTB guidebook clearly marks it as different from other tour guidebooks.

With these general ideas in mind, I now turn to a more detailed analysis of JTB’s possible readership, based on indications found in its cultural descriptions. I examine two targeted segments of the broader readership of the JTB’s guidebook series, and particularly how the information apparently directed toward these audience segments must be formulated with respect to the shared cultural knowledge of the JTB’s readership.

While the Fodor’s series caters to images that its primarily Western audience share about Japan and the Japanese, the JTB’s guidebook series often seems oriented toward answering potential responses from Western readers. To demonstrate how JTB achieves this orientation, I will focus on its specific targeting of two categories within its audience of potential tourists: (1) Western visitors; and (2) youth visitors. As will be evident, JTB’s descriptions are clearly fashioned in awareness of expected responses from these audience segments, as well as other interested parties.

The audience of "Western visitors." Earlier I noted that the principal audience for the JTB guidebook is comprised of citizens from Western nations. In order for JTB to be able to make its text understandable to Western readers, many of its descriptions must compare unfamiliar aspects of Japanese culture to aspects of Western culture assumed to be more familiar to its readership. In the following discussion, I provide several examples to illustrate how JTB's touristic discourse is fashioned by considering the anticipated responses from "Western visitors."

The inclusion of frequent references to the West, whether as a generic category or to specific nations such as the United States, enables potential visitors to understand a given cultural practice, while at the same time making it more likely that they will respond favorably to unfamiliar elements of Japanese culture. For example, in the introductory section to the JTB guidebooks, Japan is said to have about the same climate as the lateral middle belt of the United States and central and southern Europe (p. 13, in the 1955 edition; p. 25, in the 1975 edition). In a discussion of Japan's size, one finds this comment: "The total land area is slightly less than that of the American state of California or the Europe nation of Sweden" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 18). In describing the four islands of Japan, there are references comparing their size to the American states of Minnesota, Massachusetts, and New Jersey, as well as Scotland and Wales in Britain. There are other examples of descriptions which refer explicitly to the characteristics of Western countries: "Cafes, however, are not genuinely like those in the Western countries" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1955, p. 29). Certainly Japan's climate, size, restaurants, and accommodations could as easily be described by comparison to China, Korea, or other Asian nations. However, such descriptions would be less likely to provide points of reference to benefit Western readers.

Another indication of the JTB's use of Western standards as bases for comparison is the frequent effort to assure visitors that they will feel comfortable

because many standards for food, accommodations, and so forth, are comparable to “Western standards.” An example of this is found in the 1975 edition: “Drinking water anywhere in Japan is assuredly safe” (p. 40). Why does JTB consider it necessary to stress the “safeness” of Japan’s water? What elements of the context could give meaning to this statement? To stress that the water is safe is to respond to a question, real or imagined, concerning whether water in Japan really is safe; moreover, this is a question typically posed by people from so-called advanced nations concerning their visits to “less-developed” nations.

Similarly, in the 1975 edition, one encounters the following assertion about food in the chapter, “Reception of Foreign Visitors”: “To the gourmet, probably no country is more enticing than Japan” (p. 40). This controversial assessment does not occur in the later discussion, in the section on “Food and Drink” (pp. 155-157), where more detailed information about various kinds of Japanese food (rather than broad thumbnail evaluations of “Japanese food” as a whole) is presented. When the text addresses “foreign visitors,” it is important to specify the quality of food in Japan. However, when the author is engaged in a more general description about food in Japan, with a generalized rather than a specific audience in mind, the focus of attention is upon the food itself. In the latter reference, therefore, a more neutral phrasing seems more appropriate. Depending upon the identity of the audience for whom the text is written, cultural descriptions are fashioned to be different in flavor.

Moreover, many references using the word “foreign” in the 1955 edition are changed in later editions to “Western,” one presumes as a response to the needs of JTB’s Western visitors: thus, “foreign style” hotel is rephrased as “Western-style hotel,” and “foreign style” restaurant changed to “Western-style restaurant.” In earlier editions, the terms “foreign” and “Western” seem largely synonymous and are used interchangeably. Not surprisingly, then, one finds this statement in the

1955 edition, but not in the 1975 and 1991 editions: "Many [foreign-style restaurants] have recently adapted themselves to the new order of things, and they are gradually assuming the character of those in the West. . . ." (p. 28).

Since those who define the standard of "internationalization" versus "modernization" are generally from Western countries, JTB's orientation toward the West raises an interesting question: does the JTB recognize those in its potential audience who are English-speaking and yet not of Western origin, such as visitors from Hong Kong or India? Compared to Westerners, the needs of these readers are far less conspicuously attended to, since many aspects of Japanese tourism are classified either as "Western" or "Japanese." Unless these non-Western English-speaking visitors are assumed to be comfortable with comparisons based on Western standards, they may find it necessary to align themselves with Japanese culture, rather than finding something resembling their own cultural practices. It is puzzling that the JTB guidebook would want to place its readers in the position of making such a choice. The conclusion seems inescapable: the discourse in the JTB guidebook is aimed at Western visitors, where such "standards" are taken for granted and are promoted as "international standards." Hence, either the visitors are themselves assumed to be Westerners, and thus familiar and comfortable with "Western standards," or else the visitors are required to view Japanese facilities according to "Western standards."

A second example demonstrating JTB's construction of descriptions which recognize primarily Western visitors is to be found in the following passage describing the evolution of the Japanese film industry. In the passage, taken from the first part of the "Film" section, under the category "Modern Japan," in the 1991 edition of Japan, the New Official Guide, JTB positions Japanese film with respect to Western perceptions:

It can be said that Westerners did not discover Japanese movies until "Rashomon" appeared in 1950, but their actual beginning took place much earlier—more than 40 years before, in fact. . . . At that time, Japan was making every effort to catch up with the economically and socially advanced countries of the West in order to build up a modern capitalist system by introducing Western culture and industrial techniques into the social and economic fabric of Japanese society. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 262; similar statements are to be found in the 1975 edition, pp. 236-237)

By positioning itself in relation to the West, JTB is able to define the meaning of Japan's film industry. In other words, the Japanese film industry is defined by reference to Western discourses. An even more evident awareness of this orientation is to be found in the 1975 edition, where one encounters two statements that are deleted from the 1991 edition: "It probably comes as a big surprise to many foreign visitors to Japan when they find a movie industry so well-organized and highly developed in a small island country of the Orient." (p. 237); and further, "Japan is now regarded as one of the foremost movie producing nations of the world. This is because Japan can produce artistic movies of the highest level. . . . Moreover, the Japanese movie industry is regarded with envy by many European businessmen because it has become financially stabilized" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1975, p. 237). One should note that the latter two passages are instances illustrating a general pattern in which a more confrontational tone encountered in the 1975 edition is removed or "toned down" in the 1991 edition (for example, it was the 1975 edition which boasted, "To the gourmet, probably no country is more enticing than Japan" (p. 40), a statement which does not appear in the 1991 edition). The more aggressive tone of some of the passages in the 1975 edition can be explained by the fact that Japan, in the 1970s and 1980s, experienced something of a cultural backlash in reaction to the widespread adoption in Japan of

cultural practices of some other countries (particularly the United States).³⁶ By 1991, however, Japan had become sure enough of its cultural identity to be less defensive about its own culture.

However, to return to the passages which appear in the 1975 edition but not in the 1991 edition, one can ask the following question: why would foreign visitors find that a proficient Japanese film industry is a “big surprise”? Is that because Japan is not expected to be successful in the area of film production, perhaps because it is a “small island country of the Orient,” remote, unexplored, and perhaps underdeveloped? Or does the JTB description imply that foreigners, particularly Westerners, have so monopolized the film industry that they would be surprised that anyone, particularly Asians, could equal or better the achievements of the West? Or do the passages suggest that, unlike the situation in some other countries, the Japanese film industry is well-organized, highly-developed, and undergirded by financial stability? The formulation of questions such as these give some idea of the complexity with which JTB’s description is formulated in a sophisticated awareness of its Western readership. In fact, the description engages many discourses simultaneously, and yet remains part of an unfinished discourse (confirmed by the removal of the passages from the subsequent edition of the JTB guidebook).

More importantly, it is implied in the passage that recognition of the Japanese film industry was bestowed on Japan by the West. Some “envy” is said to have originated specifically from “many European businessmen” rather than from

³⁶ Reischauer (1988) offers this explanation of how the Japanese have come to terms with the dichotomy between their tradition and development as a modern nation: “One reason why the Japanese may be overcoming their fears of inferiority to the West and the resulting counterbursts of a superiority complex may be a growing realization that they had set up a false dichotomy for themselves between Western technology and native virtues. In time the same realization will probably come to the rest of the non-Western world, relaxing the whole inferiority-superiority problem. At first all modern technology was defined as being Western, leaving very little untouched by it that could be defined as Japanese or Eastern. But in actuality modern technology is Western not by nature but only by time sequence” (p. 406).

other people in the film industry. This consistent orientation toward the standards of Western countries is confirmed in the 1991 edition's discussion of Japanese movies in the 1980s, where it is implied that a film director must go beyond Japan in order to become well-recognized: "Indeed, there are many fine young directors who have gained a following in Japan but have yet to be discovered abroad" (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 265).

Why is it that the Japanese film industry must be defined by reference to those "outside Japan," particularly those in "the West"? As we saw previously,³⁷ Japan is given some leeway in declaring ownership of practices such as flower arrangement and the tea ceremony; apparently, however, this latitude does not extend to ownership of arts such as filmmaking. The distinction between flower arranging and filmmaking is perhaps to be found in the fact that Japanese film achievements are seen as examples of cultural "borrowing" from Western nations. All three editions of the JTB guidebook acknowledge the impact of the French and American film industries upon Japanese film; moreover, many foreign films have been imported into Japan throughout the history of Japanese film. Through this cultural "borrowing," the West is granted rights to ownership of a significant portion of the discourse on the Japanese film industry, so that the JTB guidebook must respond to what it perceives as the existing discourse based on widely-held systems of meaning. The West thus provides the standards against which Japanese must evaluate their success in the film industry, as well as the standards against which Japanese film is to be critically evaluated. Hence, even though the success of the film industry is well recognized in Japan, it remains deficient, except for the young directors who are "discovered abroad" and granted recognition from foreign nations.

³⁷ See Chapter Four, pp. 235-237.

Given the constrictions imposed by the requirements that the JTB position Japanese film with respect to foreign film industries, one is not surprised to find a sense of relief when JTB settles upon an area of filmmaking in which the Japanese excel. In the following quotation,³⁸ JTB boasts about Japanese achievements in animation:

An area in which the Japanese film industry demonstrates unique talent and creativity is animation films. The level of artistic design and direction evidenced in Japanese animations of recent years has earned wide acclaim both in and out of Japan. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 265)

In a somewhat similar manner to its depiction of flower arrangement as “uniquely Japanese,” JTB finds no difficulty in asserting Japanese superiority concerning animated film techniques. However, recognition is not given by Japan alone; the “wide acclaim” is said to include countries both “in and out of Japan.” Thus, once again, the message relies for its persuasive force on other discourses, such as those which assert the superiority of Japanese animation.

Descriptions of the Japanese film industry are thus fashioned in response to real and imagined Western discourse about the film industry in general, and about the Japanese film industry in particular. Previous communication (for example, discourses concerning Westerners as visitors and their impact upon the Japanese film industry) establishes the trajectory upon which subsequent communication (the description of the Japanese film industry in the JTB guidebook) can be based. The JTB author is faced with the task of situating Japanese film production with respect to other, supposedly more advanced, film industries in other countries. To accomplish this task, the author finds it necessary to anticipate and allow for audience knowledge of various aspects of the film business.

³⁸ This passage was also discussed as a counter-example in the analysis of Fodor’s use of the dimension of ownership to formulate restricted readings of Japanese cultural life, Chapter Four, pp. 169-170.

Another important clue that the JTB's description of Japanese film is fashioned in awareness of Western standards of judgment is to be found in the point of comparison used by JTB to symbolize the recognition of Japanese film by Westerners: Akira Kurosawa's "Rashomon." As the JTB states, "It can be said that Westerners did not discover Japanese movies until 'Rashomon' appeared in 1950, but their actual beginning took place much earlier—more than 40 years before, in fact. . . ." (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 262).³⁹ This passage is marked by a surprising turn of phrase, in which the author states that the belief that Westerners did not "discover" Japanese film until the release of "Rashomon" is neither an established fact nor even a widely-held belief, but rather that it "can be said." Of course, it is possible that anything about Japanese film "can be said": hence, it is puzzling why the author chooses "Rashomon" as a benchmark, particularly since it is apparently done merely to serve as a convenience for the author to have something to rebut (if effect asserting, "this could be said, but it is not really true").

However, the use of the film "Rashomon" as a largely imaginary benchmark does appear to play into what the author seems to assume is the knowledge base that most Westerners share about Japanese film. Many Westerners probably would know about the Kurosawa films "Rashomon" and "The Seven Samurai," but be assumed to be unenlightened regarding lesser-known Japanese movies. Hence, the author of JTB's description may be anticipating audience response, not about the date that Westerners first became aware of Japanese film (whether in 1950 or "40 years earlier"), but rather about the film which is assumed to have transformed foreign perception of Japanese film ("Rashomon"). The choice of "Rashomon," then, is dictated by the popularity of that film, and the answer provided to the anticipated question from the audience is directed toward correcting the perception

³⁹ This full passage is quoted in this chapter, p. 494.

that "Rashomon" represents the turning point in Western perception of Japanese film.

The JTB's strategy in this passage reminds one of the logical fallacy of the "straw man": by setting up an imaginary standard, it becomes easier for the author to refute the standard by appeal to "inside" information. At the same time, the author is permitted to "correct" this imaginary view by implying that the Japanese film industry was, and is, more advanced than is popularly thought. The point to remember is that potential discourses to which a cultural description may be oriented can be real or imaginary. In other words, an author may just as conveniently reply to a discourse that he or she can persuade the reader is a "real" discourse, as to reply to a discourse that the reader has actually obtained through listening or reading.⁴⁰

A third example illustrating how the dimension of uncompletedness can be employed to suggest the discourses familiar to Western visitors is to be found in the JTB guidebook's description of Mt. Fuji.⁴¹ All three editions of the JTB guidebook mention the following elements of the mountain's history: (1) the first foreigner who climbed the mountain; (2) the first European woman who reached the summit; and (3) the anthropologist from the University of Chicago who climbed the mountain five times.

⁴⁰ As we have seen, the Fodor's authors often use what one suspects is a "straw man" approach to orient their cultural descriptions, as indicated in these examples: (1) "Tales of horror floating around the world of unsuspecting tourists swallowed up by money-gobbling monsters disguised as quaint little restaurants on the back streets of Japan's major cities abound in these days of the high yen." (Fodor's, 1990, p. 71); (2) "Japan has variously been called a gourmet's paradise and the gastronomic end of the world." (Fodor's, 1969, p. 91); (3) "Still, the Japanese do have their particular hang-ups and idiosyncrasies. They explain many of these by the fact that they are a homogeneous people." (Fodor's, 1990, p. xxvi); (4) ". . . no one can honestly ask a stranger to come and have a look, and expect him to derive much pleasure from his first impressions." (Fodor's, 1962, p. 56); and so on. In each of these passages, as indicated in previous analysis, the author may be sidestepping responsibility for proving that his or her recounting of the stated "general opinion" is true, leaving open the possibility that each description serves as a stylistic convenience to set up an argument only for the purpose of refuting it later.

⁴¹ Some elements of these descriptions are also analyzed in discussion of the dimension of tension, Chapter Five, pp. 298-301.

Inclusion of these three specific elements of Fuji's history, and not other information, immediately provokes several questions. Why is it necessary to identify the first "foreigner" who climbed the mountain? Certainly there could also be a "first foreigner" who did something noteworthy in Kyoto, Nara, or Tokyo, but such individuals remain unknown to the JTB guidebook's readers. Moreover, it is intriguing that all three people mentioned in the guidebook's descriptions are of Western origin. Is it possible that other "foreigners"—such as Asians or Africans—are not considered? Is it perhaps because the JTB guidebook is written for Westerners that these three people deserve particular attention? Moreover, why is it necessary to identify the first "European woman" to reach Fuji's summit? One possible answer to this last question may be found in an earlier discussion of the ancient Japanese tradition that no Japanese woman could be allowed to climb Mt. Fuji. According to the guidebook, this custom remained in effect until the Meiji Restoration (around 1868). Hence, it is reasonable to assume that women, in the case of Mt. Fuji, constitute a distinctive category. However, this gives rise to another question: why is it a European woman who is singled out? Was there no "first African woman" or "first Asian woman" to have climbed the mountain? If such individuals exist, there is no indication of it in the JTB guidebook's description.

No touristic discourse is written or read in an abstract space disassociated from sociohistorical circumstances. All discourse is written in awareness of anticipated response from those for whom it is fashioned. As a guide written for English-speaking visitors, it is not surprising to find that the JTB guidebook's focus of attention is on the West, since readers are likely to find such an orientation more congenial.

A final example indicating that the JTB author has in mind specific Western audiences, and is moreover writing in anticipation of their responses, occurs in the

following passage describing long-distance sleeper trains and the services they provide:

Some long-distance limited-express sleeper trains are equipped with dining cars, which offer reasonably priced Western and Japanese meals as well as beer, spirits and soft drinks. For those wishing to eat at their seats or desiring to purchase souvenirs, attendants with vending carts pass through the cars selling boxed lunches, coffee, spirits and local specialties. Train conductors can be identified by their uniforms, and are ready to give information and assistance on train changes and other passenger requests. On Shinkansen trains, announcements are made in English. However, for the non-Japanese-speaking foreigner, there are still some difficulties to be overcome when taking a rail journey in Japan. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 55)

There are a number of specific phrases in this passage to suggest that potential questions which might be posed by the Western visitor have been considered and answered: (1) “reasonably priced Western and Japanese meals”; (2) “attendants with vending carts pass through the cars . . .”; (3) “train conductors can be identified by their uniforms, and are ready to give information and assistance . . .”; and, perhaps most significantly, (4) “. . . for the non-Japanese-speaking foreigner, there are still some difficulties to be overcome when taking a rail journey in Japan.” These and other phrases are clearly aimed at answering questions likely to be posed by tourists who wish to ride the train. Particularly for extended rides, tourists want to know which services are available, and more importantly, whether their requests in English are likely to be understood. To have addressed these questions demonstrates, by implication, that JTB’s communication has been formulated in anticipation of an audience precisely and definitely conceptualized according to some previous knowledge.

The final sentence, however, reveals by its placement that one of the traveler’s most characteristic fears—being placed on a high-speed conveyance going to the wrong destination and being unable to obtain information—may in fact be

justified. One interesting feature of this concluding sentence is that it is so blunt: there is no attempt to soften the blow for the potential tourist (as was evident, for example, in the JTB's discussion of accommodations and food). This uncharacteristically direct assertion may reveal that JTB is more certain of itself by the time of the 1991 edition; it is sure enough of Japan's position to include Japanese food among its offerings, and yet not to attempt to apologize for the fact that English may not be spoken on some of the long-distance trains. Thus, in this case, authorial intention and attitude are revealed by the indication that the author probably knows the potential response of his or her audience, but may have decided not to answer it. Such self-assurance may reveal JTB's awareness that Japan may finally be able to persuade people to want to visit without finding it necessary to seem subservient to them.

The audience of "youthful visitors." Another grouping of discourses apparently acknowledged by JTB's guidebook are those related to youthful visitors to Japan, as evidenced by the following description of youth hostels:

Youth hostels are simple, neat and inexpensive accommodation facilities. They are operated to promote wholesome travel by the youth, to encourage the cultivation of a sound mind and body, and to strengthen international friendship through travel between the youth of Japan and foreign countries. . . . Youth hostels are equipped with separate bedrooms for men and women, dining rooms, showers and heating systems. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 51)

There are many potential audiences to whom this passage may be addressed. First, of course, are the "youths" themselves. Increasingly, as Japan has evolved into a favored destination for tourists, the number of young people visiting the country has risen steadily. In response to the demand for cheaper accommodations, the JTB and other government agencies have assumed management of an extensive network of youth hostels. One recalls the assurances

given by JTB to potential visitors regarding ryokan, hotels, and other kinds of accommodations;⁴² one finds similar assurances about youth hostels in the quoted passage. Emphasis is placed on simplicity, cleanliness, reliability, and so on.

However, a second, broader, audience to whom the passage is directed may be the parents of youths who may wish to visit Japan. Hence, one finds references to the hostels' "wholesomeness" and an unambiguous statement that accommodations are segregated by sex. These may represent attempts to provide reassurance to parents whose children might want to visit Japan.

There may also be another, even broader audience addressed by the JTB description: the opinion of society at large. Many cultures (particularly American) place a great deal of emphasis on children. Thus, if one is to invite children into the country as a means of strengthening "international friendship," one is obliged to make provisions for their safety and good treatment.

At the same time, one also notices a strong indication of traditional Japanese morality in the passage. Even while opening its doors to young people, the Japanese government does not want to be seen as encouraging the disrespect and lax morals that people of the elder generation sometimes fear among young people. In the passage one finds not only information, but the added assertion that the youth hostels are helpful in "cultivation of a sound mind and body." Frankly, it is difficult to see how a cheap hotel could significantly aid any young person in that process, but the inclusion of the remark perhaps indicates awareness of another element of the JTB's potential audience: the elderly, more traditional segments of the Japanese population.

In this discussion, we have looked at some general characteristics of the JTB's orientation of its discourse toward related discourses, as well as conducting a more detailed inquiry into JTB's orientation toward discourses related to two target

⁴² See Chapter Three, pp. 104-107, and Chapter Five, pp. 291-296.

segments of its readership, the audiences comprised of Western visitors and youths. In the next section, discussion will center on one of the JTB's most important tasks: orienting its cultural descriptions toward discourses relating to Japan's international political status.

Negotiating Japan's international political status. While attending to the needs of its potential visitors and their likely responses toward JTB's guidebook, JTB also tries, through its touristic discourse, to redefine Japan's position in the international community of nations. To achieve international status, as defined by Western standards, Japan must differentiate itself from other Asian countries, in order to divest itself of the images of being "backward" or "underdeveloped." Since Asian countries are often viewed as more "traditional" than Western countries, Japan's negotiation of its international status entails not only its success in economic and political affairs, but its ability to manage its image as a "traditional" Asian country.

There are many indications that JTB orients its discourse toward definite preconceptions among its Western readership. For example, JTB would have no need to emphasize Japan's international status, were it not for the images of the East as backward and undeveloped, as measured by Western standards. Nor would JTB need to downplay the impact of World War II, were it not for a perceived need to respond to the widespread perception among Westerners that Japan provoked the Allies, bringing on the resultant destruction of their country. On the other hand, JTB would have little need to make reference to World War II at all, if it were not for the fact that its anticipated audience might have some doubts about Japan's activities during the war. Finally, JTB would find it less necessary to constantly stress Japan's economic success and to provide so much detailed information on Japanese businesses, were it not that Western nations are so interested in aspects of the "Japanese style" of business. In the discussion which

follows, I utilize three examples to demonstrate how, through the symbolic devices of touristic discourse, Japan defines itself in relation to the West, to the East, and to the idea of tradition.

Japan and the West. A good example of how the dimension of uncompletedness may be used to situate Japan in relation to the West can be found in JTB's description of the arrival of Admiral Perry and the subsequent opening of contact between Japan and the West. Notice how the JTB author demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of the necessity to concede the general knowledge about the importance of Perry, while at the same time protecting the reputation of the Japanese by refusing to portray the Tokugawa shogunate as having given in to pressure from the West:

One of the fundamental policies of the Tokugawa Shogunate was isolationism, but in June 1853 Admiral Matthew Perry's ships from America arrived at Uraga (eastern end of the Miura Peninsula, Kanagawa Prefecture) and broke up this conservative tradition. This became a catalyst for anti-Tokugawa groups in Kyoto and other western districts in Japan, bringing the groups that had been fomenting discontent against the Shogunate to the surface. By 1868 Tokugawa Shogun had abandoned the reins of power, and the Meiji Restoration Government was established in its place. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 362)

In this passage, the author finds it necessary to acknowledge what it takes to be the shared perception among its readers that it was Perry's "visit" that opened Japan to the Western world. To do this, the author seems to anticipate reader knowledge and address the text to readers likely to share this perception of Perry's arrival. However, beyond the Western audience likely to read this narrative, it is also true that the author may be acknowledging other audiences, particularly those within the editorial infrastructure of Japan, the New Official Guide who will read the manuscript but who are unlikely to wish to see Japan depicted as the passive recipient of Perry's aggressive incursion.

Therefore, it becomes necessary for the author to frame the Japanese reception of Perry's incursion in terms less threatening to Japan's image. First, the author claims, the Tokugawa shogunate made a policy of isolationism (thus implying that there existed a past practice which needed to be reformed). Second, Perry's arrival is said to have served as a catalyst to bring together several "anti-Tokugawa" factions (thus implying that the shogunate was already declining in power). Third, the result of the "anti-Tokugawa" sentiments in the country led, not to the Tokugawa shogunate being overthrown, but rather to its having "abandoned the reins of power" (thus implying that the Tokugawa government surrendered more or less voluntarily).

Even absent a knowledge of Japanese history, the positions taken by the JTB author seem open to question. For example, it is difficult to see why the Tokugawa shogunate would have wanted to "abandon the reins of power" if not placed under pressure to do so. Moreover, once Perry is brought into the discussion, his role in the process leading to the Tokugawa regime's departure is largely ignored (his arrival is depicted as having served simply to unite anti-Tokugawa forces). These implications and others point the critical reader toward the conclusion that the author may be attempting to render a biased account of these particular events. In other words, the author seems to be trying simultaneously to satisfy the needs of several distinct audiences, necessitating a careful selection and framing of historical "facts." These suspicions are confirmed when one compares the JTB account to that of Reischauer (1977), who highlights some of the tensions that may have led to the Tokugawa regime's "voluntary surrender":

The Tokugawa system had been shaken to its foundations by the events since 1853, and the whole antiquated structure began to disintegrate. All policies had become subject to debate by samurai from all over Japan. Some of the great domains vied with one another and with Edo for influence over the Kyoto court, and Choshu openly

defied Edo's authority. A military expedition sent in 1864 to chastise it produced only a compromise settlement, and a second expedition in 1866 ended in complete failure. Finally a coalition of Satsuma, Choshu, and some other "outer" and collateral domains seized control of the imperial court and in the name of the emperor announced the resumption of direct imperial rule on January 3, 1868. The shogun and a few loyal domains put up a half-hearted resistance, but a so-called "imperial" army seized Edo, putting an end to more than two and a half centuries of Tokugawa rule. (Reischauer, 1977, p. 80)

From Reischauer's account, one gets a better idea of the conflictual nature of the events that are described in the relatively more calm depiction contained in the JTB guidebook. Moreover, one can see the reasons why JTB would want to downplay the suggestions of conflict in other historical accounts; while the JTB guidebook depicts a situation of relatively smooth transition from the Tokugawa to the Meiji eras, Reischauer's account depicts Japan as considerably less stable, racked by internal conflict and pressured externally by widespread changes in the international community of nations. In other words, the picture painted by Reischauer shows Japan as weaker than the picture painted by the JTB guidebook. When one considers the audiences addressed by the two works, the reasons for each author's choices may become more clear. Once again, one is reminded of the soundness of the dimension of uncompletedness as a tool to be used in the analysis of text which at first may appear puzzling or opaque.

Japan and the East. Frequently, when it is a representative of the host country who is describing the country itself, it is often those elements of the host culture about which the describer is most sensitive that seem to require the greatest authorial effort to discern and respond to the needs of multiple audiences.

In the following example passage describing the origins of the Japanese language, a significant amount of detail concerning linguistic theory is presented. However, by applying the lens of uncompletedness to the passage, one is able to speculate about the reasons for including this much detail and thereby be led to a

likely source for JTB's strategy in writing the passage: the widespread perception that the Japanese language is derived from Chinese.

The assumed dependence of Japanese on the Chinese language (in fact, of many Japanese cultural practices on their Chinese origins) often seems to be taken by JTB as a symbol of Japan's failure to fully achieve status in the eyes of the world as an independent cultural entity, while at the same time leading Western readers to classify Japan in the same "traditional" category as Chinese. In the passage quoted below, the author of the JTB guidebook seems extremely sensitive about this issue, so much so that he or she seems to think it necessary to enclose the admission of the lineage of the Japanese language within a welter of linguistic concepts.

There have been many scholastic attempts to find a relationship between the Japanese language and other languages, including the Korean, Chinese, Ural-Altaic and Indo-European languages. However, the most widely accepted theory holds that the spoken Japanese language developed independently of all other languages although the written language is primarily based on Chinese kanji characters. As with many languages, Japanese can be separated into written and spoken language, with the difference between the two lying in verb endings, auxiliary verbs and postpositions. The written language is mainly used for official documents and publications. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 104)

As an author employs more and more data as support for his or her descriptions, he or she at the same time develops more dependence on the sources of that data. An unsupported assertion at least has the benefit of not making the author dependent on another source for the interpretation of what has been asserted. Here, the necessity for the JTB author to develop a complex argument necessitates bringing into the discourse multiple systems of meaning, most (though by no means all) related to the field of linguistics.

Moreover, the well-developed argument achieves its status by anticipating audience response and adjusting to the predicted reactions of the audience. The task confronting the JTB author is somehow to transmute an evident fact—that the Japanese language is derived from the Chinese language—into an assertion that seems to deny that fact. To do this, the JTB author must enlist the services of “scholars” and to take from these legitimated sources the information that will allow the evident fact to be rebutted.

First, the JTB guidebook acknowledges the portion of the audience upon whom it intends to rely on for support: the academic community. The author notes that there have been “many scholastic attempts” to find a connection between the Japanese language and a variety of other languages listed in the text (Chinese is included as part of the list). Second, however, the “most widely accepted theory” (which is not explicitly identified in the guidebook’s description) is that spoken Japanese developed independently of “all other languages.” It is interesting that the JTB chooses to foreground this dichotomy between the spoken and the written languages: it demonstrates the awareness of the JTB author that some strategy is necessary to preempt the possible conclusion that the written “component” of the Chinese language was responsible for the written component of the Japanese language. Hence, the potential responses of at least two audiences appear to be addressed: the first is comprised of those who know that the Japanese language is in some way derived from Chinese, and the second is comprised of those who may perhaps be persuaded that there are finer points to be considered before identifying the Chinese language as the origin of the Japanese language. Moreover, there appears to be a presumption that evidence which will persuade this second audience is likely to come from the field of linguistics. A distinction is then drawn between spoken and written language, but not before the author admits that the written language is based “primarily” (not entirely) on Chinese

kanji (characters). Finally, the passage closes with a description perhaps directed toward the potential audience who might still be harboring the suspicion that the Japanese language is derived from the Chinese; the author states that the written language (the part derived from Chinese) is limited in its use to official documents and publications.

By the time one encounters the simple assertion (Japanese is based on Chinese), it has ceased to retain its significance; under the scrutiny of linguists, government officials, Asians (who are more likely than Westerners to know the origins of the language), and other potential audiences, the simple assertion of the relationship, once finally brought into the stream of social discourse, seems to have lost its energy and power to influence. Through its complex maneuvering to address the needs of these and other potential audiences, JTB distances Japan from Chinese, and other Asian languages, thus regaining for Japan its status as an independent cultural and political entity in the international realm.

Japan and the concept of traditionality. The discourses relating to the present as “modern” and the past as “traditional” comprises yet another discursive space in which the distinction between East and West must be negotiated. This negotiation about the role of traditionality is crucial to Japan’s efforts to claim equality or superiority in the international political arena. In the 1991 edition, for example, this passage⁴³ contains several statements about Kyoto which, examined through the lens of uncompletedness, appear to be somewhat defensive:

However, Kyoto is no mere repository for Japan’s traditional culture. . . . It is the seventh largest city in Japan and an important industrial hub as well as the educational center of Western Japan. It is also equipped with well-organized transportation facilities and hotel accommodations. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 655)

⁴³ This passage is also examined in discussion of the dimension of tension, Chapter Five, pp. 296-298.

Similar statements can be found in the 1975 edition, except that in 1975 Kyoto was the fifth largest city in Japan, rather than the seventh. The JTB guidebook's statement suggests a response to a series of possible questions about Kyoto. Is Kyoto merely a repository for Japan's traditional culture? Is it possible for Kyoto, given its traditionality, to embrace industry and education? Is it possible for Kyoto to have well-organized transportation facilities and modern hotel accommodations, given its traditionality? The JTB description provides an affirmative answer to all these questions, real and imagined, from its Western readers. In defining Kyoto in light of its traditional heritage, the JTB guidebook also refers to its modern aspects, apparently so that readers will be disabused of the notion that Kyoto embraces only undesirable, "backward" traditions. Given the sociohistorical character of discourse on modern and traditional elements of society, it is not surprising to find that there are no such statements in the 1955 edition.

Elements of temporal change in uncompletedness of JTB's descriptions. The JTB guidebook series responds to the discourses of international politics, attempting to reformulate descriptions of Japan's status, as the world opinion of Japan and the Japanese continues to change. As we have seen, there has been a considerable increase in Japan's economic, political and social status since the end of World War II. In this section, two specific patterns of temporal change relating to JTB's response to discourses about Japan will be examined: (1) response to changing international politics; and (2) the role of history in the description of touristic sites.

Response to changing international politics. In the 1991 edition, the JTB guidebook describes the Japan-China war in the following terms:

Prior to the Geneva Conference, Japan clashed with China. In 1932, Japan took over control of Manchuria, setting up the state of

“Manchukuo” and thereby extending its influence in that part of Asia. In 1937, the clash of interests developed into an armed conflict between Japan and China.

This led to opposition from the United States and Great Britain and ultimately to the Pacific War (World War II). Japan was defeated and all Japanese territory was occupied by the Allied powers with the aim of instituting a large-scale reform of Japan and turning it into a truly democratic state. The people in general denounced all that remained of militarism. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 101)

The phrasing of these statements in the 1955 and 1975 editions are different in several important respects. First, the action taken by Japan with regard to Manchuria changes from the depiction of Japan as helper to depiction of Japan as invader. According to the 1955 edition, “In 1932 Japan helped Manchuria gain its independence, thereby extending her influence in that part of Asia” (p. 88). In both the 1975 and 1991 editions, we read, “In 1932, Japan took over control of Manchuria, setting up the state of ‘Manchukuo’ and thereby extending its influence in that part of Asia” [Emphases added]. Notice, too, that the feminine pronoun “her” has been dropped in favor of the more neutral and powerful “its.”

Second, while the 1955 edition assigns blame for the conflict to the Japanese themselves, later editions do not. The following statements are made in the 1955 edition, but deleted in later editions: “This was a unilateral action on the part of Japan. Naturally enough, it provoked the opposition of the United States and Great Britain and ultimately led to the Pacific War” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1955, p. 88). In the 1975 and 1991 editions, the event is described in a less censorious tone, minimizing the seriousness of the conflict: “This led to opposition from the United States and Great Britain” (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 101). The text does not explain precisely what led to the opposition from these two countries. It is not surprising that, in recounting the event, the 1955 edition provides a thorough description: “The military, political and financial leaders who had led Japan to war

were all brought low. The people in general denounced all that remained of feudalism" (p. 88). Again, in the 1991 edition, the description blaming Japan is formulated in somewhat less critical terms: "The people in general denounced all that remained of militarism" (p. 101).

Third, the damaging results of the war with Japan are lessened in severity, from "the war ended in a crushing defeat of Japan and landed the nation in a very sorry plight" in 1955, to the simple statement, "Japan was defeated" in 1975.

Precisely what was role of Japan in the second World War? What was the relation among Japan, Manchuria, and China? How much blame should be placed upon Japan or upon other nations? From the more focused account of Japan's actions, to the somewhat more neutral tone, the "same" event has been depicted in different ways. However, applying the lens of uncompletedness, one is led to ask this question: why was it necessary for the JTB guidebook to provide different versions of "reality" to its readers? What might have been the purpose of reframing the event in these ways?

First, by reframing the event in a different light, JTB is able to create a better image of Japan in its 1975 and 1991 editions. This depiction, of course, must be in line with reader perception of the specific situations in which JTB finds itself. As time goes on, as memories about World War II become less vivid, less demand is placed on Japan to provide detailed information about the history of the war and its aftermath, particularly when such events do not elevate the image of Japan. By not mentioning the unfortunate situation which Japan in large measure brought upon itself, JTB manages to enable Japan to be appreciated and understood in modern terms; by not mentioning Japan's reaction to the leaders who brought Japan to war, JTB manages to ameliorate the audience's memory of Japanese militarism. Avoiding the assignment of blame to Japan itself also gives Japanese

more allowance for the government's actions; it is the readers who will have to decide which parties to blame.

A second reason for JTB's reorientation toward the international political situation may be that there are by 1991 many other Asian nations, particularly China, which have gradually gained the recognition of the international community, a fact which Japan cannot ignore. In response to this political discourse, Japan must situate itself not only with respect to the West, but also to the international political arena. Even if JTB's intended audience is comprised of Westerners who care less about actions taken toward Manchuria, Japan cannot ignore the overall international political situation. Avoiding a detailed account of the war, as was apparently attempted in the 1975 and 1991 editions, may even be seen as a means of seeking improved relations with other Asian countries. Since Japan is interested in establishing diplomatic relations with China, it can no longer claim status as a "helper" to Manchuria; rather, under the scrutiny of international politics, Japan must state that it "took over" Manchuria, a picture that is perhaps more congruent with China's perceptions of Japanese actions.

History can never be represented by an "accurate version" of what occurs. As history continues, each subsequent edition of the JTB guidebook needs to address the same issues under new circumstances and in response to new discourses. Just as there is no definite conclusion as to which of the extant versions is the most "honest and accurate," there is no final word as to how World War II will be represented in future editions of the JTB guidebook.

The role of history in the description of touristic sites. Just as accounts of an historical event may vary from one edition of a tour guidebook to another, the management of history in descriptions of touristic sites also depends upon various competing voices unique to the circumstances of writing. In this section, I examine how history is conceived as part of the background description of a site, through

the lens of uncompletedness, as demonstrated in three editions of JTB's guidebooks.

In all three editions of the JTB guidebook, one finds numerous examples of the history of a given site or location introduced as an element of travel information. In the 1955 edition, among thirty-eight suggested travel routes identified, only seven areas and/or cities contain information about history as a separate category. On other routes, even though there is no subsection designated "history," historical information is provided as part of the general description. In the specific category "history," it is interesting to note that smaller type letters are used, perhaps to minimize the importance of the historical background of the city or area.

In the 1975 edition, however, historical background has become a standard category for nearly every city, as well as areas surrounding the city, when the area is designated as a route (there are only a few exceptions⁴⁴ to this rule). Ironically, however, the pervasiveness of the category "history" does not necessarily imply that historical information is considered important for visitors, because the descriptions of history are printed in italics and smaller type size, suggesting the unique position of history: while italics mark historical information as distinct from other information, the smaller-sized type makes historical information seem less important. The message conveyed to readers seems to be that, if they do not want to read the historical information, they can just as easily pass over it. In the 1991 edition, the category "history" remains much the same, except that there is no typographical marking to designate "history" as distinct from other parts of the narrative. One could say that in the 1991 edition, "history" has been normalized as part of the touristic site information.

⁴⁴ These exceptions include the following: Hokkaido is an island, both Yamaguchi and Shiminoseki are cities with history sections of their own, and "Sapporo and Vicinity" does not contain a section on history.

How is one to make sense of these diverse ways of presenting the historical background of specific touristic sites? The fundamental question remains as to why it is necessary for the JTB guidebook to address issues of history at all. To what audience is the material addressed and for what purposes? From the Bakhtinian dimension of uncompletedness, we know that any written discourse is composed in anticipation of potential responses. By observing the development of how the presentation of Japanese history has evolved, we are able to speculate about the potential response that JTB might be anticipating.

In the 1955 edition, Japan was widely considered to be a “traditional” country. Perhaps it is for this reason that the historical background of the city is not considered to be of much importance: in a manner of speaking, the whole nation can be considered as part of history. By the 1975 edition, Japan as a nation embraces its historical roots but at the same time is still viewed as struggling toward modernization. Historical background became an issue to be contemplated in deciding the nation’s status, rather than something to be taken for granted and ignored. The struggle over the role of history and the traditionality with which it has come to be associated can be observed in the ways in which the information in the section is presented: in smaller-type letters to lessen its importance, but in italics (calling attention to its inclusion).

In the 1991 edition, however, history has achieved a new status: it is no longer something to be proud of, or to be ashamed of, because Japan has become one of the most powerful and industrialized nations in the world. Japan’s history, then, is in the 1991 edition simply another aspect of Japanese life, no more and no less important than any other aspect. As noted earlier, the JTB guidebook utilizes various linguistic devices to create a distance between the present and the past. Now that Japan considers itself safely settled in the present, it may perceive that there is less need to exert effort either to emphasize or de-emphasize the

importance of history. As tourists visit Japan, in any area, they are free to exert effort to understand the history of a given tour site, if they so choose.

The previous and subsequent communication on the subject of modernity, then, serves to frame the context within which history is portrayed. From being part of the nation, to possessing an ambivalent status, and finally to normalization, the written discourse evolves from one form to another, meeting the demands of new sociohistorical circumstances. The incorporation of historical information in the discussion of touristic sites is a reflection of the meaning of "history" to the Japanese themselves; in terms of uncompletedness, JTB's description is oriented toward Japanese accounts of their own history. The 1991 edition is certainly not the "last word" on Japan's touristic sites. In years to come, the issue of history may become less important, or may be reintroduced and foregrounded, as circumstances warrant.

Comparative Stylistic Analysis Relating to Uncompletedness in Fodor's and JTB's Descriptions

In analyzing the passages above, we have seen numerous examples illustrating how the authors of the Fodor's chapters try to anticipate the potential responses of their audiences by, for example, comparing unfamiliar sites with the familiar, by expressing controversial claims in stereotypical terms, by preempting controversial claims through broad generalization, and a number of other techniques. In this section, I want to focus on some important characteristic stylistic mechanisms utilized by the authors and editors of Fodor's and JTB's to indicate the discourse toward which they appear to orient their narratives as well as the outcomes they may expect.

Fodor's—Stylistic mechanisms. Throughout its guidebook series, Fodor's tends to employ several characteristic stylistic mechanisms which can be examined under the lens of uncompletedness. In the following, I analyze two of these

specific mechanisms in greater detail: (1) orientation toward “academic” discourse; and (2) use of ideologically “loaded” discourse.

Orientation toward “academic” discourse. Perhaps as a result of educational training in many Western countries, readers of touristic materials are assumed to have become accustomed to a style of writing that might be termed “academic discourse.” This discourse is characterized by presentation of information in standardized fashion, as well as by a narrative style that tends to be less personal, more based in fact than in opinion, and more tentative than declaratory. Thus, typical academic discourse might be written in the passive voice, be heavily laden with factual or statistical data, and be characterized by the use of words and phrases which suggest uncertainty (“may,” “might,” “are said to be,” and so on).

However, in the Fodor’s series, one often finds a style of writing that might be termed “pseudo-academic” discourse. In this style of writing, the form of academic discourse is retained (including the less personal voice and the characteristic phrasing), but the requirements for evidential support are either ignored and applied less stringently. To write in the pseudo-academic style, the touristic author must orient him- or herself not only toward academic discourse (that is, the author must use stylistic mechanisms which will be recognized by the reader as belonging to the academic genres), but must also redirect reader attention in ways that will conceal a lack of evidence supporting the author’s assertions. The orientation toward these other established discourses thus represents an instantiation of the dimension of uncompletedness.

The example quoted below is taken from Edward Seidensticker’s introductory chapter in the 1962 Fodor’s guidebook. Seidensticker describes the Meiji Era, implying that its excesses drove the Japanese inevitably toward international war:

The energies of Meiji had gone astray, and invited disaster. Perhaps there was something innately aggressive about the Japanese, although their relatively peaceful pre-modern history does little to support the suspicion. It may be, again, that the emperor cult was responsible for the disaster, although all countries have similar patriotic symbols, and the existence of the emperor tells little about the forces that set Japan to expanding. Most likely the culprits were industrialization and urbanization, and Japan's transgressions were therefore not unique. Compelled by similar forces, other countries have behaved and are behaving in a like fashion. (Fodor's, 1962, p. 75)

This stylistic approach is used frequently in the Fodor's series. A number of systems of meaning (all likely to be shared by the Western reader) are introduced, each framed in the tentative phrasing favored by academic professionals: "perhaps there was something . . ."; "it may be, again, . . ."; "most likely . . ." These are interesting choices, suggesting a dispassionate consideration of alternatives, and thus standing in dramatic contrast to some of Seidensticker's more extravagant formulations elsewhere in the introductory chapter.

Nevertheless, the air of authorial objectivity in this case is illusory, because each of the assertions which follows a given qualifier itself represents an unsupported generalization about the possible "causes" of Japan's entry into the war; thus, the author is not simply bringing in a greater number of viewpoints, but rather a greater number of viewpoints which demand further elaboration and support.

Moreover, the author's choice of the "causes" of Japan's participation in World War II, among all possible causes, is highly selective (again, the author seems to be playing to knowledge most of his or her readers will assume were the causes leading to Japan's warmaking). Three separate causes are considered: (1) Japanese are "innately aggressive"; (2) the emperor "cult" drove the people into war; and (3) the "culprits" were "most likely" "industrialization and urbanization." Notice that in each of these three instances, the phrasing places the referenced

cause in the worst possible light: Japanese are not just “aggressive,” but innately aggressive; Japanese were not just devoted to their emperor, they followed a “cult” figure; industrialization and urbanization were not just causes, but “culprits.”

Moreover, each of these references itself instantiates a number of systems of meaning. Apart from the stereotypes examined earlier, one notices in the quoted passage the use of emotionally “loaded” words whose purpose seems designed to invoke associated systems of meaning: “suspicion,” “culprit,” and “cult.” The first two words suggest that the undertaken military actions were inherently transgressive, in the sense of being criminally culpable (and thus unjustifiable), while “cult” summons associations of mindless religious devotion, perhaps linked in the popular consciousness with the actions of suicide kamikaze pilots during the Pacific War. Thus, the immediate perception that the narrative combines reasonable voices in objective discussion, when considered in terms of its connection to various anticipated responses, turns out to be highly questionable.

Use of ideologically “loaded” discourse. Another characteristic mechanism upon which the Fodor’s guidebooks rely is the “loaded” descriptor. Of course, the use of “loaded” words is considered appropriate in the promotional writing of tourism as well as many other commercial enterprises. However, this mechanism is considered under the dimension of uncompletedness because of the necessity for “loaded” descriptors to make explicit and implicit reference to identified systems of meaning (ideologies).

To illustrate, let me continue with Seidensticker’s passage, quoted in the previous section. I focus now on the latter portion of this passage: “Most likely the culprits were industrialization and urbanization, and Japan’s transgressions were therefore not unique. Compelled by similar forces, other countries have behaved and are behaving in a like fashion” (Fodor’s, 1962, p. 75).

There is a subtle and intriguing orientation to other discourses in this passage. Here, the emotionally charged word “transgressions” (suggesting moral censure, which, again, precludes justifiable cause) is seemingly applied to nations other than Japan, and hence at first glance, the passage seems at least somewhat more reasonable than some of the other assertions analyzed from Seidensticker’s introductory chapter.

On the other hand, notice that these “other countries” are not identified; thus, there is really no specific data against which to compare the Japanese “transgressions.” If one speculates as to the reasons for this lack of specificity, it is easy to see that the “West” encompasses nations whose “expansionist” policies (military activity driven by the need to consolidate economic markets) are not just similar to Japan’s pre-War expansionist aims, but indeed substantially surpass them: both the United States and Great Britain are certainly examples of nations whose reach in international relations, driven by attention to growth, has sometimes exceeded their grasp.⁴⁵

Further ambiguity is engendered by the use of terms such as “in like fashion.” Cued by the lack of specificity regarding the identity of the referenced countries, one is not even sure what these unidentified nations might have done to be considered by the author as comparable to Japan. One wonders which aspect of the Japanese behavior is the point of comparison: the making of war or the similar response to certain “forces” (by which the author apparently means economic and industrial progress)?

Here, one might attribute the influence of the dimension of uncompletedness to what the passage does not say. In other words, by not

⁴⁵ Notice, for example, how acceptable the stated reason for the United States “opening” Japan in the mid-nineteenth century has become in Western discourse: the United States simply “demanded” that Japan “open its markets” to the rest of the world. Seldom is this motivation ever questioned or criticized in Western accounts of history.

specifically identifying which meaning systems are being invoked, Seidensticker allows the readers of the guidebook to invoke whatever discourses they consider most appropriate to their particular agendas. The key phrase is the reference to "other nations": by using this phrase, the author invokes an overarching meaning system (the reader is free to choose which nation), secure in the knowledge that Western readers, upon provision of the stimulus phrase "other nations," are probably unlikely to identify Western nations as "transgressors."

The inclusion of at least two references to economic progress and war also brings up a more problematic appeal to other discourses. In the first reference, one reads this sentence: "Most likely the culprits were industrialization and urbanization, and Japan's transgressions were therefore not unique." Here, one again sees the suspicious conjunction, "and," identified elsewhere⁴⁶ as a weak connector that often serves to link ideas which are only incidentally associated. In the first part of the sentence, the author identifies what s/he thinks is the best choice ("most likely") among causes for Japanese entry into the War. Again, the assertion takes the form more of a pronouncement,⁴⁷ a judgment passed in the absence of supporting evidence. Following the conjunction "and," one finds a vague assessment, "Japan's transgressions were . . . not unique," suggesting that there is a necessary connection between industrialization and economic growth, on the one hand, and the urge to expand through the conduct of warfare, on the other.

This is a troubling attribution, particularly when applied to the so-called "developing" nations. To get the full force of the meaning system apparently underpinning this reference, one needs to consider some of the descriptions of Japanese society which have been cited elsewhere in this dissertation, particularly the references which imply that the Japanese standard of living is not, and cannot

⁴⁶ See Chapter Three, pp. 152-153.

⁴⁷ Notice the difference in tone between this assertion and the more tentatively phrased positions characteristic of the earlier portion of the paragraph.

be, the equal of standards of living in the West. The cumulative effect of these characterizations, both explicit and implied, is to lead the reader to the conclusion that, regarding both Japan and similar nations, economic development leads to warfare. By refusing to specify the identity of the nations who might have resembled Japan in going down this purported path to inevitable conflict, and by delivering this judgment in the superior and detached tone assumed in the narrative, the author seemingly removes him- or herself from consideration as someone from one of these “other countries.” Thus, the judgment about the connection between industrialization and expansionism is assigned only to “developing” nations. In other words, the already-developed nations (the “West”) seem to have been absolved from being responsible for the warfare that results from overly expansionist economic goals.

Without too much effort, Seidensticker’s logic can be easily reversed: because of the sides they took in the international disputes with Japan in the early twentieth century (based, as such decisions so often are, on economic considerations), it could be said that it was the expansionism of the Western nations which “led inevitably” to the war with Japan! Seidensticker’s discourse works to condemn the “developing” nation for the very expansionism that has resulted in the dominance of “developed” nations. Thus, the “developing” nation loses out regardless of how it is characterized. If it develops itself industrially and economically, it is drawn “inevitably” into war; if it does not develop itself, it remains forever the inferior of the “developed” West. Indeed, the clever interweaving of these various ideologies in Seidensticker’s description of “history” ensures that Japan has the dubious honor of being subjected to both deprecations simultaneously.

Imprecise connection of evidence to described phenomena. While Fodor’s authors often exclude statistical and other factual evidence, there are also occasions

on which such evidence is included, but connected to elements of Japanese culture in imprecise and misleading ways. An example, again from Edward Seidensticker's introductory chapter in the 1962 edition of Fodor's, illustrates this stylistic mechanism. In the passage below, Seidensticker demonstrates his awareness that (even in 1962) Japanese cities are regarded as being occupied primarily by young people seeking to escape Japan's "less-developed" past.

Meanwhile more than half of the forty-six prefectures in Japan were losing population. In the five years before 1960 the farm population between the ages of sixteen and twenty-nine dropped by a sixth. The countryside is being drained of youth, and the cities jammed to the bursting. Women outnumber men everywhere except the major urban centers, where the country boys have gone to seek their brighter, more modern futures. [Emphasis added] (Fodor's, 1962, p. 57)

Here the dimension of uncompletedness is shown through the author's stated awareness of two factors: first, that statistics exist which prove his point, and second, that these statistics permit him to extend his observations into a more broad, more vivid characterization of Japan as a whole. In this passage, Seidensticker seems to depart from his customary style of making assertions without supporting evidence. In the first underlined portion of the passage, for example, he is quite forthcoming about the specifics of his support, if not about its source.

For this particular point, the statistical evidence does indeed seem to support Seidensticker's view. However, one should remember that one of the most frequent criticisms leveled against Seidensticker's inappropriate generalizations is that they are rarely, if ever, backed up by specific evidence. Thus, it is the unusual nature of the statistic quoted in the passage above that may call attention to the fact that the other examples are unsupported. Among other things, that leads one to question whether factual support for Seidensticker's earlier assertions was available

to him, and, based on stylistic considerations, he chose not to use it, or whether he simply extended the assertion because of the absence of substantive support from other sources. Given the frequency and breadth of Seidensticker's assertions, the latter explanation seems the more likely.

Indeed, this latter interpretation seems to be confirmed by the breadth of the assertion which immediately follows the statistics in the passage quoted above (particularly the second emphasized portion). In that latter portion, Seidensticker apparently assumes that the provision of statistics in the earlier portion entitles him to resort to extravagant descriptive metaphors: the countryside "is being drained of youth, and the cities jammed to the bursting." While the statistics are convincing, they clearly do not permit Seidensticker to draw conclusions such as, "the countryside is being drained of its youth."

However, even in this sequence of utterances, one sees the operation of the dimension of uncompletedness: clearly, it is the presence of the statistical support in the former assertion that permits the claims espoused by the latter assertion. In other words, under the influence of the dimension of uncompletedness Seidensticker is responding, not to the previous discourse of others, but to the previous discourse of Seidensticker himself.⁴⁸

JTB—Stylistic mechanisms. Among a number of idiosyncratic stylistic mechanisms used by JTB, one is particularly well explained under the lens of uncompletedness: adjustment to changing discourses.

⁴⁸ Notice, too, that the qualifications established in the author notes for Seidensticker and other identified authors is also a means of orienting the reader toward other discourses for which the author is responsible. For example, Seidensticker is described in the 1969 Fodor's guidebook as follows: "He is noted for his many translations, including Tanizaki's Some Prefer Nettles and The Makioka Sisters and Kawabata's Snow Country and Thousand Cranes. He is the author of Japan in the Life World Library." Such references, particularly when placed at the first of the chapter, serve to channel reader perception of Seidensticker's competence even before his evaluations are encountered.

Adjustment to changing discourses. In discussing the changing role of Japan in the international community throughout the years, JTB has found it necessary to reckon with differences in how people from other cultures regard Japan. Such changes are often to be found in discourses which reflect JTB's apparent awareness of reader perceptions about Japan. In the JTB series, one can find numerous instances in which it is clear that JTB authors and editors believe they know how Japan is described in regard to a particular area or topic. For example, I have looked at passages describing restaurants and hotels according to certain (generally Western) standards. I have also examined what appear to be JTB responses to stereotypes about the Japanese people. Not only do such responses suggest JTB is replying to specific discourses, but a comparison of various editions of the guidebook reveals that, over time, the JTB senses changes in the discourse of non-Japanese about Japan and changes its own responses accordingly.

Often, some of the most dramatic examples of the dimension of uncompletedness are to be found in the description of sociohistorical events about which the host country might be expected to be embarrassed. A disastrous war, an ill-considered expedition, an unwise investment—all these sociohistorical events can result in situations that the host country would probably just as soon forget.

However, in the Bakhtin group's theory of social discourse, it is unlikely that such events will be forgotten. The more noticeable the event (the factor that causes the host country to be embarrassed about it in the first place), the more likely this same event is to be indelibly engraved on the pages of world history. In adapting itself to these very noticeable historical events, then, the host country must, again, reveal the multiple audiences that are assumed to be reading a given account.

In accounting for the development and aftermath of World War II, JTB, clearly discomfited over Japan's role in the war, at the same time seems compelled to boast a bit about Japan's postwar recovery. To retain "face" in the world

community, therefore, JTB must walk a fine line between not offending other nations (by accepting responsibility for the war) but at the same time not appearing to be objectionably meek in accepting the impetus toward "reconstruction" imposed on the country by the Allies. The resultant merging of awareness of two sets of potential audiences, two responses, two overarching systems of thought about the war and its aftermath, is an excellent illustration of the dimension of uncompletedness. The presentation of Japan's case, quoted below, is a good example of how one can effectively respond to the often contradictory expectations of multiple audiences.

In 1945 World War II ended with Japan on the losing side.⁴⁹ Severe air raids devastated the whole of Japan. As a result, its production facilities, which the country had built up through the process of modernization since the Meiji Restoration, were heavily damaged. The "Pauley Interim Report," which was announced by the U.S. occupation forces on December 7, 1945, said that the Japanese standards of living and production would be restored but kept at a level no higher than that of 1926 to 1930. The image of "reconstruction" that Japan had immediately after the war was not to be an economic power but to become a country that could take pride in itself as a "nation with a high level of culture," even though it meant that the country would not recover its former economic level. (Japan Travel Bureau, 1991, p. 135)

The passage begins with a hint of the strategy that the JTB will adopt; unrepentant, JTB states that the "war ended" with "Japan on the losing side." This is not quite as strong or direct it might be, were the assertion phrased, "Japan was defeated in World War II." One is offered a foreshadowing of JTB's strategy: Japan will acknowledge some responsibility, but will do so in a reserved way that will not be unreasonably submissive toward Westerners.

⁴⁹ This is an interesting initial linguistic formulation which skillfully avoids face-threatening terms such as "beaten," "conquered," or "occupied."

The passage continues with the JTB guidebook describing the destruction of the country from air raids. Here, the author introduces an unusual theme: that the progress that had characterized the Meiji Restoration had been halted and even reversed by the war. Here, and subsequently in the passage, one finds it difficult to escape the impression that, not only is Japan not openly acknowledging its part in the war, but that it may even be blaming other countries for the devastation it has had to endure. This is indicated later in the passage by references, in a critical tone, to the fact that Japan would not be allowed to go back up to the level of economic success it had enjoyed before the war. JTB's ire is also demonstrated by an intriguing use of punctuation: the word "reconstruction" is placed in quotation marks, indicating that the author feels that it should not really be considered a reconstruction.

The impression of resentment against the strictures imposed by the rest of the world on Japan for its role in World War II are very strong in this passage. Moreover, the quotation from the Pauley interim report concerning a "high level of culture" may be less an admission on JTB's part that the Allies at least respected Japan's traditions, than a criticism that Japan had been classified a "traditional country," and that others had taken insufficient cognizance of its needs as an economic power.

Moreover, the management of Japan's image throughout the passage is achieved by skillful manipulation accompanied by authorial awareness of multiple responses. The passage, which seems more appropriate in 1991, would have been tempered in previous years. As history evolves, as Japan further increases its economic and political status and as the memory of its role in World War II fades, Japan is permitted to address the world community in ways that emphasize its status and de-emphasize its military adventurism.

Conclusion

Discourse concerning Japanese tourism is not defined simply by Japanese or by non-Japanese themselves, but rather is negotiated, contested, and compromised by the audiences, actual or imagined, for touristic discourse. The uneasiness occasioned by the struggle for definition leads to tension; on the one hand, touristic discourse is predictable, oriented to the needs of tourists and inscribed by sociopolitical circumstance. Still, in awareness of the self and the other, the participation of multiple voices impels the discourse toward unpredictability. While Japanese touristic discourse is open to interpretation in future editions, and in awareness of multiple responses, the image of Japan so presented is, in a way, finished and closed as an index to the circumstances upon which the discourse bases its meanings. Through an awareness of past, ongoing and potential responses from its audiences, and an awareness of the previous and subsequent discourse on tourism, touristic descriptions of Japan will continue to be developed.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

Summary

In this dissertation, I have advanced a method of textual criticism based upon some of theories of Mikhail Bakhtin and his colleagues. As a source of data to which this method can be applied, I have analyzed two series of tour guidebooks about Japan, the Fodor's series (1962, 1969, 1976, 1982, and 1990 editions) and the Japan Travel Bureau's Japan, the Official Guide, alternatively titled, beginning with the 1964 edition, Japan, the New Official Guide (1955, 1975, and 1991 editions). Despite changes in both series over the years, a number of primary themes regarding the position of Japan with respect to others nations, particularly Western nations, have emerged. First, both series are compelled to address the dominant framework according to which Asian countries such as Japan are conceived: the assumed inferiority of the East, as against the assumed superiority of the West. The Fodor's series, particularly in its earlier editions, takes Western superiority as self-evident, setting a supposed standard which Japan must strive to attain if it is to achieve the status of being a developed nation—unfortunately, in the view of the Fodor's series, Japan has not only not yet achieved this elusive standard, but is unlikely ever to reach the standard, and hence forever remains inferior to more “developed” Western countries. At the same time, the JTB's series has been shown to be painfully aware of its confinement to the inferior category in comparisons between East and West, and hence consistently orients its descriptions to redressing the imbalance, portraying Japan and Japanese in a relentlessly positive light.

A second recurrent theme in cultural descriptions in both guidebook series concerns stereotypes about Japan and the Japanese. Throughout the Fodor's series,

though more overtly in its earlier editions, authors consistently describe the Japanese culture in terms of stereotypes to which their Western readers have become accustomed. While in cultural description some reference to stereotypes is inevitable (in that the unfamiliar must be expressed in terms of the familiar), detailed analysis of key passages reveals that many of the stereotypes employed by the Fodor's guide are both hurtful to Japanese people and proven largely invalid given the advances in Japan's international status in the years since World War II. Unfortunately, despite evidence to the contrary, the Fodor's series clings to key stereotypical depictions for an inappropriately long period of time (in some cases, as we have seen, for the two decades from the 1962 through the 1982 edition). The JTB's series, on the other hand, spends considerable effort utilizing its superior base of knowledge about Japanese culture, as well as its more extensive access as a governmental agency to credible sources on Japan, to reply to common stereotypes about Japan and the Japanese.

A third recurrent theme to be seen in the touristic cultural descriptions analyzed in this study has to do with authorial/editorial "voice," that is, the characteristic style in which cultural descriptions are expressed in the two series. We saw, for example, that the "voice" of the Fodor's series, for nearly two decades, was characterized by omniscience and distance, undergoing a significant change only after the thoroughgoing revision of the 1990 edition. On the other hand, even though the "voice" of the 1990 Fodor's is more personal and less blatantly reliant upon overt stereotypes, there are tones of omniscience and cultural stereotyping still expressed, albeit much more circuitously. The "voice" of the JTB's series, meanwhile, clearly shows a pattern of increasing confidence in making the case for its equality with or superiority over Western nations. Interestingly, JTB's characteristic voice begins somewhat apologetically in the 1955 edition, becomes increasingly confident and even arrogant in the 1975 edition, and then moderates to a tone of quieter self-assurance in the 1990 edition.

Limitations of the Present Study

Despite its advantages, the Bakhtinian analysis of cultural description as a communication process also has important limitations. The first of these involves the derivation of categories from the work of the Bakhtin circle. The work of Bakhtin and his colleagues covers such a broad range of topics and so relentlessly resists categorization and classification that any limitation to five, or indeed any other number of dimensions for analysis, runs the risk of representing the work of Bakhtin and his colleagues in selective and limited terms. For example, to derive the five dimensions for the analysis of cultural description, I took those elements of the group's work relating directly to their dispute with the standard sender-receiver model of structural linguists such as Saussure. This means that the group's other work, such as their influential writings on the subjects of literature, aesthetics, semiotics, and so on, has not been explicitly summarized in the derivation of the five dimensions.

For perspectives other than those espoused by the Bakhtin group, this might pose less difficulty. However, the group was so firm in its position opposing categorization and fragmentation of living discourse for the purpose of analysis that anyone who systematizes the Bakhtinian framework in order to construct a system to analyze cultural description may in fact be working counter to the purposes of the Bakhtinian approach.

To this objection, I can provide two answers. First, I can justify the systematization of the Bakhtin approach on the grounds of utility: the study of communication is sorely in need of tools which are as effective as the Bakhtinian perspective in linking acts of communication to broader sociohistorical circumstances. It should be clear from the results of analysis of the passages from the two guidebook series that a great deal of meaning in cultural description in tour guidebooks remains

hidden unless the critical reader is prepared to conduct detailed exploration of tour guidebook texts while keeping in mind their inextricable connection to sociohistorical circumstances.

The second answer to possible objections about inappropriate systematization of Bakhtin is that those who register the objection may not fully understand the true import of the Bakhtin circle's work. If it is true that no text is ever finished, or that the meaning of text is constantly negotiated through engagement in social discourse, or that each utterance is but a moment in an ongoing process of communication—if these Bakhtinian principles are true and valid, then they must also be characteristic of the works written by the Bakhtin group itself. If one takes the central message of the group at its face value, then no interpretation of the body of work of the Bakhtin circle—provided such interpretation is grounded in that body of work—can ever be “inappropriate.” Just as the writer of cultural description in the tour guidebook, upon placing his or her texts into the stream of social discourse where they will inevitably be engaged according to the architectonic systems of readers, so the writings of the Bakhtin circle have engaged a significant number of scholarly applications and interpretations in areas as diverse as political science (Strauss, 1990), use of rhetoric in fiction (HopKins, 1989), and the teaching of writing in business (Cross, 1990). In my opinion, Mikhail Bakhtin and his associates would celebrate, rather than condemn, the divergent applications of their principles, including the applications to be found in the critiques of cultural description in this dissertation.

A second limitation of a Bakhtinian approach to analysis of cultural description lies in its apparent reliance on extensive interpretation of the analyst. A suspicion which nearly always accompanies the reading of “thick” analyses of text that there is more of the author's view in the interpretation than there is of the author's “real” intention. However, I hope it is clear that the critic who applies the Bakhtinian methodology searches, not for “clues” to authorial intention, but for linkages between

the author's text and sociohistorical circumstance. In any case, the Bakhtinian critic of cultural description orients his or her critique not inward, but outward, not toward his or her own architectonics, but toward the architectonic systems of others. Moreover, the Bakhtin perspective undermines any notion of there even existing a "real" authorial intention: it must be remembered that the author's is merely one of a chorus of voices lending to the interpretation of the text.

At the same time, it is undeniable that to conceive such orientations involves acts of critical interpretation. As should be clear from the analyses in this dissertation, even should the critic orient his or her analysis to the architectonics of others, other systems of meaning can be understood only from within the architectonics of the critic, and by necessity, the critic's architectonics must remain unique to that critic alone. Thus, it is impossible to guarantee that another critic applying the same system of analyzing dimensions of description that I have employed in this dissertation would discover "in" the Fodor's and JTB's descriptions the same points I have discovered. Indeed, given the premises of the Bakhtin circle, it is certain that my interpretations and that of another critic would necessarily differ, even though we may use the "same" analytical scheme of five Bakhtinian dimensions.

A third limitation of this study lies in process of selecting passages for detailed, "thick" analysis. Although, as I note in Chapter Two, I attempted to cover as broadly as possible all of the material in the two guidebook series, clearly it is impossible to do so. Therefore, one might object that I have selected those passages which make my point and ignored those which do not support the claims I am making.

While this objection is valid to some degree, I think it is also clear that the dimensions derived from the Bakhtinian perspective are consistently demonstrated as applicable to many different kinds of cultural description in the Fodor's and JTB's series, regardless of subject or the edition in which they are found. Moreover, as demonstrated in the detailed analyses of these passages, it is not only possible to

demonstrate the validity of the Bakhtinian dimensions in any given cultural description for one edition, but to trace meaningful development of key cultural descriptions over time, as such descriptions evolve and change according to the predictions of the Bakhtin group. Moreover, as was shown in the analyses of passages in the earlier chapters, frequently a passage will demonstrate the validity not simply of one, but of more than one Bakhtinian dimension. I feel that these characteristics—consistency of findings temporally across several editions, consistency of findings to diverse topic areas, and consistency of findings of more than one dimension of analysis—adequately demonstrate the pervasive usefulness of the Bakhtinian dimensions in the analysis of cultural description. While it is true that I have had to select among the passages to analyze, I have found that these passages consistently demonstrate the validity of the Bakhtinian perspective as a means of critiquing cultural description.

Importance and Yield

Just as the Bakhtin group's efforts were aimed at providing a fuller, richer depiction of communication in its sociohistorical context, so the present project is, through a similar process of sociohistorical specification, aimed at offering a richer, fuller account of the seemingly mundane and ordinary elements of cultural description to be found in the tour guidebook. Just as Bakhtin and his colleagues were able to demonstrate that the sender-receiver model of communication either took for granted or discounted the features of sociohistorical specificity which give communication a great deal of its meaning, so it is hoped that this dissertation, by linking the tour guidebook to the features of sociohistorical circumstance which inform its cultural descriptions, will make it clear that most readers of the tour guidebook are taking far more for granted about the described cultural Other than they may know. The goal of the Bakhtin group, stated repeatedly throughout their writings, was in effect to

revitalize how communication is perceived, turning critical readers away from overly abstract views of linguists and other scholars, and toward complex, contradictory, difficult, but ultimately more satisfying elements of social life that inform communication and make it more interesting. It is hoped that this dissertation has performed a similar service for the lowly tour guidebook, which should be seen not as an ordinary, cut-and-dried rendering of the culture, relayed more or less intact from author to reader and digested by the reader primarily for the purpose of having more information to use on a vacation. Rather, the guidebook should be seen in relation to the infinite variety of sociohistorical circumstances to which its cultural descriptions must be linked if they are to be seen as meaningful.

From its inception, the descriptions in the tour guidebook evolve from idea to draft to publication, and then through subsequent editions, through the guidebook's purchase by readers who link such descriptions to the specific aspects of their sociohistorical existence, carried over to encounters with the cultural Other on their subsequent vacations, and on and on, setting multiple trajectories which in turn dictate the future evolution of the tour guidebook, which must in turn itself deal with such factors as marketplace demand, changes in editors and authors, changes in the culture being described—indeed, the complexity of the circumstances in which the tour guidebook is given meaning as an element of social discourse is overwhelming. However, to alert the critical reader of the magnitude of this complexity is precisely the goal of the Bakhtin circle's work. The group sought to provoke critical reanalysis of "ordinary" communication, arguing that through this process it would be self-evident that no communication is "ordinary," in the sense that no communication can be assumed to be a more or less straightforward rendering of information.

Future Directions

One of the most rewarding aspects of this project has been the fact that the findings suggest a number of interesting avenues for future investigations. While it is not feasible to discuss all of these potential research projects here, three are particularly promising.

First, to address the potential limitation of the study that its findings are based on selected text not representative of the guidebooks as whole entities, I propose rigorous and thorough content analysis (both by computer and by interpretation of the analyst) of the scanned text of the guidebooks.¹ While I think it likely, based on the evidence in this dissertation, that my conclusions would be confirmed by such content analysis, it is also possible that some of my conclusions could be refuted or at least reformulated. In either case, quantitative analysis is urgently needed to bolster the largely interpretive analysis advanced in this discussion.

Second, other elements of the Bakhtinian approach need to be incorporated in the dimensions of analysis utilized to probe the communicative act of cultural description. As noted previously, in explaining the perspective taken by Bakhtin and his colleagues, I have chosen to focus on what they have to say largely in response to the linear sender-receiver model advanced by linguists such as Saussure.² This has necessitated that I ignore a number of other topics related both to critical aesthetics (such as the group's notion of answerability) and to cultural activity (such as the chronotope, or space/time orientation of cultural knowledge). Despite the fact that, in this preliminary project I am more than pleased with the results of applying Bakhtinian principles even to a limited degree, I feel that the five dimensions I have

¹ As noted previously, limited computer comparison of selected chapters in sequential editions of the Fodor's and JTB's series on subjects such as history were used in this analysis to confirm the stability of representations over time. I propose extending the coverage to the entire volume and then subsequently to other tour guidebooks on Japan.

² See Appendix, pp. 555-556, et seq.

described are related, both philosophically and in terms of their application, to broader domains addressed in the Bakhtin circle's eclectic scholarship. In future studies, I will include material from these broader domains. This will be an effort requiring, but also deserving of, a considerable expenditure of time and patience.

Third and finally, while there is evidently a great deal of material to be discovered in analyzing only a limited number of sampled editions of two guidebook series concerning a single country, Japan, I think it is evident that one could profitably extend the data analyzed in at least two directions. First, as noted in the overview of Japan guidebooks in Chapter Two, the "standard" guidebooks such as Fodor's and the JTB's series comprise only a tiny part of the currently available touristic literature on Japan. A significant portion of the literature is also comprised of what I have termed "alternative guidebooks." It would be interesting to explore what the dimensions of analysis advanced here might suggest about the authors and editors of these alternative guidebooks. One would predict not only an evident variance between alternative and standard guidebooks in terms of authorial and editorial architectonics—for example, one would at least expect different strategies for positioning the alternative guide vis-a-vis the standard series—but also some noticeable divergence in how cultural elements are depicted (for example, in the relative weight given specificity and generality). Moving beyond the confines of Japan, of course, one could also extend the study to encompass other cultures, particularly those of other East Asian countries whose patterns of economic and cultural evolution are somewhat different from those of Japan, and whose representation in both Western guidebooks and those of their own country is almost certainly distinct from the way Japan is represented (see, for example, the case of Taiwan [Chang & Holt, 1991]). Introduction of such alternative "voices" can considerably enrich our understanding of international tourism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981a). The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin. (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans., M. Holquist, Ed.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981b). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans., M. Holquist, Ed.) (pp. 259-422). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981c). Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel: Notes toward a historical poetics. In M. Holquist (Ed.), The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans., M. Holquist, Ed.) (pp. 84-258). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984a). Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics (Ed. and Trans., C. Emerson). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984b). Rabelais and his world (Trans. H. Iswolsky). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986a). Speech genres and other late essays. V. McGee, (Trans.), C. Emerson & M. Holquist, (Eds.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986b). The problem of speech genres. In (V. McGee, Trans.), C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.), Speech genres and other late essays (pp. 60-102). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). Art and answerability: Early philosophical essays by M. M. Bakhtin (V. Liapunov, Trans., M. Holquist & V. Liapunov, Eds., K. Brostrom, Trans. Supplement). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Boissevain, J. (1977). Tourism and development in Malta. Development and Change, 8, 523-528.
- Boissevain, J. (1978). Tourism and development in Malta. In V. Smith (Ed.), Tourism and economic change (pp. 37-56). Williamsburg, VA: William and Mary Press.
- Boorstin, D. J. (1975). The image: A guide to pseudo-events in America. New York: Atheneum.
- Booth, W. C. (1982). Freedom of interpretation: Bakhtin and the challenge of feminist criticism. Critical Inquiry, 9, 45-76.
- Britton, S. G., & Clarke, W. C. (Eds.). (1987). Ambiguous alternative: Tourism in small developing countries. Suva: University of South Pacific.

- Bryden, J. M. (1973). Tourism and development: A case study of the Commonwealth Carribean. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buck, R. C. (1977). The ubiquitous tourist brochure: Explorations in its intended and unintended use. Annals of Tourism Research, 4, 195-207.
- Carroll, J. (1980). The tourist. In J. Carroll, Sceptical sociology (pp. 140-149). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Chang, H.-c., & Holt, G. R. (1991). Tourism as consciousness of struggle: Cultural representations of Taiwan. Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 8, 102-118.
- Christopherson, Robert C. (1983). The Japanese mind: The Goliath explained. New York: Linden Press.
- Clark, K., & Holquist, M. (1984). Mikhail Bakhtin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Cohen, E. (1984). The sociology of tourism: Approaches, issues, and findings. Annual Review of Sociology, 10, 373-392.
- Crick, M. (1989). Representations of international tourism in the social sciences: Sun, sex, sights, savings, and servility. Annual Review of Anthropology, 18, 307-344.
- Cross, G. A. (1990). A Bakhtinian exploration of factors affecting the collaborative writing of an executive letter of an annual report. Research in the Teaching of English, 24, 173-203.
- Davis, D. E. (1978). Development and the tourism industry in third world countries. Society and Leisure, 1, 301-322.
- de Kadt, E. (Ed.). (1979). Tourism: Passport to development?. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diamond, J. (1977). Tourism's role in economic development: The case reexamined. Economic Development and Social Change, 25, 539-553.
- Dumoulin, H. (1976). Buddhism in modern Japan. In H. Dumoulin & J. C. Maraldo (Eds.), Buddhism in the modern world (pp. 215-276). New York: Collier.
- Emerson, C. (1983). Translating Bakhtin: Does his theory of discourse contain a theory of translation? University of Ottawa Quarterly, 53, 23-33.

- Erbes, R. (1973). International tourism and the economy of developing countries. Paris: OECD.
- Fodor's. (1962). Fodor's guide to Japan and East Asia 1962. E. Fodor, & R. C. Fisher, Eds. New York: David McKay Company Inc.
- Fodor's. (1969). Fodor's guide to Japan and East Asia 1969. E. Fodor, & R. C. Fisher, Eds. New York: David McKay Company Inc.
- Fodor's. (1976). Fodor's Japan and Korea 1976. E. Fodor, R. C. Fisher, & R. Moore, Eds. New York: David McKay Company Inc.
- Fodor's. (1982). Fodor's Japan and Korea 1982. A. Tucker, Ed. New York: Fodor's Modern Guides, Inc.
- Fodor's. (1990). Fodor's 90 Japan. D. Low, Ed. New York: Fodor's Travel Publications, Inc.
- Fowler, R. (1981). Anti-language in fiction. In R. Fowler, Literature as social discourse (pp. 142-161). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.
- Gibney, F. (1979). Japan: The fragile superpower. Rev. Ed. New York: Basic Books.
- Graburn, N. H. H. (1989). Tourism: The sacred journey. In V. L. Smith (Ed.), Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism (pp. 21-36). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hanks, W. F. (1989). Text and textuality: A review. Annual Review of Anthropology, 18, 95-127.
- Heise, J. O. (1981). The travel book: Guide to the travel guide. New York: R. R. Bowker Company.
- Hiller, H. L. (1979). Tourism: Development or dependence?. In R. Millett & W. M. Mill (Eds.), The restless Caribbean (pp. 51-61). New York: Praeger.
- Hirschkop, K. (1989). Dialogism as a challenge to literary criticism. In C. Kelly, M. Makin, & D. Shepherd (Eds.), Discontinuous discourses in modern Russian literature (pp.19-35). London: Macmillan Press.
- Holquist, M. (1981). Introduction. In M. Holquist (Ed.), The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.), M. Holquist (Ed.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Holquist, M. (1990). Introduction: The architectonics of answerability. In M. Holquist & V. Liapunov (Eds.), Art and answerability (pp. ix-xlix). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- HopKins, M. F. (1989). The rhetoric of heteroglossia in Flannery O'Connor's Wise Blood. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 75, 198-211.
- Horne, D. (1984). The great museum: The representations of history. London: Pluto Press.
- Hudman, L. E. (1980). Tourism, a shrinking world. Columbus, OH: Grid Inc.
- Hymes, D. H. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant (Eds.), Anthropology and human behavior (pp. 13-53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Jafari, J. (1974). The socio-economic costs of tourism to developing countries. Annals of Tourism Research, 1, 227-262.
- Japan Travel Bureau [Tourist Industry Bureau & Ministry of Transportation]. (1955). Japan: The official guide. Tokyo, Japan: Japan Travel Bureau, Inc.
- Japan Travel Bureau [Tourist Industry Bureau & Ministry of Transportation]. (1964). Japan: The new official guide. Tokyo, Japan: Japan Travel Bureau, Inc.
- Japan Travel Bureau [Tourist Industry Bureau & Ministry of Transportation]. (1975). Japan: The new official guide. Tokyo, Japan: Japan Travel Bureau, Inc.
- Japan Travel Bureau [Tourist Industry Bureau & Ministry of Transportation]. (1991). Japan: The new official guide. Tokyo, Japan: Japan Travel Bureau, Inc.
- Johnson, S. K. (1988). The Japanese through American eyes. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kahn, H. (1980). Tourism and the next decade. In D. Hawkins et al. (Eds.), Tourism planning and development issues (pp. 3-20). Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Kutz, E. (1990). Authority and voice in student ethnographic writing. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 21, 340-357.

- Lengyel, P. (1975). Tourism in Bali: Its economic and social impact, a rejoinder. International Social Sciences Journal, 27, 753-757.
- Lew, A. A. (1986). Guidebook Singapore: The spatial organization of urban tourist attractions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.
- Lokke, V. (1987). Contextualizing the either/or: Invariance/variation and dialogue in Jakobson/Bakhtin. In C. Koelb & V. Lokke (Eds.), The current in criticism (pp. 201-241). West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- MacCannell, D. (1976). The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class. New York: Schocken Books.
- Machlis, G. E., & Burch, W. R. (1983). Relations between strangers: Cycles of structure and meaning in tourist systems. Sociological Review, 31, 666-692.
- Matejka, L., & Titunik, I. R. (1973). Translators' introduction. In L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik (Trans.), Marxism and the philosophy of language (pp. 1-6). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- McKerrow, R. E. (1989). Critical rhetoric: Theory and praxis. Communication Monographs, 56, 91-111.
- Medvedev, P. N. (1985). The formal method in literary scholarship: A critical introduction to sociological poetics (Trans. A. J. Wehrle). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Melton, J. G. (1986). Nichiren Shoshu Academy, Soka Gakkai. In J. G. Melton (Ed.), Encyclopedic handbook of cults in America (pp. 171-175). New York: Garland Publishing Co..
- Mitchell, L. S. (1979). The geography of tourism: An introduction. Annals of Tourism Research, 6, 235-244.
- Morson, G. S. (1986a). Bakhtin: Essays on his dialogues and work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morson, G. S. (1986b). The Baxtin industry. Slavic and East European Journal, 30, 81-89.
- Morson, G. S., & Emerson, C. (1989). Introduction: Rethinking Bakhtin. In G. S. Morson & C. Emerson (Eds.), Rethinking Bakhtin: Extensions and challenges (pp. 1-60). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

- Morson, G. S., & Emerson, C. (1990). Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Morton, W. S. (1973). The Japanese: How they live and work. New York: Praeger.
- Nash, D. (1981). Tourism as anthropological subject. Current Anthropology, 22, 461-482.
- Nash, D. (1989). Tourism as a form of imperialism. In V. L. Smith (Ed.), Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism (pp. 37-51). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Nunez, T. (1963). Tourism, tradition, and acculturation. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, 34, 328-336.
- Nunez, T. (1978). Touristic studies in anthropological perspective. In V. Smith (Ed.), Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism (pp. 207-216). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (1967). Tourism development and economic growth. Paris: OECD.
- Philipsen, G. (1975). Speaking "like a man" in Teamsterville: Culture patterns of role enactment in an urban neighborhood. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61, 13-22.
- Reischauer, E. O. (1970). Japan: The story of a nation. New York: Knopf.
- Reischauer, E. O. (1977). The Japanese. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reischauer, E. O. (1988). The Japanese today: Change and continuity. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rosenow, J. E., & Pulsipher, G. L. (1979). Tourism: The good, the bad and the ugly. Lincoln: Century Three Press.
- Sadler, P. G., & Archer, B. H. (1975). The economic impact of tourism in developing countries. Annals of Tourism Research, 3, 15-32.
- Said, E. W. (1978). Orientalism. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Saussure, F. (1959). Course in general linguistics. W. Baskin (Trans.), C. Bally & A. Sechehaye (Eds.). New York: Philosophical Library.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1982). The ethnography of communication. London: Basil Blackwell.

- Scribner, S. (1984). Studying working intelligence. In B. Rogoff & J. Lave (Eds.), Everyday cognition: Its development in social context (pp. 9-40). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, V. (1978). Hosts and guests. Annals of Tourism Research, 7, 13-33.
- Smith, V. L. (Ed.) (1989). Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Strauss, C. (1990). Who gets ahead? Cognitive responses to heteroglossia in American political culture. American Ethnologist, 17, 312-328.
- Thompson, C. (1983). The semiotics of M. M. Bakhtin. University of Ottawa Quarterly, 53, 11-21.
- Todorov, T. (1984). Mikhail Bakhtin: The dialogical principle. (Trans. W. Godzich). Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Turner, L., & Ash, J. (1975). The golden hordes: International tourism and the pleasure periphery. London: Constable.
- Varley, H. P. (1983). Japanese culture. New York: C. E. Tuttle.
- Volkman, T. A. (1990). Visions and revisions: Toraja culture and the tourist gaze. American Ethnologist, 17, 91-110.
- Voloshinov, V. N. (1973). Marxism and the philosophy of language (L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik, Trans.). New York: Seminar Press.
- Voloshinov, V. N. (1976). Freudianism: A Marxist critique. I. R. Titunik (Trans.). New York: Seminar Press.
- Warshaw, Steven. (1990). Japan emerges: A concise history of Japan from its origin to the present. Berkeley, CA: Diablo Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). Vygotsky and the social formation of mind. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- White, A. (1984). Bakhtin, sociolinguistics and deconstruction. In F. Groversmith (Ed.), The theory of reading (pp. 123-146). Sussex: The Harvester Press.
- Young, G. (1973). Tourism: Blessing or blight? Harmondsworth: Penguin.

APPENDIX

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN AND HIS CIRCLE—A SOCIOHISTORICAL SUMMARY OF BASIC CONCEPTS

Introduction

Given the social-historical character of Bakhtinian analysis, to understand the richness of Bakhtin and his associates' work, it is important and necessary for one to be acquainted with Bakhtin's life circumstances. In this chapter, I will first outline a biography of Bakhtin, situating his work in the four major periods of his life. I then turn to a detailed explanation of Bakhtin's basic ideas. Through three vantage points—communicators, messages, and context—I will constantly contrast Bakhtinian ideas with the standard Western model of communication to highlight its sociohistorical character.

Mikhail Bakhtin and His Work

Who was Mikhail Bakhtin? In the absence of an overall framework in which to place his work, Bakhtin's eclecticism and scope of inquiry seem overwhelming, touching on literature, philology, history, philosophy, ethics, linguistics, cultural studies, and a number of other areas. To add to the difficulty, Bakhtin was a relentless eccentric, situating his studies well outside the standard historical and critical frameworks familiar to most scholars. Nevertheless, on further examination, there appear to be a limited number of prominent and readily identifiable themes which tie the events and products of Bakhtin's scholarly career together. These are most conveniently presented against the background of twentieth century history, particularly the tumult of Soviet politics. To describe the evolution of Bakhtin's ideas, I will first provide a brief biography of Bakhtin, then describe the major periods of his scholarly work.

Biography

Mikhail Bakhtin was born in Orel, Russia, on November 16, 1895. Bakhtin's family had been members of the old Russian nobility since at least the fourteenth century, though by the time of Bakhtin's birth they no longer owned property. Bakhtin lived in several cities during his childhood: Orel, then Vilnius (Lithuania), and finally Odessa, where he finished the gymnasium and took a job teaching history and philology at the local university in 1913. He later transferred to St. Petersburg University, and in 1920 moved to Vitebsk, where he became embroiled in a fledgling cultural movement that included prominent scientists, expatriate artists such as Marc Chagall, musicians who taught at the local conservatory, and a number of well-known Russian literary figures.

With the rest of Russia embroiled in civil war and revolution, Vitebsk was one of a few havens for intellectuals fleeing Moscow and Petrograd. In Vitebsk, Bakhtin and several of his closest associates, including his friends Pavel N. Medvedev and Valentin N. Voloshinov, were actively involved in debates, colloquia, publications, and other scholarly activities. Some of the ideas of Bakhtin which have proved so influential in recent years may be traced to the ferment that surrounded the activities of his circle in Vitebsk in the 1920s.

Since birth, Bakhtin had been afflicted with osteomyelitis, a degenerative bone disease; in the early 1920s, the disease spread to the point where Bakhtin had become permanently handicapped. In Vitebsk, he met Elena Aleksandrovna, who cared for him through flareups of his illness and several operations. Bakhtin married Elena in 1921, and continued to lecture at colloquia and to informal discussion groups, though the pain from his illness was often so acute that he was obliged to lecture while lying on a couch. Despite his condition, as well as a general decline in intellectual activity which had begun in Vitebsk shortly after Bakhtin's

arrival, these years were among the most productive in Bakhtin's career. Though little published work remains from the period, Bakhtin was extremely active in public discussions, lectures, and the writing of preliminary sketches of the books which were to be published later in his career and after his death.

In 1924, Bakhtin moved to Leningrad, where several colleagues in his circle had already taken up residence. By this time, Leningrad had recovered from the worst of the privations of the civil war. The city was the site of intense competition among various intellectual groups vying for government subsidies and the notice of their colleagues. Bakhtin kept largely out of these battles, but as a result suffered from lack of income and the connections which would have brought his work to the notice of the Leningrad intellectual and academic community.

As the decade of the 1920s progressed, however, the iconoclastic views of the Bakhtin circle increasingly isolated them from the trends toward conformity and bureaucratization in Soviet society. Several of Bakhtin's colleagues modified their public positions, even while expressing privately the opinions that had distinguished their group in their early days in Vitebsk. In particular, Voloshinov and Medvedev openly espoused Marxist ideology and joined the Stalinist regime which had become entrenched by the end of the 1920s. Nevertheless, primarily because of their discussion of religious matters, many members of the group remained under the threat of political repression throughout the Stalinist era.

Bakhtin was arrested and put into prison on January 7, 1929, as part of a general roundup of intellectuals and religious leaders. Due perhaps to his reputation as a scholar, or perhaps to his infirm health, Bakhtin's brief internment was rather mild. He was never placed on trial and was seldom interrogated. Several of his family and friends began a campaign to have him released and in December 1929, he was let out of detention to recuperate in his home. Officials

informed Bakhtin's wife that they had originally intended to sentence him to ten years' imprisonment, but decided instead to change his sentence to six years' exile in the town of Kustanai in Kazhakstan.

Bakhtin and Elena lived in Kustanai from 1930 to 1934. Bakhtin got along quite well with the populace in Kustanai, where the officials responsible for agricultural collectivization found use for his ability as a teacher and the knowledge of clerical procedure he had learned from his father, a banker. Ironically, Bakhtin, who was forbidden to teach literature and philology by the terms of his exile, found himself teaching courses in bookkeeping to the pig farmers of Kustanai.

On August 4, 1934, Bakhtin's exile was officially over, though he did not return immediately to Leningrad. Despite his exile, and primarily on the strength of his friend Medvedev's recommendation, Bakhtin was hired to teach at the Mordovia Pedagogical Institute in Saransk. The Institute, barely five years old, forced upon Bakhtin a severe workload: three required courses per term, one elective, and several required lectures on literary subjects to Party officials.

However, in 1937, most of the faculty of the Institute were caught in the Great Purges of the Stalin era. Though Bakhtin escaped the initial wave of trials and imprisonment, he was afraid that he would eventually be arrested, leading him to resign on July 20, 1937. Bakhtin's political background made him persona non grata in Moscow; in fact, legally, he was not allowed to live any closer to the city than 100 kilometers. Just outside that range lay the town of Savelovo, where Bakhtin and his wife moved in 1937.

In 1938, the pain in Bakhtin's right leg grew to the point that it had to be amputated. By the end of 1938, the Great Purges had reached a climax and began to lose their force; as a result, the pressures on the Russian intelligentsia began to ease. Bakhtin found himself in great demand as a lecturer and discussant.

Moreover, he was well supplied with books, borrowed secretly by a friend at the Lenin Library in Moscow and brought to Savelovo. As an amputee, Bakhtin received a small pension from the government, freeing him of the need to work, and allowing him to spend all of his time writing.

In 1941, taking advantage of a provision that a student could present a dissertation without going through a program of graduate study, Bakhtin wrote his doctoral dissertation for the Gorky Institute. Bakhtin's scholarly career was delayed by World War II, though the need for people to fill jobs under the emergency conditions of the war caused Soviet authorities to be more lenient about allowing former exiles to teach in the schools. Bakhtin taught the Russian language in the local Savelovo schools from January 1942 to September 1945. While his teaching may have improved his standing with government officials, it left him little time to write. Nevertheless, by the end of the war, Bakhtin had redeemed himself in the eyes of the Soviet authorities; in 1945, he was even given back his position at the Pedagogical Institute in Saransk. He was appointed chairman of the Department of General Literature at the Institute and promoted to the rank of docent in September 1945.

In Saransk, Bakhtin got back to his dissertation, an examination of the place of folk humor as an expression of rebellion in the Renaissance, as treated in the works of Rabelais. However, before Bakhtin could defend his dissertation, the authorities passed strict new measures designed to bring literature and its criticism more in line with Party ideology. Among other restrictions, Party officials limited references to folk practices which, to them, made the Russian people seem primitive. Critics expanded on this idea, arguing that to venerate folk forms and folk humor (as Bakhtin had done in his dissertation) was misguided and wrong.

Bakhtin was brought before a special committee and charged with overly emphasizing such aspects of Rabelais' work as his grotesque images of the human

body and its processes. At about the same time, Party officials began a campaign attacking the Gorky Institute for its liberal policy toward accepting dissertations, singling out Bakhtin's dissertation as particularly problematic. The Institute postponed review of the dissertation until June 1951, officially awarding Bakhtin, not the doctorate, but the lesser candidate's degree on June 2, 1952.

Both materially and in terms of status, Bakhtin's later years in Saransk may have been the most rewarding of his life. Following Stalin's death in 1953, there was more encouragement of intellectual activity, though apparently Bakhtin did not benefit immediately from the relaxation of political pressure, perhaps because he had little ambition and preferred to pursue his studies out of the public eye. However, Bakhtin's health continued to decline and in 1961 he asked to retire from his teaching position at the Institute.

In 1966, the daughter of Yuri Andropov, then head of the KGB, took a seminar in which Bakhtin's work was presented. Impressed by Bakhtin's ideas, the young woman persuaded authorities to take Bakhtin and his wife Elena into the Kremlin hospital, normally reserved for the elite of Soviet society. But by 1970, Andropov told his daughter that the Bakhtins could no longer stay, and they were placed in an old people's home in Grivno, not far from Moscow. There, in 1971, Elena's deteriorating heart condition worsened, and in November 1971, she was transferred to a hospital in nearby Podolsk, where she died about a month later.

Bakhtin was shattered by the loss of Elena, with whom he had been very close. Moreover, he had long ago lost the use of his remaining leg. Reluctantly, he decided to join the Writer's Union because it offered health care and residence benefits. In 1971, Bakhtin moved to a home for creative writers in Peredelkino. As a result of a petition by several colleagues, Bakhtin was finally given permission to live in Moscow on July 31, 1972. Money saved through the thrifty habits of his wife, together with royalties coming in from the long-delayed publication of his

books, gave Bakhtin a comfortable living in a two-room Moscow apartment in his final years. By August 1974, however, his health had deteriorated to the point that he could no longer work. Through the remaining months of his life, he was cared for by teams of nurses, supported by oxygen inhalators, and given constant injections. Mikhail Bakhtin died on March 7, 1975.

The Major Periods of Bakhtin's Career

The above biographic outline provides a framework against which the development of the ideas of Bakhtin and his associates can be better grasped: there are characteristic concepts and representative works associated with each period. Following the chronological classification system of Morson and Emerson (1990), the career of Mikhail Bakhtin can be divided into roughly four periods: (1) from 1919 to 1924 (the early years of the cultural renaissance going on in Vitebsk); (2) from 1924 to 1930 (from the time of the move to Leningrad through his arrest); (3) from 1930 to the early 1950s (encompassing Bakhtin's release from jail, subsequent exile, and ultimate reconciliation with Soviet authorities); and (4) from the early 1950s to 1975 (from the beginnings of widespread public notice of Bakhtin's ideas to his death).

The first period (1919-1924) is characterized by a preoccupation with aesthetics. Strongly influenced by the approach of Kant (though not necessarily by his conclusions), Bakhtin argued that the aesthetic act provided a link between ethics and cognition. During this period, Bakhtin was not concerned with language as such, although his writing appears to be driven by a largely negative response to Formalist literary criticism. Representative of this period is the 1924 article, "The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art," in which Bakhtin decries the Formalist tendency to analyze literature in terms of linguistic devices purportedly used by authors to achieve "effects." Nevertheless, despite his

objections, Bakhtin was unable in this period to provide a reasonable alternative to Formalism.

Bakhtin's main task in the second period (1924-1930) was to discover an alternative literary critical methodology to replace Formalism. In the 1929 book, Problems of Dostoevsky's Creative Art (available in English as Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics (Bakhtin, 1984a)), Bakhtin offers a provisional answer to this problem: a typology of prosaic language, as expressed in the novels of Dostoevsky. In contrast to the first period, the focus of attention in the second period is on language as such. Bakhtin is obliged to redefine language in a way as distinct as possible from Formalism and structural linguistics. The Formalists had elevated poetics; Bakhtin, in answer, felt that the key to social language was to be found in language use in the novel, the study of which can be called "prosaics" (Morson & Emerson, 1990).

In the third period (1930 to the early 1950s), Bakhtin's perspective broadens from its specific focus on Dostoevsky to the use of language in all novels. In this period, Bakhtin is also concerned with the place of the novel in human consciousness and its relation to history, as well as to the factors which distinguish the novel from other literary genres. These ideas are discussed extensively in the essays, "Discourse in the Novel," "From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse," and "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" (all of which are included in English translation in the 1981 collection, The Dialogic Imagination (Bakhtin, 1981)). In this period is also to be found another specific example of Bakhtin's analysis of the novel, the 1940 book (based on his dissertation), Rabelais and His World (available in English as Rabelais and His World (Bakhtin, 1984b)).

In the final period of Bakhtin's career (late 1950s to 1975), he returned to the ethical and philosophical concerns with which he began. His chief project in this period, according to Morson and Emerson (1990), was to cull the best of his work

into a synthesis which could be used to provoke further discussion of the issues he had raised. The questions he addresses are of the broadest possible scope, reflected in the titles of his essays of this period—for example, “Toward a Methodology for the Human Sciences”—and the unfinished character of several bodies of notes he was making for future projects. Bakhtin’s writing during this period also reflects a professional sense of responsibility to future scholars by proposing the outlines of investigations to be taken up by others.

Bakhtin’s Ideas of Communication

One useful way to categorize the diverse ideas of the Bakhtin circle is to look at specific elements of the critiques they pose to the standard sender-receiver model of human communication. This model, espoused by Ferdinand de Saussure and other structural linguists, was criticized as a seriously flawed representation of the process of communication, primarily because it ignored the specifically social characteristics of speech and writing. The standard elements of the sender-receiver model (sending/receiving communicators, message, and context) were held by Bakhtin’s circle to be grotesque oversimplifications of the true nature of even the most ordinary or common speech. To the Bakhtin group, describing communication in the abstract is a dangerous indulgence, since communication is performed by specific people, is directed toward specific others at specific times and places, and is performed in awareness of specific social and historical circumstances in the past, present, and future.

Nevertheless, given the familiarity that most people have with the sender-receiver model, its components provide a useful framework to explain the elements of the Bakhtin circle’s approach. As can be seen from the sketch of Bakhtin’s life, the work of the Bakhtin circle was often defined in contradistinction to received views of language and culture. Moreover, one of the principles of the

group was that all ideas owe at least part of their substance to the ideas which they oppose, being defined as alternatives to the known. To offer a detailed account of Bakhtinian view of communication, I will examine the Bakhtin circle's arguments against the traditional views of the three elements of communication:

(1) communicators; (2) message; and (3) context.

Communicators

Who "transmits" or "receives" communication in the Bakhtin view of written and spoken discourse? The Bakhtin group was particularly troubled at the simplicity implied by the visual metaphor used by Saussure (1959) and other structural linguists to explain communication: communication originating in the brain of a sender, being "sent out" and crossing relatively uncluttered space, passing "into" the brain of the receiver. Such a depiction of the process of communication, the Bakhtin group argued, emphasizes only certain elements, primarily rules of syntax and grammar, particularly as these relate to the processing of language. One develops such an abstract representation only by systematically excluding those facets of the communication process which are specific to the context in which communication occurs. Rather than try to exclude complexity from depictions of the communicator, Bakhtin and his group sought to define the communicator in all of his/her complexity, primarily by reference to the embeddedness of the self in specific sociohistorical circumstances. In the view of Bakhtin's circle, the communicator can never escape society and history. To understand the ramifications of this argument, one needs to understand five basic concepts in the work of the Bakhtin group: (1) self; (2) point of view; (3) ideology; (4) exotopy; and (5) voice. These five concepts begin at the communicator's "core self" and move outward through increasingly complex levels of meaning toward

the individual communicator's personal, but at the same time socially-infused, style of discourse.

Self. Of the broadly ranging themes covered by the work of Bakhtin and his associates, and regardless of whether the subject is literature (Bakhtin, 1981; Bakhtin, 1984; Bakhtin, 1986), semiology (Voloshinov, 1973),¹ literary criticism (Medvedev, 1985), the act of artistic creativity (Bakhtin, 1990), or psychology (Voloshinov, 1976), the Bakhtin circle's central concern is with how the self defines itself, particularly with respect to other selves and to the sociohistorical forces in society. There exists no meaningful discourse which is not situated in a specific place and time. According to the Bakhtin circle, one can explain communication only by reference to the individual speaking subject, to the individual listening subject, and to the specific context in which the act of communication is performed. "[The speaker's] orientation toward the listener is an orientation toward a specific conceptual horizon, toward the specific world of the listener . . ." (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 282).

Self and others. On this view of the self-other relationship, the act of communicating (or prior to communicating, thinking) becomes a special and unique instantiation of the communicator's identity: it involves turning, not inward toward internal ontological verification, but rather outward in the act of joining oneself to existence. One "goes out" to other social actors in search of

¹ It is beyond the scope of this dissertation, as well as the abilities of its author, to contribute in any meaningful way to the debate over whether the two books commonly attributed to Bakhtin's colleague V. N. Voloshinov (Marxism and the Philosophy of Language [Voloshinov, 1973] and Freudianism: A Marxist Critique [Voloshinov, 1976]), as well as another book attributed to a second Bakhtin colleague, P. N. Medvedev (The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship [Medvedev, 1985]), were written jointly with Bakhtin, by Voloshinov and Medvedev themselves, or by Bakhtin himself using the two colleagues' names as pseudonyms. The implications of this debate—which are not devoid of substantive interest bearing upon the writings themselves—are summarized in the Clark and Holquist biography (Clark & Holquist, 1984); Clark's and Holquist's account is challenged by Emerson and Morson (1989). In this research, the convention of referring to the three books as the works of Voloshinov and Medvedev will be used.

knowledge to bring back in the fashioning of one's self, defining the self in contradistinction to, and cooperation with, the other. The social environment in which communicators find themselves becomes the primary source from which to draw resources which are then used to fashion a version of the self that will be involved in the communicative process. As Emerson (1986) notes, "... the fit between self and society may not be perfect, indeed cannot be perfect, but the mechanisms are always present to engage self and society in dialogue" (p. 26).²

Thus, the self is essentially social, not simply in the sense of constantly living in the structure of society (as structuration theory would have it), but in the sense that the self may be said to be composed of conceptions of other selves. In this the Bakhtin group are similar to many Marxists, holding that, "... each of us is constituted not as an individual . . . self but as a collective of the many selves we have taken in from birth" (Booth, 1982, p. 51). Since it is primarily through communication that individuals encounter other selves to employ in fashioning their own self-identity, it is by words that one understands the world, by words that one enacts what one discovers, and by words that one communicates to others the special characteristics of one's own identity.

The self, then, is not privately owned, but is shared with others. If one is dependent upon others in the social world for self-definition, then one can hardly lock away what one most prizes (self-identity) and claim it for one's own. It belongs to other people, those one has heard about, read, argued with, been praised

² In this respect, the Bakhtin circle's thought is similar to Anthony Giddens' theory of structuration (Giddens, 1976, 1979), "... the process of producing and reproducing social systems through members' application of generative rules and resources (structures). Fundamental to this process is the duality of structure: structures are at once the medium and the outcome of social action. They are its medium because members draw on rules and resources to interact within and produce practices. They are its outcome because rules and resources exist only by virtue of being used in a practice . . ." (Poole, McPhee, & Seibold, 1986:247). The group differs from Giddens, however, in their consistent resistance to the reification of structure as an entity separate from the self, as well as to the conception of social structure as distinct from the collective of human beings that constitute it.

by, threatened by, hurt by, rewarded by, or robbed by. What people know about themselves, they have obtained from others.

The text. If one assumes that selves are fashioned in concert with other selves in the social environment, then it is more difficult to assume that texts which describe social actors (either one's self or others) are either stable or permanent. The words which one speaks or writes enter the social environment, not as unchanging entities, but as shifting, ephemeral systems of signification whose character is negotiated in the process of social intercourse. Thus the perception of language which represents social others remaining "the same" from reading to reading is untenable, primarily because the selves of the writer, reader, and others involved in the context of reading are forever changing.

The inherent instability of the text, on its own in a world of social actors who engage it according to their own agendas, has yet another important implication: the meaning of the words will change from one time to the next. This implies further that, due to the dynamic alteration of the self's points of reference, what is written or said is never the last word on the subject, but rather a moment in the ongoing chain of representations of the "same" subject.

This is not to say that the Bakhtin group espouses a rather extreme form of relativism wherein messages may mean anything and everything. The ideas of the Bakhtin circle are grounded in their orientation to the social world, the specific sociohistorical context, for the source of material with which to fashion the text. Far from permitting any factor potentially to act in constraining the text, this view acknowledges only those which act in some identifiable—that is, sociohistorically specific—way upon the circumstances of the text's composition, reception, interpretation, and dissemination.

Thus, the Bakhtin group's theory of the self leads to the conclusion that ownership of ideas is communal. Once a representation is placed in the ongoing

stream of representations concerning the “same” subject, it assumes its meaning as much from those other representations as from any inherent signification of its own (indeed, the Bakhtin circle might say that the latter kind of signification simply does not exist, since all language is spoken or written in some sociohistorically specific setting).³ The self-identity becomes the “master standard” for comparisons of significations, and such comparisons are conducted through the medium of language.

One must also call attention to a particularly difficult manifestation of this process of self-definition through contrast with others: what might be termed the “constituted self,” or the person written or spoken about in discourse. From their earliest work, the Bakhtin group was concerned with the relationship of the author of a text to those people about whom he or she wrote. To some, the inclusion of “fictional” personalities in a discussion of the functioning of “real” society might seem unwarranted; however, the Bakhtin group proposes a strong and theoretically powerful link between “real” and “unreal.” The identities of those about whom one writes are conceived in a very special way—as closed, finished, and completed selves. Because the control of the characters’ worlds—their identities—rests with the author of a text, s/he seems to exercise a virtually all-encompassing command of their destinies. This principle is seen most clearly, of course, in the composition of fiction, where “made-up” characters populate and act within an “imaginary” world. These characters do what the author wants them to do, under circumstances of the author’s choosing: they exist in a hermetically sealed world from which escape or individual action is impossible.

³ This idea is to be distinguished from the deconstructionist view of language, “which holds that no one owns meaning” (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 12). “Deconstructionists locate meaning in the structure of the general possibility of difference underlying all particular differences. Bakhtin roots meaning in the social, though the social is conceived in a special way” (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 12).

Yet, if one accepts the principle that discourse is self-expression which is constructed and understood by utilizing resources within the broader social environment, then it cannot be true that characters created by an author operate independently of the author's social experience. To put it another way, the identities of the characters must be as much a result of the social resources available to the author as his or her own identity. It would be impossible to construct an experience entirely from imagination: at the very least, one must write in language that embodies some minimal degree of shared meaning between writer and reader, but more, the experience of those written about should resonate with the experiences of the reader. To achieve this understanding, the author is compelled to attend to the world of his or her own social experience, to extract (often by tedious trial and error) those facets of the world which will permit an explanation of his or her internal impressions in ways which will persuade a reader or readers.

Summary. The chief results of these two principles of the self are, first, that both selves and the communication which is generated by, or in turn, describes, selves, are communally, not individually, owned; and second, being dependent on others for the formulation of communication, descriptions of other selves are neither stable nor permanent. In general, this view stands somewhat against the Western psychological tradition in which self-definition is largely an individual, private matter. Indeed, the Bakhtin group argues that the study of an individual social actor and his or her discursive productions, removed from the social context in which s/he functions, leads to unwarranted abstraction about that person's "internal" mental processes, and furthermore, risks distortion of the meaning of that person's communicative messages: "To ignore the nature of the [sociohistorically specific] utterance . . . leads to perfunctoriness and excessive abstractness, distorts the historicity . . . , and weakens the link between language and

life. After all, language enters life through concrete utterances (which manifest language) and life enters language through concrete utterances as well" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 63).

To summarize: the Bakhtin circle centers its critique of how the social Other comes to be represented in communication by calling attention to two principles involved in the social act of defining the self: (1) that the self is defined only in concert with social Others who are at the same time also involved with social Others in performing their acts of self-definition; and (2) that the self's relation to the texts it produces, together with the relation of the selves of social Others to these same texts, are to be evaluated only as regards specific sociohistorical circumstances.

Point of view. In the previous section, reference was made to the notion of self-identity as a function of contact with and reaction to other selves. Yet the question remains as to precisely how the disparate factors in the social world (the majority of which are known only dimly to the individual social actor) become merged in discourse. How is it that the text, whether spoken discourse of conversation or written narrative, becomes melded for presentation and understanding in the act of communication? To answer this question, it will be necessary to explore one of Bakhtin's earliest concepts, the notion of architectonics.

Architectonics can be defined as "the general study of how entities relate to each other" (Holquist, 90, p. xi). More specifically, architectonics represents the Bakhtin circle's summary of the process through which the individual consciousness makes sense of its relationships with the world, as well as the relationships among the elements of the world itself. "The totality of such relationships I chart (and continually rechart) with the world constitutes my singular 'architectonics'" (Roberts, 89, p. 121).

The concept of architectonics. In the writings of the Bakhtin circle, the idea of architectonics is often expressed in almost Ptolemaic terms, with the self depicted as the center of a dynamic system of linkages which are maintained within the individual consciousness. The maintenance of the world as an “architectonic whole” is an individual, ongoing, active process in which one is obliged to “go out of” oneself, encounter the other, and return with material to fashion one’s self-identity. Rather than seeing point of view as a consciously assumed individualistic responsibility in which one may or may not participate (a process often referred to in social psychology as “perspective-taking”), the Bakhtin group insists that the interconnection between one’s own architectonics and that of others is inescapable, since others go out of themselves toward one’s own personality for resources to use in constructing their identities.

The maintenance of architectonics is also an extremely active process, an ongoing task which contradicts the view of discourse as unified and stable. Any unity granted to what one sees or hears is illusory, a fictive whole maintained through the equally fictive medium of a unified, stable language. The relations among entities can never be completely defined and thus always remain in dynamic tension.⁴ The individual human consciousness must treat a number of relationships in communication simultaneously—self-and-other, author-and-message, space-and-time—and will thus fashion through individual architectonics a means of granting status to both sides of these purportedly bipolar oppositions.

The concept of architectonics throws an interesting light upon the processes by which humans interpret discourse. In interpreting discourse, one often attributes to the author/speaker an unshakable monologism (single-viewpoint). By refocusing attention upon the necessity of the other’s point of view in achieving

⁴ Perhaps this is why the Bakhtin group prefers the Russian equivalent for the term “architectonics” over the more common “architecture”; the latter suggests more rigidity of structure.

one's own understanding, the Bakhtin group challenges the assumption that any text can be described as possessing only a single viewpoint. By making the reader/listener/understander an active participant in the architectonics of reality construction, the Bakhtin group denies the possibility of perceiving only the author or the character, space or time, self or other. Rather, the group insists that both elements of these pairs of conceptions, as well as the architectonics of the relations between them, are required for communication to be achieved, often at great expense of energy: "Involving two more key Bakhtinian terms, we may say that wholes are never given, but always achieved; work—the struggle to effect a whole out of the potential choice of parts—is precisely what, in fact, architectonics theorizes" (Holquist, 1990, p. xxiii).

Since architectonics is comprised of the ordering of meaning with its essential goal of representational unity in the individual human consciousness,⁵ it follows that architectonics is possible only in the context of human activity. Thus, abstraction from immediate experience has little or no significance in the thought of the Bakhtin circle; describing discourse in general terms, for example, is irrelevant except as a convenience to make writing or speaking easier. What matters is that each piece of discourse represents conceptual unity as achieved by the individual speaking subject, driven by that individual's architectonics, and derived from that individual's "excess of seeing"; and each piece of discourse is directed toward encountering and breaching another speaking subject's similarly conceptual unity, architectonics, and excess of seeing.

⁵ Here, the Bakhtin circle differs from Heidegger; for the latter, truth consists of discovery, or uncovering, so that understanding is essentially a private struggle in which one apprehends by tearing truth from entities, whereas "... Bakhtinian understanding respects and rigorously maintains the 'otherness' of the object, since meaning is not wrested away but rather conferred in a relationship of answerability with the self" (Roberts, 1989, p. 122). Again, it is the resolute insistence of the linking of self with others which imparts to the Bakhtin group's work its distinctive flavor.

Since the Bakhtin group's perspective requires viewing communication as sociohistorically specific, it follows that one begins to understand the speaker/listener in the communicative act by discovering as much as possible about the time and space occupied by the communicators. The metaphor "point of view" implies seeing, and seeing, as Holquist (1990) notes, "occurs only from a particular place" (p. xxv).

Further, the group claims, each individual actor occupies a completely unique "place" from which he or she views the world, a vantage point unique to that individual alone: ". . . what I see is not the same as what anyone else sees. Perception, how I 'see' the world, is always refracted, as it were, through the optic of my uniqueness" (Holquist, 1990, p. xxv). This leads to each actor having "an excess of seeing," that is, an ability to perceive what others cannot.

Discourse as contested. The preceding discussion of complexity of self and point of view sets the stage to describe a model of communication which focuses more upon conflict than many traditional models of communication. In the Bakhtin group's model, meaning is contested precisely because of the uniqueness of the individual points of view of the communicants. By insisting on the inescapable linking of individual and social through the medium of architectonics, the Bakhtin group argues that each instance of discourse, or utterance, must be inevitably contested. If each individual's architectonics is unique to that individual alone, the mere introduction of communication generated from such architectonics, reflecting that individual's unique point of view, is to compel engagement with other discourses, generated from architectonics which in turn are necessarily distinct from one's own.

As a communicating social actor, one is inevitably locked into a struggle in which one's own architectonics strive to anticipate, adjust to, and penetrate the architectonics of others. Since others are also constantly engaged in this process, it

is impossible to describe any discourse as “neutral.” The engagement of issues of self-identity are initiated with the entry of each act of communication into the social arena.

Moreover, the fact that each and every social actor possesses a unique point of view means that each social actor develops an array of strategies for formulating communication. Realizing that others possess unique points of view, one is obliged to take into account their “excesses of seeing” in formulating one’s own messages. This can even be viewed as a kind of pre-emptive self-monitoring which in turn is strongly influenced by political and social factors such as national and institutional status and individual power.

Voloshinov provides a particularly memorable explanation of this relationship between formulation of architectonic principles and the language which expresses them:

Orientation of the word toward the addressee has an extremely high significance. In point of fact, word is a two-sided act. It is determined equally by whose word it is and for whom it is meant. As word, it is precisely the product of the reciprocal relationship between speaker and listener, addresser and addressee. Each and every word expresses the “one” in relation to the “other.” I give myself verbal shape from another’s point of view, ultimately, from the point of view of the community to which I belong. A word is a bridge thrown between myself and another. If one end of the bridge depends on me, then the other depends on my addressee. A word is territory shared by both addresser and addressee, by the speaker and his interlocutor.
(Voloshinov, 1973, p. 86)

This position, by devaluing individualistic or cognitive factors in the formulation and interpretation of messages, contests the assumptions of many received models of human communication. Nevertheless, Voloshinov’s arguments follow inevitably from the Bakhtin group’s conceptions of the self and the self’s point of view. The theory of architectonics links social experience, in all of its varieties of

expression for each individual, to the production of discourse. Rather than seeking meaning in words, architectonics seeks to explain meaning by reference to the lived experience of oneself and others. Consideration of architectonics makes it difficult to conceive of discourse as unified (monologic): the involvement of the architectonics of others necessitates inclusion of divergent, and frequently conflicting, points of view.

In summary, the Bakhtin group aims at reformulating the assumed monologism of point of view, as instantiated in discourse, by their insistence on three principles: (1) that each individual social actor apprehends the phenomenal world through the inter-relations which comprise a unique architectonics; (2) that the achievement of architectonic wholes is an active process which involves considerable effort; and (3) that the instantiation of the world through the process of architectonics inevitably engages the unique architectonics of other social actors.

At the next remove from the core of the self, one needs to take account of the sociohistorical background invested in one's architectonics as a result of having experienced social others over one's life span. Discussion of this factor involves taking up another term which the Bakhtin group (particularly Voloshinov) employs in a special sense: the concept of ideology.

Ideology. Given the uniqueness of the self's individual architectonics and the point of view from which one engages the social world, it is legitimate to question the origins of individual perspective. Here too, the relentless orientation of the Bakhtin circle toward the social world shows itself. According to the group, the formulation of architectonics is hardly an individual act, but rather is fashioned of experiences with others who act out of their own architectonics. Nevertheless, over time, architectonics of individuals who act as aggregates build up and maintain mass systems of meaning. Individual systems of meaning contribute to and at the same time are influenced by mass systems of meaning.

These large-scale architectonic systems have been called by many names, including "culture," but the Bakhtin circle (particularly Voloshinov) referred to them as ideology.

The concept of ideology. In the earlier work of the Bakhtin circle, "Ideology is defined . . . in the characteristic Marxist way as a discourse on reality which can either distort reality or be true to it" (Thompson, 1983b, p. 17). As Emerson (1986) says, the Bakhtin circle's term ideologija, rendered as the English cognate "ideology," loses something in translation. Whereas the ordinary use of the word "ideology" connotes inflexibility of viewpoint, propaganda, and political repression, "For Bakhtin and his colleagues, it meant simply an 'idea system' determined socially, something that means" (Emerson, 1986, p. 23).

As Clark and Holquist (1984) point out, no full-fledged definition of the term "ideology" is to be found in the works of the Bakhtin circle. Nevertheless, Clark and Holquist explain that "ideology" in Bakhtin's work seems to be similar to what some commentators have in mind when they refer to cultural competence:

Members of different cultures have competence in the specific ways whereby their own systems assign order to the world. They know when something is "correct" or not in table manners, dress codes, and sexual relations, just as surely as they know when someone is or is not using the spoken language of the culture correctly. (Clark & Holquist, 1984, pp. 224-225)

The role of signs. The Bakhtin group insisted on the inescapably social nature of the sign, thereby suggesting that "ideology exists, in a material sense, in and through the language which constitutes it" (McKerrow, 1989, p. 102). Indeed, Voloshinov (1973) is uncharacteristically blunt in asserting, "Wherever a sign is

present, ideology is present, too. Everything ideological possesses semiotic value" (p. 10).⁶

Each ideological system has different ways of exercising influence over the production, dissemination, and comprehension of signs. On the other hand, there are no signs devoid of connection to living systems of ideology—no signs, in other words, which do not signify something in lived experience of sociohistorically specific human beings. This position strongly contradicts the abstract linguistic semiology of Saussure: signs, according to the Bakhtin group, may not be conceived apart from the people who use them. They do not exist in the abstract.

If one accepts the idea that all communication is socially enacted, then the linkage between ideological systems of meaning and their expression rests in language. As the chief vehicle through which signification is possible, the word, as the indivisible unit by which language is comprehended, is the lifeline connecting sign to experience. As Voloshinov (1973) puts it,

It is owing to this exclusive role of the word as the medium of consciousness that the word functions as an essential ingredient accompanying all ideological creativity whatsoever. The word accompanies and comments on each and every ideological act. The processes of understanding any ideological phenomenon at all (be it a picture, a piece of music, a ritual, or an act of human conduct) . . . are bathed by, suspended in, and cannot be entirely segregated or divorced from the element of speech. (p. 15)

In other words, using language, one cannot not be ideological. If one lives as a human being in social systems, one will be influenced by signs through their chief vehicle, words, and will thus become simultaneously an architect of, and the

⁶ In these earlier works, the living character of the sign is frequently offered as a counterweight to Saussure's model of communication in which sign is an internalistic and mentalistic construct functioning in a more or less fixed relationship to the signified.

product of, the ideological systems into which one is acculturated:⁷ “. . . all products of the human mind, from the simplest tools to the most elaborate cosmologies, are born of thought, which at its higher levels can execute ordering and generative tasks only by means of signs” (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 225).

Likewise, every sign encountered in lived experience must take its meaning from its connection to one or more ideological systems. Finally, since no socialization can take place without involving the medium of language, each instance of language use brings with it the unavoidable connection to both signs and the ideological system(s) which have given them life.⁸ As Booth (1982) summarizes this position,

In this view ideology cannot be conceived as something to be avoided at all cost; it is inescapable in every moment of human speech. We speak with our ideology—our collection of languages, of words-laden-with-values. And the speaking is always thus more or less polyglot—it is a collection. Though some speakers may aspire to the condition of monologue, we have all inherited languages from many different sources (“science, art, religion, class, etc.”), and to attempt to rule out all voices but “my own” is at best an artificial pretense. (p. 51)

Given its embeddedness in the medium of human discourse, then, ideology is essentially a social phenomenon. Communication is not the expression of inner

⁷ The tendency of modern readers to assume that this preoccupation with ideology is reflective of the Marxist orientation of many writers of the period in which Bakhtin and his colleagues wrote is one of the reasons why the debate over the authorship of the Voloshinov books is so significant. The argument is that it makes a difference whether the Marxist references in Marxism and the Philosophy of Language are a product of Voloshinov (an official of the government) or of Bakhtin, who was exiled by that same government (and is thought by some to have published his thoughts under the name of his friend Voloshinov in order to escape further difficulties with the authorities). Thus, the authorship of the works may make a significant difference in any attempt to summarize the Bakhtin corpus.

⁸ A useful comparison on this point may be made to the work of Vygotsky, who built his distinctive psychology based upon two key principles: first, that psychological theories must be based on sociohistorically specific studies, and second, that the individual’s consciousness begins in “external” society. Bakhtin’s group, however, emphasized the dialogic nature of what Vygotsky termed “inner speech,” and provided a much more detailed theoretical treatment of individual than Vygotsky was willing, or was able, to undertake. The connections between the work of these influential Soviet contemporaries is explored in Wertsch (1985, pp. 225-229), and Emerson & Morson (1986, pp. 27-30).

personality; rather, what comes to be expressed through personality is the result of inwardly formulated language, “spelled” according to the influence of the ideological systems out of which they are created, and to whose maintenance they in turn contribute through their use in communicative interaction.

A good metaphor to conceive of ideology in this way is to compare it to freight or baggage: discursive representation of the social Other enters social life burdened with ideological baggage, which it carries with it throughout its experience in contact with other ideologies. The ideology will be modified in contact with other ideologies, but ideology will never be absent. To depict language which represents social others as “value-neutral” is to try to define representation as something it can never be: free of ideology.

If each act of communication carries ideological baggage, unique to the architectonics of the individual who communicates it, then one might wonder how it is ever possible to communicate at all. If social actors cannot, by definition, share their architectonic systems, one might be tempted to assume that there exists too much difference between people for sharing of thoughts, ideas, and opinions to be possible. However, to the Bakhtin group, the necessary difference among individual architectonics is precisely what does guarantee understanding. Understanding is conferred through the realization of difference, not similarity.

The Bakhtin group’s focus on ideology and language represents their most identifiable divergence from most theories of discursive meaning. By insisting on the centrality of ideology, the group devalues abstraction from experience and thus places less emphasis on formal models. This allows the critical reader of linguistic representations to focus upon the unique features of representational discourse to a much greater degree than is possible in many theories of linguistics or communication.

Summary. The Bakhtin circle's view on ideology may be summarized by emphasizing the following three conclusions: (1) ideology is to be considered as lived systems of meaning enacted in sociohistorically specific circumstances; (2) as the medium through which systems of meaning (ideologies) are enacted, language is necessarily ideological; and (3) the meaning of discourse is to be sought in ideology, the meaning systems of social others, rather than in internal mentalistic mechanisms of the communicants.

Exotopy. The Bakhtin group's special term for the process of self-definition through the difference of others is exotopy. The conflict engendered by the introduction of discourse into social activity is perhaps most clearly demonstrated in the concept of exotopy, or the definition of self through radical exteriority.⁹ In propounding a view of self as jointly fashioned with others, the group breaks sharply from the ideals of synthesis or resolution of dialectical opposites favored by Soviet intellectuals of their time, preferring instead to insist that the essential task of human consciousness is to sustain and to think through one's difference. This is far more than simply accepting difference: the Bakhtin circle holds that difference is not something that one may take or leave, but rather is the inescapable and most essential aspect of self-identity.

Otherness. The mere fact of living in the world involves a quest for self-identity through the cultivation of individual architectonics and the "excess of seeing," compelling each living entity to be constantly aware of its own uniqueness, and to be conscious of both the self and the other's difference. The individual remains the builder ("architect") of his or her own identity, but the fact

⁹ Before going further into the Bakhtin group's work, it might be worthwhile to mention their fascination with terminology. Even if one avoids some of their more unusual neologisms (such as "words-with-a-loophole," or "words-with-a-sideways-glance"), the basic grounds of the group's thought are still expressed with words that sound strange even to those who speak Russian. The term "exotopy" is one such word; its definition as "radical exteriority" fails to suggest its meaning, but its centrality to the thought of the Bakhtin circle makes it impossible to avoid.

that all others are engaged in the same enterprise means that one must reckon with other systems of meaning which, by same ground rules governing the architectonics of one's own identity, involve many other "excesses of seeing," many other unique viewpoints.

Furthermore, the process by which one achieves self-definition through a respect for otherness is active, deliberate, and constitutive of change both for the initiator and the recipient of the social contact. The Bakhtin circle calls this process "living into," the ". . . going out to the other in order to come back with a self. I 'live into' an other's consciousness; I see the world through that other's eyes. But I must never completely meld with that version of things, for the more successfully I do so, the more will I fall prey to the limitations of that other's horizon. A complete fusion (a dialectical aufhebung), even if it were possible, would preclude the difference required by dialogue" (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 78).

It is very important to distinguish between exotopy and the imagined state of empathy implied by most models of understanding through communication. In the view of the Bakhtin group, empathy is illusory because it is based upon abstraction and upon the mistaken assumption that one can share architectonics with another. Instead of settling for a comfortably abstract view of imagined understanding, the group argued, one must acknowledge that understanding is effortful, precisely because understanding involves creating a new perspective, composed out of one's own architectonics and the architectonics of other individuals, the former being known only to oneself, and the latter being known only to these social others. As we will see in subsequent discussion, the more widely-known Bakhtin concept of dialogism represents an expansion of this earlier notion of exotopy.

The text. If one grants the Bakhtin group's view of respective identities (that is, that each social actor possesses a unique sociohistorical vantage point from

which to view the world), then one can also apply this principle to author and character. The difference between author and character is that the author's time and space remain open but the created character's time and space remain forever closed; the latter is bounded by the author's consciousness, held as it were to a position within the author's own individual architectonics. However, this inclusive relationship is in itself dynamic, because of the unusual relationship between the two identities: "The self's place is not only here, insofar as it must be transgredient¹⁰ and not completely immersed in this environment if it is to have the perspective needed to constitute a whole out of the other and his environment. The other is completely here, insofar as I equate his self, his body, and his environment as a unified whole-insofar as I architectonically complete him" (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 79).

So the issues involved in the depiction of the social Other are made considerably more thorny when one realizes that the author engages in a struggle with the Other, with the aim of making the Other wholly a product of the author's words. This inscription of the Other in language is an issue with which ethnographers are currently being forced to wrestle (Clifford & Marcus, 1986): how can the representer of the cultural Other in academic discourse be absolved from the responsibilities which accompany his or her status as spokesman for a body of knowledge (i.e., classical anthropology and/or sociology) gathered without the direct input of that Other, and indeed often obtained in circumstances which suggest colonialism and domination (Caucasians, usually male, studying "less developed" peoples)?

¹⁰ Another Bakhtin neologism, meaning roughly the same as "extralocality," or the process by which one achieves self-identity through the act of encountering other entities and incorporating their viewpoints into one's own. Again, this process is somewhat more difficult than what has come to be called "perspective-taking"; in perspective-taking, the ability to assume the other's viewpoint is, to at least a limited degree, taken for granted, whereas in transgredience, that ability is specifically precluded even as it is viewed as the essence of one's own identity.

As with other so-called polarities in the Bakhtinian system of thought, the tension between the fixation of the "character's" identity as bounded by the consciousness of the author is played dynamically against all other possible interpretations of that verbal depiction by the potential readers of a narrative. This is another way of stating that the architectonics of thinking systems remain in dynamic linkage. The potential for a clash of architectonic systems is always present, not just for "real," flesh-and-blood writers and readers, but for the fictive characters as well. What ties this tenuous and often confusing interlinkage of world-pictures together is the fact that all the other pictures exist and are similarly linked to the picture that enters into the social world.

Bakhtin and his associates argue that the self ensures its uniqueness by awareness of, and respect for, the uniqueness of social Others. Nevertheless, the fact that the self cannot be fashioned individually means that the resources one uses to define oneself must inevitably conflict with the resources which social Others use to define themselves. One can never "live within" another's world, but must "live into" that world temporarily through social interaction, although such temporary "residence" within the perspectives (or, more precisely, how one conceptualizes such perspectives) of others will itself cause change in one's own architectonics over time.

Summary. The Bakhtin group diverges from prominent received views of social life and personality by their espousal of the principle of exotopy. Specifically, they assert that exotopy, or otherness, aids in the fashioning of the self in three important ways: (1) by denying the possibility of a complete fusion with the other (architectonics of individual social actors will remain largely unknown to other social actors); (2) by centralizing the search for self-identity, not simply as a search for self-definitional resources in the social Other, but as a process of going out to the Other, and coming back to the self; and (3) by emphasizing the role of language

as a means of closing the world of the Other, while at the same time opening the world of the author who describes social Others.

Exotopy is important to the formulation of communication in at least two important respects. First, one must design one's own messages through the resources granted by the contents of one's own architectonics. One's grasp of language, practice in expressing oneself, familiarity with the ideas or concepts, and a host of other factors, all combine to restrain and restrict one's options in designing communication. Second, however, the communicator anticipates the response of the person or persons toward whom the communication is directed. In both respects, self-architectonics and other-architectonics govern how a message is formulated, and the formulated message is characterized by the architectonics through which, or in anticipation of which, it is formulated. One is able to discover indications of these architectonic systems by examination of the message itself: its tone, its inflection, its idiosyncratic ways of marking itself as distinct from other messages. Collectively, these characteristics are referred in the work of the Bakhtin circle as voice.

Voice. Although the word "style," at least as traditionally used in literary studies, is not quite the same as what the Bakhtin group calls "voice," the two concepts share the common activity of judging the efficacy of a number of linguistic resources to achieve some specific communicative effect.

Literary voice. As with a number of other concepts central to the group, the idea of voice is considerably more complex than is assumed by traditional studies of language. Traditional "readings" of literary voice tend to concentrate on correlations between known sociohistorical factors in the author's life and certain stylistic idiosyncrasies found in the material he or she wrote; in the words of Kutz (1990), such studies "... see 'voice' as representing the individual subjective consciousness" (p. 342). In the writings of the Bakhtin group, however, the

presence of dynamic exteriority of voice in concert or conflict (or both) with other voices renders inoperable the simple translation of what is assumed to be “inside the author’s mind” to the printed text.

The elements of language and social practice that comprise the speaker’s voice enters into dialogue with the listener’s “inner voice,” the linguistic shaping of the world which has, through time and experience, gradually become a part of the communicator’s internal makeup. Hence, there is no possibility of language entering social life apart from the voice which communicates it; no language, in other words, exists in the abstract.

In contrast to the relatively large number of communication theories which posit widely applicable, even universal, models, this formulation raises disturbing questions. If message formulation is dependent on social activity, then one confronts a question of authority: who owns the meaning of socially experienced discourse? The answer, in Bakhtin’s often-quoted aphorism, is that, “Language lies on the borderline between oneself and the other. The word in language is half someone else’s” [Emphasis added] (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 293).

Speech genre. Each characteristic way of speaking or writing tends to develop its own means of marking itself as different from other speaking or writing. The overarching metaphor employed by the Bakhtin circle to explain the “flavors” of different languages is known as a speech genre, explained by Bakhtin as follows:

All the diverse areas of human activity involve the use of language. Quite understandably, the nature and forms of this use are just as diverse as are the areas of human activity. . . . Language is realized in the form of individual concrete utterances (oral and written) by participants in the various areas of human activity. These utterances reflect the specific conditions and goals of each such area not only through their content (thematic) and linguistic style, that is, the selection of the lexical, phraseological, and grammatical resources of the language, but above all through their compositional structure. All

three of these aspects—thematic content, style, and compositional structure—are inseparably linked to the whole of the utterance and are equally determined by the specific nature of the particular sphere of communication. Each separate utterance is individual, of course, but each sphere in which language is used develops its own relatively stable types of these utterances. These we may call speech genres. (Bakhtin, 1986b, p. 60)

One defining quality of the speech genre is the presence of two forces in the construction of specialized languages: a force tending toward standardization (agreed-upon or conventional rules for the formulation of discourse), together with a force toward uniqueness (or violation of these same rules to achieve persuasive effect). The Bakhtin group compares these two forces, respectively, to the centripetal and centrifugal forces described by physicists. It is ironic that Bakhtin's group has gained a reputation for espousing a "wide-open" brand of interpretivism, when the group's writings place equal emphasis on the former component of the circle's model, the force tending toward standardization or predictability.

There is an enormous amount of effort involved in speaking with one's own voice, grounded in one's specific time-and-place, in awareness of one's own "inner voice" and the unique architectonics of social others, and conditioned by the various considerations of an uncountable number of genres belonging to oneself and others. For this reason, in the best of circumstances, communicating social actors are never really speaking (even approximately) the "same language." One comes to understand another's voice, "... not by passively recording or deciphering his or her speech, but by actively recreating it, by establishing a dialogicality between the voices one hears and the 'innerly persuasive voice' one calls one's self" (Morson, 1985, p. 88). Thus, Morson observes, one never preserves another's voice, even when one memorizes it, records it, or writes it down; instead, one

addresses the other's voice as that voice has been actively translated (created) according to one's own architectonics.

The fact that communicating involves the consideration of a number of different factors means that values must be negotiated between communicants, a fact which both holds a great deal of promise for the flexibility of supposedly stable (fixed) languages, and at the same time leaves a great deal of room for misinterpretation. Too, the idea of "misinterpretation" should probably be recast in respect of the Bakhtin group's observations about the virtually limitless number of speech genres: if one grants the premise that the word spoken is already jointly owned with social Others, it is evident that many of these others ought to (and indeed inevitably will) have some say in determining whether a message is decoded "accurately."

Summary. In the discussion of voice, one finds in the writing of the Bakhtin group a refinement of previous discussions of narrative style, based on the underpinning of conflict inherent in the group's conception of architectonically-specific discourse. Particularly, one should note the following: (1) voice is conditioned by the principle that all discourse is jointly owned by interlocutors; (2) the necessity of imprinting upon jointly-owned discourse the speaker/writer's architectonics leads to formulating specialized "languages" known as speech genres; and (3) the achievement of unified description of social Others is accomplished by the juxtaposition of various discourses derived from distinct systems of architectonics.

Message

Throughout the preceding discussion of self, it has been necessary to make a number of specific references to the messages which are communicated between the "sender" and the "receiver." It has been shown, for example, that, in the view

of the Bakhtin group, messages are owned communally (not individually), that they cannot exist in the abstract (that is, they must be sociohistorically specific), and that their formulation and interpretation demands effortful activity (due primarily to the “baggage” they carry from their embeddedness in the unique architectonic systems of communicators).

These observations, however, constitute only the beginning of the Bakhtin circle’s critique of language. Because the group focused primarily on literature, language and its use became the central ground from which they launched their broader critique of social life and culture. However, to critique the forms of literature and language use, the group found it necessary to reformulate the central concerns of linguistics. Having abandoned the safety of abstraction favored by structural linguistics (in which one was permitted to make general statements about instances of language use based upon linguistic performances which possessed “similar structures”), Bakhtin and his associates were obliged to come up with a more appropriate unit of communication, and then to address how that unit worked. The more appropriate unit came to be called the utterance, and the way it worked was described in the circle’s writings as signification and dialectic. Let us consider each of these ideas in more detail.

Utterance. In order to fashion a sociohistorically grounded theory of communication, the Bakhtin group directed its attention away from the arbitrary categories of speech they had inherited from structural linguistics; concepts such as “sentence,” “paragraph,” “turn,” “word,” “phrase,” and so forth, while useful for the systematic description of linguistic elements, were felt to be inadequate to reflect the complex dynamics involved in the actual use of language (essentially the same conclusion as that espoused by the modern-day field of sociolinguistics (Hymes, 1962)).

Here again, the Bakhtin circle directs its critique to the dangers of excessive abstraction. For example, suppose one considers the basic unit of spoken speech to be the sentence. The concept of the sentence is intended to describe a grouping of words, regardless of the context in which these words are uttered. To put it another way, regardless of the circumstances in which it is used, the grouping of words designated as a "sentence" remains a sentence. Other linguistic concepts, from those at the micro-level (such as phonemes), to the macro-level (such as literary genre), are likewise manifestations of the predisposition of structural linguistics to emphasize abstraction at the expense of specificity.

This over-emphasis on abstract linguistic categories, according to the Bakhtin group, is particularly evident in the view of communication as the "sending" and "receiving" of messages. Because the sentence (or other linguistic unit) is held to apply to a predetermined grouping of words, regardless of who "sends" or "receives" it, there is a strong tendency on the part of sender-receiver theorist to discount the receiver's response in describing the message which is sent, as well as a tendency to discount the message's sender in describing its reception.

The Bakhtin circle wanted to include, along with the recognized abstract linguistic categories, categories oriented toward social performance of speech, based upon what they called "utterance." The idea behind the utterance is to be found in the specifically and essentially social character of communication. As Clark and Holquist (1984) put it, "Utterance is Bakhtin's covering term for a situation whose duality had been obscured by the unitizing assumption that speaking and listening were exclusive and integral activities. People were thought to do one or the other. But Bakhtin's experience confirmed that people do both simultaneously" (p. 216).

On this view, formulation of the message, like the definition of self or like the ideology-based architectonics of communicators, cannot be viewed as an individual activity. In contrast to the mentalistic notion of communicators

formulating messages internally according to the rules of grammar and syntax, favored by Saussure and other structural linguists, the Bakhtin circle held that units of meaning are to be determined socially, that is, by the social circumstances in which language is uttered.

The message never enters social life in a pure and uncontaminated state. Messages about a given subject are spoken or written in awareness of other messages which have already been written or spoken about the subject; on the other hand, such messages are also written or spoken in anticipation of future messages which have yet to be written or spoken about the subject.

The idea of the utterance was formulated in order to compensate for the fact that abstract linguistic categories of speech fail to convey the social nature of messages (the markers of where they begin and end are not to be found in the social circumstances of those who utter and understand them). "Bakhtin argues that the utterance is a more comprehensive unit than the sentence. It constitutes the whole that underwrites the completedness of sentences which act as its parts" (Clark & Holquist, 1984, pp. 217-218).

There is some indication in the writing of Saussure that he and his associates were aware of the difficulty of excluding social circumstances from the description of speech performance. This led to the attempt of Saussurean linguists to divide socially performed speech into the categories of langue (the systematic aspects of language) and parole (the individual speech act). But this "solution" drew even sharper criticism from Bakhtin and his colleagues, who held that the langue-parole distinction masked a problematic tendency of structural linguistics to limit meaning only to that which could be abstracted irrespective of context:

In particular, [Saussure's model] endorses a traditional view that the utterance is an instantiation of the linguistic system, which in turn implies that utterances are mechanical accumulations composed of units of language (words, sentences, etc.). Bakhtin objects that

although utterances do typically contain words and sentences, those sorts of entities do not exhaust the utterance's defining features. An utterance is also constituted by elements that are, from the point of view of traditional and Saussurean linguistics, extralinguistic. (Morson & Emerson, 1986, p. 125)

As in other ideas propounded by the Bakhtin group, the notion of utterance contradicts the assumption that meaning is somehow possessed by the individual formulator or understander of a message. Bakhtin and his associates thought that all communication involves sharing linguistic meaning, the introduction of an utterance being simply a moment in the ongoing stream of discourse, dependent for its meaning upon discourse occurring before and after the speaker's introduction of the unit into social existence. "After Adam," wrote Bakhtin critic Todorov (1984), "there are no nameless objects nor any unused words. Intentionally or not, all discourse is in dialogue with prior discourses on the same subject, as well as with discourses yet to come, whose reactions it foresees and anticipates. A single voice can make itself heard only by blending into the complex choir of other voices already in place" (p. x).

In the utterance, however, the Bakhtin circle saw the possibility of tying the message to the social circumstances in which it is spoken or written, thereby avoiding the pitfalls that accompany overly abstract descriptions of language. In Bakhtin's view, to treat the message in the absence of social life is to rob language of that which gives it meaning. Bakhtin's words, quoted earlier, are worth repeating: "Language enters life through concrete utterances (which manifest language) and life enters language through concrete utterances as well" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 63).

To summarize the Bakhtin group's concept of utterance, the following conclusions are evident: (1) utterance is conceived as a more appropriate marking of language units than abstract categories favored by structural linguistics; and

(2) the utterance is defined by specific sociohistorical circumstances, particularly those relating to subsequent and antecedent utterances.

However, the connection of the utterance to social existence is more than simply a matter of social practice. It is also a function of reference, those aspects of social life which the utterance signifies. To examine the Bakhtin group's view of this process of representation, it will be necessary to take up together two terms used by the group in a special sense: signification and dialectic.

Signification and dialectic. Much of the Bakhtin circle's thought on the subject of dialectic is to be found in V. N. Voloshinov's works, particularly Marxism and the Philosophy of Language (Voloshinov, 1973). Whereas Bakhtin deals primarily with the utterance and its situation in cultural and literary history, Voloshinov's focus is upon the sign and its situation in ideological circumstances. Bakhtin's group conceived of the sign "... in the very basic Augustinian tradition which defines sign as something that stands for something else" (Thompson, 1983, p. 16). However, given the emphasis Bakhtin places on the social nature of language, such an abstract conception of sign will not do. Instead, Bakhtin and his colleagues prefer to draw the distinction between "sign" and "object"; the latter, being a "thing," cannot signify. Meaning, according to this line of reasoning, is the expression of semiotic relationship between one kind of reality and another kind of reality for which it stands.¹¹

Earlier discussion focused on the central role of ideology in the Bakhtin circle's theory of semiotics, ideology having been there defined simply as "systems

¹¹ It should be noted that "... nowhere in the work of Bakhtin do we find a fully elaborated theory of semiotics" (Thompson, 1983, p. 16). Instead, various fragments from Bakhtin (and more particularly, Voloshinov) are examined, together with commentators on the Bakhtin literature, to offer an idea of what the Bakhtin circle means when it refers to "sign" and "signification." As will be evident, however, the references to semiotics in the Bakhtin corpus are made more understandable if one is acquainted with Bakhtin's overarching cultural theory and its relation to human discourse. In other words, there is nothing in the work of Bakhtin and his colleagues concerning semiotics that will radically contradict the material already summarized.

of meaning," that is, group and individual architectonics which have acquired meaning in lived experience. Voloshinov's adamant declaration—"everything ideological possesses semiotic value"—again marks the incursion of the abstract theory of the sign in the "real world" of socially specific meaning.

Since signification can occur between any two aspects of reality, there are a number of specific entities which may constitute a sign. For one thing (and this is particularly important given the Marxist agenda of the Voloshinov book), any physical object or product can, depending on the relation between itself and other systems of meaning, be considered a sign. As Voloshinov notes, this property even extends to common, or consumer, goods:

Any consumer good can likewise be made an ideological sign. For instance, bread and wine become religious symbols in the Christian sacrament of communion. The consumer good, as such, is not at all a sign. Consumer goods, just as tools, may be combined with ideological signs, but the distinct conceptual dividing line between them is not erased by the combination. Bread is made in some particular shape; this shape is not warranted solely by the bread's function as a consumer good; it also has a certain, if primitive, value as an ideological sign (e.g., bread in the shape of a figure either krendel or a rosette). (Voloshinov, 1973, p. 10)

The qualification expressed in the latter part of this quotation is essential to understanding the Bakhtin group's approach to signification. Note that Voloshinov specifies that the consumer good, which can be a sign, is not necessarily a sign, even though it may interact with other representations in the social realm which are clear and unmistakable signs. Moreover, one should realize that Voloshinov is not insisting that a given object be either a sign or an object: "Without ceasing to be a part of material reality, such an object, to some degree, reflects and refracts another reality" (Voloshinov, 1973, p. 9).

In fact, essential to the Bakhtin group's approach to signification is the idea that each and every sign, while signifying something else, is a part of the interrelated levels of reality which it describes. The essential aspect of the sign, however, lies in its extension beyond itself, into the social world of meaning. This is why Bakhtin and Voloshinov insist on the inextricable linkage between ideology and sign (where one is present, so is the other). The sign never means in any abstract sense, but rather "reflects and refracts" other systems of meaning, which are themselves grounded in specific physical circumstances. The sign (in counterposition to Saussurean semiotics) has no intrinsic meaning, but possesses a meaning conditioned by its own material reality, as well as by the reality of the thing which it comes to signify.

The Bakhtin circle's theory of the sign firmly ties signification to the physical world, and further, both the sign and the world to human consciousness. This ability to connect the so-called internal mental world and the outer world of hard reality enables the Bakhtinian model to challenge theories which seek to mark off the individual consciousness from interaction with others. As Voloshinov (1973) puts it,

Idealism and psychologism alike overlook the fact that understanding itself can come about only within some kind of semiotic material (e.g., inner speech), that sign bears upon sign, that consciousness itself can arise and become a viable fact only in the material embodiment of signs. The understanding of a sign is, after all, an act of reference between the sign apprehended and other, already known signs; in other words, understanding is a response to a sign with signs. (p. 11)
[Author's emphasis]

This view of the utterance ultimately bears on demonstrating the Bakhtin group's position that there really is no such thing as isolated discourse: all signification, if it is to be meaningful, must make reference to other signification,

and further, must anticipate and successfully adapt to future signification of the object of communication.

It should also come as no surprise that Bakhtin's group viewed the production and maintenance of signification as essentially a process of social interaction. Voloshinov underscores the importance of sociohistorical circumstances in formulating and altering signs:

Every sign . . . is a construct between socially organized persons in the process of their interaction. Therefore, the forms of signs are conditioned above all by the social organization of the participants involved and also by the immediate conditions of their interaction. When these forms change, so does sign. (p. 21)

According to Voloshinov, each sign, by virtue of its linkage to material historical circumstances, possesses an inner dialectic quality. The sign has a number of guises it can assume, depending on the nature of the context in which signification is performed. However, if it is true that signs can have multiple meanings, why is it that in ordinary life, most signs seem to have a unitary meaning? Why is it that they surrender their multifaceted character only upon close examination of the ideologies and architectonics systems they signify? The answer, according to Voloshinov, is that, in most circumstances, one ideological system of meaning will dominate others, so that the imposition of unitary meaning is in fact illusory and is based on the power of the dominant ideology to dictate the interpretation of the sign within the architectonics of a large number of social actors.

Thus, as Bakhtin puts it, ". . . every concrete act of understanding is active" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 282). When one takes into account the number of signs and ideologies that must be accommodated in the act of communication, it is no wonder that so often human beings fail to be congruent in the meanings they assign to language. However, for Bakhtin, the inevitable effort involved in the

enacting of communication in the social environment is a cause, not for distress, but for celebration. Like the writer of the novel, whose deliberate precipitation of uncertainty serves as the creative mainspring which drives development of the genre forward, the human being, as “author” of his or her own life, is impelled toward development of more proficiency in social interaction by the very uncertainty they encounter in their day-to-day activity.

To summarize the position of the Bakhtin group on signification and dialectic, one should bear the following overall conclusions in mind:

(1) signification is the situation in which one aspect of architectonic reality “reflects and refracts” (stands for) another aspect of architectonic reality; (2) since all architectonics possess ideological significance, all signification is ideological, and all ideology possesses semiotic significance; and (3) the dialectical tension which accompanies all signification leads, not simply to a fragmentation of social life, but to also to the cohesion of social life.

Context

With the ideas of the Bakhtin circle concerning “sender/receiver” and “message” firmly in hand, one is now prepared to go on to the notion of context, although of course context has been central to the exposition of all of the Bakhtin group’s ideas up to this point. With the specific introduction of the idea of context, however, comes discussion of two of the better-known concepts associated with the Bakhtin circle—heteroglossia and dialogism—as well as the lesser-known idea of uncompletedness. As will become evident, these three elements of context build upon and elaborate the basic elements of architectonic systems and the reality of their expression in language. Still, with an understanding of these more basic elements, one is in a far better position to apprehend what the Bakhtin group means by terms such as “heteroglossia,” which, despite their popularity in the

community of critical scholars, frequently suffer misinterpretation and misapplication.

Heteroglossia. Certainly the best-known, and probably the least understood, term in the Bakhtinian literature is heteroglossia. As Holquist points out, heteroglossia is a more general term which encompasses other ideas in Bakhtin:

The term Bakhtin uses here, "heteroglossia", is a master trope at the heart of all his other projects. . . . Heteroglossia is Bakhtin's way of referring, in any utterance of any kind, to the peculiar interaction between the two fundamentals of all communication. On the one hand, a mode of transcription must, in order to do its work of separating out texts, be a more or less fixed system. But these repeatable features, on the other hand, are in the power of the particular context in which the utterance is made; this context can refract, add to, or, in some cases, even subtract from the amount and kind of meaning the utterance may be said to have when it is conceived only as a systematic manifestation independent of context. (Holquist, 1991, pp. xx-xxi)

Heteroglossia merges two forces: one force tending toward order in language (referred to as a centripetal force), in conflict with a force tending toward disorder or uniqueness (referred to as a centrifugal force). Achieving communication in social interaction depends upon the social actor being able to rely on a certain amount of predictability in interaction (language, rules of the speech community, physical ability to hear and be heard, and so on), but also upon the flexibility to adapt to the specific context. Both are necessary: hence, the term "heteroglossia" does not imply "many voices," but rather "voice in awareness of many other voices." The successful elaboration of a meaningful message, as has been emphasized at several points, is not an individual undertaking, but is achieved in cooperation and/or conflict with others.

One can see why a superficial reading of Bakhtin might suggest that one consider heteroglossia as simply another synonym for polyphony (or "multi-voicedness"). The immediate suggestion of a number of voices intermixing and

interanimating each other focuses attention upon the languages and their performance in the activity of communicating. However, acknowledging that many varieties of language exist and that they “conflict with each other” misses most of the value of what Bakhtin and his circle have to say. Languages are not the creation of the people or the social groups which use them; hence, depicting the intermixing of languages as if it were simply a matter of one group using “its” language as a resource in conflict with other groups and “their” languages leaves a great deal unexplained.

The concept of heteroglossia has generated a great deal of work by researchers in the fields of sociolinguistics and anthropology. Like many encompassing theories, the Bakhtin group’s theory of heteroglossia contains within it threads of many other specializations; hence, regardless of one’s communicative specialization, one is likely to see evidences of that specialty somewhere in Bakhtin. One suspects that this may be the reason for the premature appropriation of terms like “heteroglossia”: the interested researcher comes upon a good, generative metaphor like heteroglossia, interprets it according the research purpose at hand, and then moves on to other projects without considering how complex the notion really is. The unique feature of Bakhtin, as White points out, lies in the completeness of his coverage of the manifold forms of sociolinguistic data:

Although separate aspects of heteroglossia (genre, register, sociolect, dialect, intertextuality, addressee-anticipation) can all be found under different names in current sociolinguistics, Bakhtin mobilizes them within a social dialectics of contention and negotiation. Heteroglossia not only foregrounds the words of people normally excluded from the realms of the “norm” and the “standard”, it also relativizes the norm itself, subverting its claim to universalism. I think Bakhtin pushes the implications of this to such a point that it becomes a radical critique, not only of “high” language, but of any theory which tries to generalize and universalize on the basis of that high language, like, say, Transformational Grammar. (p. 127)

One point on which most commentators do seem to agree is that the notion of heteroglossia implies social struggle.¹² According to Bakhtin and his colleagues, introduction of the utterance involves a number specific activities, any or all of which may bring the individual into conflict with others. This is the struggle initiated when one puts one's own architectonic "spin" on one's message, structuring the message as a variant on the "official" discourse. The formulation of the utterance simultaneously answers both the requirements of the individual architectonics, and the social requirements involved in accommodating the architectonics of others. What is easily visible as a variety of discursive forms arises, then, not from individual construction and consequent ownership, but from the inevitable variety of social experience itself. Heteroglossia is not a question of private ownership, but of dialogic collusion.

The Bakhtin group is trying to provide a counterweight to what they consider to be excessive attention to the normative and systematic aspects of language. Thus, while the Bakhtin circle could hardly deny the regular and predictable character of language, they were also aware that too much had been said concerning these centripetal forces, to the point that linguists such as Saussure seemed to propounding a view of language which in effect discounted diversity by attempting systematically to describe what was of necessity unpredictable.

Hence, according to Bakhtin's circle, Saussure's concept of langue and parole fails in both its aspects: langue cannot be considered as a system of abstract, normative principles, nor can parole be a "... mere instantiation of the system of language" (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p. 139). Both concepts require that language

¹² Though, again, it also necessarily involves cooperation and agreement with the centripetal forces tending toward closure; commentators, however, are curiously silent concerning this harmonious facet of the theory.

be far more systematic than simple reflection reveals it to be. Thus, the challenge of the Bakhtin circle is issued on the field of academic authority: by emphasizing heteroglossia, they are challenging the right of linguists to determine what language is.

By removing social others from language, and conceiving of communication as if it were being spoken by no one, linguists had provided the basis for scholars from other disciplines to make the same basic errors:

In "Discourse in the Novel," Bakhtin attacks linguistics, poetics, and stylistics for misconstruing or insufficiently appreciating the fact that different people and groups speak differently. The problem is typically reduced to purely personal idiosyncrasy, to conscious or unconscious error, or to dialectology. None of these approaches, alone or in combination, is adequate to an appreciation of heteroglossia's rich significance. (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p. 139)

The same could be said of present-day sociolinguists such as Hymes (1962) Philipsen (1975), or Saville-Troike (1982), all of whom would be said by the group to overly reify aspects of situation such as rules and context. This is not to say that any of these approaches is wrong, but it is interesting to note how any systematization of communication inevitably brings in its wake charges of insensitivity to specificity of context (described by Scribner (1984) as the "rigor/relevance" controversy). In the work of Bakhtin and his associates, however, one finds a means of accommodating both those who aim at systematization and those who would critique them: both voices, according to this view, are necessary to the understanding of the phenomenon of communication.

With an understanding of heteroglossia, one is now in a position to treat the "centripetal/centrifugal" analogy with a little more subtlety. To begin with, since it mistakenly summarizes disparate entities under a single metaphor, the analogy of "centrifugal" force does not convey the nuances of Bakhtin's conception.

These “centrifugal” forces, which continually upset order, are not themselves in any way unified as forces of opposition. Those whose encounters with Bakhtin have been shaped by the idea of carnivalization or been mediated by a Marxist framework often misunderstand him on this crucial point. Centrifugal forces are essentially disparate and disunified; relative order may be produced among some of them, but the production of such order is itself a project. As we have noted, even the choice of a single word for these forces (centrifugal) may itself be misleading, suggesting as it does lines of force radiating from a center in an organized way. (Morson & Emerson, 1990, pp. 139-140)

An important consequence of this relentlessly dynamic heteroglossic model is its view of language as unregenerately active, never settled, never finalized. This characteristic prevents the positing of any convenient correlations between sociohistorical factors (such as demography, group membership, or institutional affiliation), and linguistic choice.

One should also point out the role of speech genres in the production of heteroglossia. The variety of different languages used in social communication arises primarily from the fact that the architectonics of the individual social actor are strongly influenced by inherited systems of meaning which come from acculturation into a variety of groups. Accordingly, each person “inherits” a number of specific signs, shared to varying degrees by outgroup members. Any individual actor, then, formulates messages according to, first, his or her own architectonics, and second, by the various architectonics that have been acquired as a result of acculturation.¹³ The following passage by Bakhtin reveals how complex the heteroglossic interweaving becomes:

¹³ Moreover, one should note that Bakhtin’s theory also posits heteroglossic relationships among one’s own architectonics and those of the other group members. Such additional heteroglossic influence, multiplied by the large number of groups in which one holds simultaneous membership, causes the individual’s architectonics to diverge even more dramatically from other members of “the same group.”

But the centripetal forces of the life of language, embodied in a “unitary language,” operate in the midst of heteroglossia. At any given moment of its evolution, language is stratified not only into linguistic dialects in the strict sense of the word (according to formal linguistic markers, especially phonetic), but also . . . into languages that are socio-ideological: languages of social groups, “professional” and “generic” languages, languages of generations and so forth. From this point of view, literary language itself is only one of these heteroglot languages—and in its turn is also stratified into languages (generic, period-bound and others). And this stratification and heteroglossia widen and deepen as long as language is alive and developing. Alongside the centripetal forces, the centrifugal forces of language carry on their uninterrupted work; alongside verbal-ideological centralization and unification, the uninterrupted processes of decentralization and disunification go forward. (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 271-272)

In the face of such complexity, it is difficult to maintain the assumption of a “unified language” spoken in more or less the same fashion by large numbers of people. However, it is equally important to recognize that the role of culture is to produce precisely this systematization. To put it another way, civilization is designed for the express purpose of providing predictability and stability so that the work of creativity and uniqueness may go forward.

The predominance of monoglot tendencies in culture points to the underlying reasons why humans try so hard to unify the varieties of language which are clearly so divergent. In fact, the Bakhtin circle is claiming, humans cannot do otherwise and be able to maintain the integrity of their architectonics. The tendency of culture to try to stabilize the architectonics of its society’s members (or, perhaps more accurately, the tendency of society’s members to seek such stabilization through membership in groups) is the chief factor which leads to the maintenance of speech genres (in the sense of providing members of social groups with distinctive systems of signs which permit them to establish their own identity).

Different professions each have their own way of speaking, as do different generations, different classes, areas, ethnic groups, and any number of other possible divisions. The important thing to understand is that for Bakhtin these different "languages" are not just a matter of, let us say, a professional jargon. In that case, the specialized vocabulary of the profession could simply be recorded in a dictionary, and the idea of a unified language would not be threatened. No, what constitutes these different languages is something that is itself extralinguistic: a specific way of conceptualizing, understanding, and evaluating the world. A complex of experiences, shared (more or less) evaluations, ideas, and attitudes "knit together" to produce a way of speaking. (Morson & Emerson, 1990, pp. 140-141)

As Morson and Emerson point out later in their discussion, this means that Bakhtin is never talking about "language," but invariably, "languages." Bakhtin describes this process in somewhat more poetic terms:

Such is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school and so forth. It is possible to give a concrete and detailed analysis of any utterance, once having exposed it as a contradiction-ridden, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language. (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 272)

This increasingly detailed picture of the richness and the subtleties of heteroglossia permits one to appreciate Bakhtin's observation that language "lives beyond itself." Features of the language which are "settled upon" by linguistic theorists simply take place as one representation (not the authoritative representation they are assumed to be) among many others in social life. It is the living word in socially enacted discourse that will serve as the arbiter of meaning. Ironically, then, the presumption that linguistics theorists have achieved an "accurate" picture of language use actually does hold sway, but only within the specific speech community of scholars who hold a similar opinion.

Words, in the Bakhtinian theory, not only cannot be conceived devoid of social contextualization, but are also subject to modification as they "live" through social intercourse. Like magnets, they gather the energy of the language they

contact, first from their “own” architectonic resources, and later through their development, as co-created with other signs in socially-used language.

To summarize, the following points concerning the Bakhtin group’s ideas about heteroglossia should be born in mind: (1) heteroglossia is the covering term for the interaction of two forces in language, a centripetal force (tending toward closure and predictability) and a centrifugal force (tending toward openness and unpredictability); (2) heteroglossia is an attempt to redress the imbalance caused by excessive emphasis on the normative and systematic aspects of language; and (3) heteroglossia exerts a particularly powerful influence on speech genres.

Dialogism. Next to heteroglossia, perhaps the next most frequently mentioned term in scholarly discussions of Bakhtin and his circle is dialogism. Like heteroglossia, however, the popularity of the concept of dialogism has become burdened with what Todorov (1984) has described as “an embarrassing multiplicity of meanings” (p. 60).¹⁴

One reason for the divergence among the various renderings of dialogism, argues Hirschkop (1989), lies in conceptual confusion associated with the term, both in Bakhtin and more traditional critics:

As it has been adopted in formal literary analysis, dialogism designates a number of disparate practices—parody, the use of socially marked languages in literary texts (from Shakespeare’s Porter to the Artful Dodger), collage, and what Bakhtin calls stylisation, the pointed emphasis of socially distinct speech. Not only are these practices arguably very different in form and effect, they are also typical of very dissimilar historical moments. The argument of an essay like “Discourse in the novel” is that such practices are all varieties of dialogism, defined as the coexistence in a single utterance of two intentionally distinct, identifiable voices. The definition here is itself

¹⁴ At another level, however, it could be said that such intonations of meaning, the taking on of the flavors of the words, signs and systems of meaning with which the basic term “dialogism” comes into contact, is far from “embarrassing,” but is in fact precisely what Bakhtin has in mind. It is worth noting that Bakhtin, no more than those he criticizes, can remain immune from the changes which result from the introduction of his basic terminology into the streams of social discourse.

revealing. Why describe such stylistic phenomena in terms of voices, with all the connotations of individuality this implies? It would seem more accurate to describe them as social conventions—stylistic or generic—characteristic of particular historical moments and situations. Bakhtin, of course, says as much, and this essay is often cited, quite rightly, as evidence of a “social” turn in his work. (pp. 6-7)

Fowler (1981) makes a similar point, holding that Bakhtin uses dialogism in at least two distinct (though not contradictory) senses:

First, it means consciousness of the actual or potential response of an interlocutor, orientation toward a second act of speech. This double-voicedness has been extensively discussed by Bakhtin. . . , developing Eichenbaum’s treatment of the special Russian style of dramatic narrative known as skaz. The phenomenon is not, however, just a literary style but a property of all discourse. All language usage shapes itself toward an image of the other to whom it is addressed. . . . The second meaning which Bakhtin has in mind for “dialogic” seems to be “dialectical.” The dialogic relationship confronts unresolved contrary ideologies, opposing voices in which conflicting world-views resist submersion or cancellation. (Fowler, 1981, p. 144)

A third way in which the meaning of dialogism may be apprehended is by a comparison of dialogism with its alleged opposite, monologism. As Lokke (1987) notes, the so-called opposition of monologism is illusory, since the monologic response is itself dialogic to the extent of anticipating and responding to concepts exterior to it in the act of self-definition:

Bakhtin’s monologic/dialogic pairing is not an exclusive binary in that the terms are not equivalent; they do not exclude each other, for the monologic is only a special case of the dialogic. The monologic defines itself by excluding particulars of its environment in order to constitute itself. It is a system which constitutes itself by the intensity of its foregrounding of exclusivity. In short, Bakhtin’s dyads are essentially asymmetrical, interdependent, and thus become hierarchical only to the extent that environment as “inclusiveness” is privileged over the systems it relates to. Inclusiveness, however, constitutes only some ever-receding horizon. (p. 212)

Despite the multiplicity of meanings attributed to “dialogism,” it is clear that they share the common aversion of the Bakhtin group to overly abstract models of communication. As Clark and Holquist (1984) put it, “By conceiving of words as if no one ever actually spoke them, linguists have turned dialogic signs into monologic signals” (p. 213). Words and utterances, the Bakhtin group argued repeatedly, are neither stable nor self-equivalent, but rather constantly negotiated in the dynamic flux of social interaction. Thus, the “meaning” of a word becomes fixed within the conceptual scheme of the person who assigns that meaning. The more adamantly the interpreter of language insists upon a particular interpretation of meaning, the greater the degree of monologism between the interpreter and the language. It is this removal of language from the sphere of social activity to which the Bakhtin group remained most opposed.

The reliance on this social factor in accounting for human communication also cautions interpreters of Bakhtin and his group not to assume that they endorse a “wide-open” stance regarding dialogism; in other words, the group nowhere states that dialogic activity is limitless in a given interaction, because the requirement that dialogism operate in a human context imposes the same limitations on communication as those imposed by the architectonics of the communicants:

Bakhtin’s strategy . . . is to highlight the one universal feature present throughout the vast array of possible contexts. No matter how bewilderingly various are such contexts, their power to change the meaning of words is not unlimited, for they are able to do so only on one condition: they can have their effect only within the space where differences in a word’s meaning can be registered, namely between two speakers. The one constant in the ceaselessly shifting, ever new conditions in which an utterance is pronounced is the unique locus where such conditions are able to have an effect, the locus constituted by the individual speaker and his addressee. (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 214)

By emphasizing the act of speaking, the Bakhtin group has in mind a critique which encompasses more than simply personal reference. Rather, they seem to be pursuing an overall goal of forcing abstraction into the service of socially immediate speech¹⁵ between actual, socially interacting individuals in specific circumstances. There is in Bakhtin, asserts Holquist (1981), “. . . no such thing as a ‘general language,’ a language which is spoken by a general voice, that may be divorced from a specific saying, which is charged with particular overtones” (p. xxi). Holquist concludes that this happens in any social communication, “even when that someone else is one’s own inner addressee” (Holquist, 1981, p. xxi).

In addition to its utility in the analysis of spoken discourse and literature, dialogism (or, more accurately, dialogue) possesses the additional advantage of serving as a convenient metaphor for summarizing Bakhtin’s broader social theories:

A dialogue in Bakhtin’s system is a datum from experience that can serve as an economical paradigm for a theory encompassing more global dimensions. In an exchange between two speaking subjects, what each says to the other is difficult to describe in terms of language alone. The talk is segmented not only by words and sentences but also by protocols that determine who is talking. The different ways in which speakers indicate appropriate points for others to respond are enormously varied, depending on the topic, the speakers, and the context of the utterance. But the relations between utterances are always conditioned by the potential response of an other. Thus, these relations are part of communication and cannot be adequately dealt with in terms of the language system alone. (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 217)

¹⁵ This emphasis on the immediate act of speaking is in some ways similar to the ideas of speech act theorists such as Grice and Austin. However, the Bakhtin circle would probably find unacceptable the systematizations of speech acts, particularly noticeable in Grice.

Voloshinov goes somewhat further, arguing that the dialogue metaphor describes a force which stimulates social evolution through the modification of signs and their relationships with their ideologically-infused referents:

It follows naturally that, for Volosinov, dialogue is the basic model of reciprocal relations in verbal communication. . . . He implies that actually every cultural pattern can be derived from the conceptual framework of human dialogue; hence dialogue assumes the character of a primordial source of social creativity in general. In striking parallel to the Peircian interpretation of inner speech, Volosinov suggests that closer analysis reveals that the units of inner speech join and alternate in a way that resembles an exchange in dialogue. (Matejka, 1973, p. 5)

Thus, the inevitable conflict enjoined by the use of the sign in social discourse, and the necessity for its resolution through social activity, impels society forward.¹⁶

One reason for this central role of dialogism in social evolution may be found in the degree of effort necessary to achieve understanding. One can sympathize with the Bakhtin group's complaints about linguistic abstraction promoting misunderstanding when one realizes the problems caused by use of the term "receiver" in the classical model of communication. Referring to one of the communicants as "receiver" virtually compels one to see the process of communication as one in which most of the work is done by the "sender," while the "receiver" simply passively accepts the message. According to Holquist (1990), this conception could hardly be further from the truth:

Dialogism conceives knowing as the effort of understanding, as "the active reception of speech of the other" [Marxism and the Philosophy of Language, p. 117] . . . The adjective is all-important here: "active

¹⁶ Voloshinov's theory has been incorporated into the "theory of activity" by Swedish organizational theorist Yrjo Engestrom (1986). Engestrom applies the term springboard to these critical points at which seemingly unresolvable linguistic contradictions impel social development. Engestrom's project is to describe, as a series of conflict-resolving stages, ways in which organizations may advance beyond obstacles engendered by sign-systems and their associated ideological systems of meaning.

reception" means that quoting is never simply mechanical repetition, but constitutes work—it is labor. (p. xlii) [Author's italics]

In spite of all this activity, however, one should not assume that social meaning even approaches final solution, since each of the "owners" of socially shared meanings can contest those meanings to greater or lesser degrees, depending on how much power they can claim in social interaction.

Moreover, despite the persistent mention of conflict, meaning in discourse is not simply the result of counterpoising interpretations against one another, but depends as much on sharing and cooperation as it does on competition. With the work of Bakhtin and his colleagues, one always encounters these two paradoxical implications: that which results in socially shared meaning cannot be a determiner of complete harmony, because even socially shared meaning can never be shared completely.

Dialogism also exerts a powerful temporal effect upon discourse. Any utterance enters into dialogic relationship, not simply with other utterances on the "same" subject at that specific time, but also with later and earlier versions of its own ideological connotations—between later and subsequent versions of "itself." According to Bakhtin and his associates, any utterance, no matter how fixed it may be within a conceptual horizon, always answers other discourses, and always orients itself to a future answer to itself. Thus, the utterance is inextricably locked, not simply into the present sociohistorical circumstances, but future and past circumstances as well:

However monological the utterance may be (for example, a scientific or philosophical treatise), however much it may concentrate on its own object, it cannot but be, in some measure, a response to what has already been said about the given topic, on the given issue, even though this responsiveness may not have assumed a clear-cut external expression. It will be manifested in the overtones of the style, in the finest nuances of the composition. The utterance is filled with dialogic

overtones, and they must be taken into account in order to understand fully the style of the utterance. After all, our thought itself—philosophical, scientific, and artistic—is born and shaped in the process of interaction and struggle with others' thought, and this cannot but be reflected in the forms that verbally express our thought as well. (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 92)

Since the inclusion of this temporal dimension extends the field of possible representations indefinitely back into the past and forward into the future, the number of permutations among various utterances is increased dramatically.

Bakhtin depicts changes in the ideological associations of signs and meaning systems as an accumulation of associations which modify the "original" sign as time progresses (just as the formulation of that sign was itself influenced by the accumulation of influence of other systems of meaning which preceded it in time).

Bakhtin (1981) puts this somewhat more poetically:

There is neither a first nor a last word and there are no limits to the dialogic context (it extends into the boundless past and the boundless future). Even past meanings, that is, those born in the dialogue of the past centuries, can never be stable (finalized, ended once and for all)—they will always changed (be renewed) in the process of subsequent, future development of the dialogue. At any moment in the development of the dialogue there are immense, boundless masses of forgotten contextual meanings, but at certain moments of the dialogue's subsequent development along the way they are recalled and invigorated in renewed form (in a new context). Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival. (p. 170)

In summary, one can emphasize the following points concerning dialogism:

(1) despite a multiplicity of meanings, dialogism is used consistently to account for the interaction among multiple voices and their associated architectonic systems, as these voices are used in socially-enacted discourse; (2) dialogism is constrained by the centripetal forces in language and in social life, and thus does not possess unlimited power to change meaning; and (3) dialogism is enacted both between

individual communicants, and between “versions” of a message in dialogic interaction with earlier and later versions of the message itself.

The ideas of heteroglossia and dialogism, while encompassing the centripetal or stable tendencies of linguistic expression, nevertheless seem to be focused primarily upon destabilization of fixed meaning. This is perhaps because scholars have overwhelmingly emphasized stability in their discussions of communication, so that any alternative view is taken as a challenge to the view of communication as a relatively stable and predictable process. As one considers the final concept in this discussion of the Bakhtin group’s communication “model”—the idea of uncompletedness—the feeling of unpredictability is brought out even more strongly. As the view of communication has become increasingly complex, the possibility of fixing the multiplicity of factors into some kind of stable structure becomes increasingly unlikely, and the horizon of possibilities is opened to an even greater degree.

Uncompletedness. It seems fitting to close this discussion of the Bakhtin circle’s theory of communication by referring to their conclusion that human life and all of its products (such as artistic creations and cultural practices) must always remain in an unfinished (uncompleted) state. If all elements of human life are answerable to all other elements, and by implication, all such elements must be changed, then the introduction of communication into the social sphere brings it into contact with forces which ensure that it will be forever altered and hence remain uncompleted. As Bakhtin puts it, “Nothing conclusive has yet taken place in the world, the ultimate word of the world and about the world has not yet been spoken, the world is open and free, everything is still in the future and will always be in the future” (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 166).

This position is taken because of the group’s insistence upon specificity; by emphasizing the sociohistorically specific aspects of communication, one abandons

the safety of abstraction in which concepts are “always true.” It is only in the world of the ideal, the abstract, that a word or utterance can remain unchanged. To believe that meaning is constant is, to the Bakhtin group, one of the most debilitating of fictions, since it blinds the social actor not only to the nature of the discourse he or she may be attempting to understand, but results in a kind of mental laziness which perpetuates concepts which people might tell themselves they understand, but which in fact they do not.

Again, one may turn to the metaphor of the novel in order to help understand why social life remains forever unfinished. The relationship between the self and other is remarkably similar to the relationship between the author and the character in the novel. It is as if social actors live their lives aware that their own social horizon will always be unfinished, but behaving according to the illusion that the lives of all other social actors are finished. Not being able to grant the social other the same open-endedness that one grants to oneself (because knowledge of their architectonic systems is necessarily limited), one is brought in daily life face-to-face with the social results of one’s frequently ill-informed judgments about others’ architectonic systems. Nevertheless, it is precisely this inability to “really” fixate the social Other that makes social life so unpredictable and hence so endlessly interesting.

Finally, the uncompletedness of the world is guaranteed by the unfinished nature of the only medium through which the world can be experienced, the medium of linguistic representation. All of the endless linkages to contested points of view, the vagaries of individual architectonics engendered by histories sensed only dimly (if at all), the manifold contexts in which communication may transpire (which in turn invokes its own associated architectonics and historical circumstances)—such factors intercombine with each other and with the dynamic flux of history to create endlessly changing worlds in which the most mundane

communicative activities take on enormous significance, due to their inextricable fixation in the tapestry of life:

According to Bakhtin, language is never a unitary system of norms. On the contrary, in language, as in the psyche and everywhere else in culture, order is never complete and always requires work. It is a task, a project, always ongoing and never finished; and it is always opposed to the essential messiness of the world. In language, messiness is the result of the complexities of daily living, with all its unforeseen, small, prosaic purposes and shifts in mood and evaluation, which are not reducible to a system. (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p. 139)

To summarize the position of the Bakhtin circle on the subject of uncompletedness, one can point to the following conclusions: (1) because language enters life infused with the flavor of architectonic systems, its referents can never be stable entities; (2) it is only from the safety of abstraction that expressed language can be considered finalized; and (3) the complexity of the world expressed by language ensures that no verbal expression can ever be the final and authoritative expression spoken on the subject.

VITA

George Richard Holt was born on October 4, 1949, in Murphysboro, Illinois. He was educated in the public schools of Murphysboro, received the degree of Bachelor of Science in organizational communication from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale in 1985, and was awarded the degree of Master of Science in organizational communication from the same institution in 1986. He began doctoral study in the Department of Speech Communication at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1986, where he studied until 1990.

He was Assistant Professor of Communication at the University of Louisville in 1990-1991, and since August, 1991, has been Assistant Professor of Speech Communication at the University of South Dakota.

His research on organizational communication, intercultural communication, and other topics has been published in several journals and edited volumes.