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Du national au global/From National to Global/ナショナルからグローバルへ
Par Patrick FRIDENSON (Directeur d’études à l’EHESS)
パトリック・フリーデンソン（社会科学高等研究院教授）

Soyons lucides. La grande majorité des historiens japonais comme des historiens français (ou allemands ou américains, etc.) ne s’occupent que de leur pays. Il y a donc un intérêt de principe à créer les conditions leur permettant d’échanger et de travailler ensemble. C’est ce que propose le nouveau programme Histoire de la Fondation France-Japon de l'EHESS. Mais cet intérêt n’est pas que de principe. Il tient d’abord à la position du Japon au cours de l’histoire, et notamment depuis le Moyen Âge. Le Japon n’est en effet pas un pays entièrement à part, ni non plus un pays fermé. Et depuis la révolution de 1868 il incarne progressivement une autre façon d’être moderne. Nous avons donc à apprendre des historiens japonais sur ce qu’ils nous apportent sur leur pays. Et c’est d’autant plus nécessaire que les traductions de livres et d’articles du japonais vers le français sont en nombre insuffisant, comme l’a signalé le colloque des 19-20 avril 2014 sur la traduction organisé à Tokyo par la Maison de la traduction organisé à Tokyo par la Maison France-Japon de l’EHESS. Le nouveau programme en question se veut, s’il est dans le même esprit que les invitations d’historiens et historiennes japonais à Paris que l’EHESS assure chaque année depuis 1992, va au-delà. Son second intérêt tient donc au fait qu’il s’adresse à l’ensemble de la communauté des historiens dans les deux pays, bien au-delà des spécialistes. Il leur propose non seulement de faire des comparaisons mais encore d’étudier des objets communs. Il suggère aussi que ces conférences de Japonais invités en France et l’établissement d’un réseau franco-japonais pourraient enrichir les recherches d’histoire globale qui se développent depuis une quinzaine d’années dans le monde et qui permettent de voir l’histoire du monde autrement, et autrement que du point de vue de l’Occident. Qu’il me soit permis ici de souligner au passage que l’on retrouve ici un chemin ouvert par le premier président de la VIe section de l’Ecole pratique des hautes études (dont l’EHESS est issue), Lucien Febvre, lorsqu’il avait créé la revue trilingue Cahiers d’histoire mondiale, publiée sous les auspices de l’UNESCO de 1953 à 1972.

AyaH a participé de 2011 à 2013 à un groupe de recherche pluridisciplinaire, lancé à l’EHESS, avec des collègues japonais et occidentaux dont les travaux ont été discutés lors d’une journée à l’OCDE le 25 novembre 2013 (et vont être mis en ligne sur Canal U) puis dont l’aboutissement vient de paraître en français en février 2014 sous le titre グローバル資本主義の中の経済変化-合本キャピタリズムとモーラル (Gappon Capitalism: The Economic and Moral Ideology of Shibusawa Eiichi in Global Perspective) (Tokyo, Toyokeizaishinpousha, 2014), je peux témoigner d’expérience que de telles coopérations ne sacrifient jamais le national, contrairement à ce qu’on entend parfois, qu’elles aident aussi à reconnaître à la fois les circonstances et les tensions avec le global dont le national est pétri et qu’elles peuvent être jugées pertinentes par des acteurs hors de l’enseignement supérieur et de la recherche qui veulent débattre de leur expérience actuelle et bénéficier de l’éclairage des chercheurs et des universitaires.

Connaitre les interconnexions dont le Japon a été partie prenante, connaître les observations étrangères mutuelles dont les pratiques nationales de part et d’autre ont été l’objet, c’est, comme l’avait suggéré l’historien Serge Gruzinski dans un beau livre, non pas avancer vers un quelconque monde plat, mais mieux comprendre ce qui lie et ce qui différencie les quatre parties du monde.

Pour lire les articles sur notre site :
http://ffj.ehess.fr/no_2014_03.html
Inaugural Conference of RP5 «Histories Across Borders»「越境する歴史学」
Wednesday June 4th, 2014, 6:00pm-8:00pm, Paris 2014年6月4日水曜日
«Transnational History and Japan»「トランスナショナルな歴史と日本」
By Sheldon GARON (Princeton University) シェルドン・ガロン

Venue: EHESS le bâtiment Le France (190 Avenue de France 75013 Paris, Auditorium)

With the participation of Pierre-Cyrille Hautcoeur, Alessandro STANZIANI, Jean-Frédéric SCHAUB, Bernard THOMANN, Sébastien LECHEVALIER

Global or transnational history is today the hottest subfield of history. Scholars transcend national narratives to chart the movements of peoples, ideas, and institutions across national boundaries. Yet transnational history remains centered on the Atlantic world. The exclusion of East Asia, especially Japan, has been a glaring gap. Modern Japanese officials, entrepreneurs, and reformers were among the world’s greatest transnational learners, avidly investigating Western practices. The world of the 19th and 20th century was intensely interconnected. Western nations also systematically investigated each other’s best practices. In this international marketplace of ideas, Japan acted not only as a taker but a maker of transnational knowledge. In key instances, Westerners studied Japanese models of national mobilization, as would other Asian nations later in the 20th century.

Sheldon Garon is the Nissan Professor of History and East Asian Studies at Princeton University.

This event was organised with the support of the Cercles de formation de l'EHESS, Réseau Asie et Pacifique (CNRS) and GIS Asie. Program is available at: http://ffj.ehess.fr/upload/GAS2014_flyer.pdf

International Symposium co-organized with the Canon Institute for Global Studies
キヤノングローバル戦略研究所・EHESS日仏財団共催国際シンポジウム

Venue: Institute of Social Science, The University of Tokyo Organizers: Fondation Franco-Japon de l’EHESS & The Institute for Social Sciences, The University of Tokyo

Guest Speakers: Shin ARITA (The University of Tokyo) ; Sandrine BRETONNIÈRE (EHESS) ; Takashi FUJITANI (The University of Tokyo) ; Kenji HIRASHIMA (The University of Tokyo) ; Ryo KANBAYASHI (Hitoitsubashi University) ; Caroline Guibet LAFAYE (ENS) ; Sébastien LECHEVALIER (EHESS) ; Yuichiro MIZUMACHI (The University of Tokyo) ; Naotomi NAKAMURA (The University of Tokyo) ; Akiko SUWA-EISENMANN (PSE) ; Bernard THOMANN (INALCO) ; Shigeki UNO (The University of Tokyo) ; Hiroshi YOSHIKAWA (The University of Tokyo) ; Bénédicte ZIMMERMANN (EHESS)

Program is available at: http://ffj.ehess.fr/upload/201407RP4Tokyo.pdf

Tuesday, July 15th, 2014, Tokyo 2014年7月15日火曜日

Towards a New Global Economic Order: which implications for firms, workers and governments? 「新たなグローバル経済秩序に向かって: 企業、被雇用者、政府への影響」

Venue: Ito Hall at the University of Tokyo (Hongo Campus)
Language: English (Simultaneous translation from English to Japanese will be provided.)

No admission fee required, but advanced registration is necessary on the website of the Canon Institute for Global Studies (http://www.canon-igs.org/en/event/20140523_2593.html).

 Speakers: Andreas DOMBRET (The Deutsche Bundesbank) ; Yoshia-ki FUJMORI (LIXIL Corporation) ; Toshikiko FUKUI (The Canon Institute for Global Studies) ; Mitsuhiro FURUSAWA (Vice Minister of Finance for International Affairs) ; Fukunari KIMURA (Keio University & Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia) ; Kumasa KUSAKA (The Japan Economic Foundation) ; Kihei FUJIMORI (LIXIL Corporation) ; Toshihiko FUKUI (The Canon Institute for Global Studies) ; Sébastien LECHEVALIER (EHESS & The EHESS France-Japan Foundation) ; Anne LE LORIER (Banque de France) ; Christian MASSET (Ambassador of France in Japan) ; Yaichiro TAKITA (Nikkei Shimbun) ; Martin TONKO (Roland Berger) ; Kotaro TSURU (Keio University) ; Koji TSURUKA (Cabinet Secretariat); Hiroshi YOSHIKAWA (The University of Tokyo) ; Franz WALDENBERGER (Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich & German Institute for Japanese Studies)
Already in the late 1980s, Japan has been transformed into an immigration country. Although the share of foreign residents is less than 2% still today in international comparison very low, Japan has already for over a quarter-century a highly continuous immigration flow of foreign workers. In fact, in absolute numbers of yearly net immigrants, Japan is one of the important migration destinations among OECD countries. As many Western societies before it, Japan has struggled for years to cope with this new reality as immigration country. Officially its immigration policy is restrictive by accepting only highly qualified foreign workers in some professional fields, which are explicitly defined in Japan’s immigration law. Still, Japan has also three important side-doors for greater career opportunity. The other factor is due to the interplay between the economic fluctuation and the family reaction. In fact, household income has been dulled in the 1970s, and the increasing number of wives went to work as part-time worker in order to address new situations. Therefore, the probability of wife’s employment was negatively correlated with husband’s income. In other words, a husband’s income is the derogatory predictor of wife’s choice to work.

My current research is aimed at examining the mechanism of socio-economic inequality, focusing on the interplay of family and employment in the contemporary societies and, in particular, the modern and contemporary Japan.

Family, company and government used to play a vital role in ensuring the livelihoods of all citizens. In fact, the tax, pension, and social security policy in Japan are essentially based on the so-called “male-bread winner model”. According to this model, husband earns the whole household income, while wife works at home as a full-time housewife. For example, the post-war social security system in Japan has largely shaped by this relatively modern conception of the gender-based division of labour that initially developed among middle-class family in Europe and United States.

However, when the rapid economic growth ended in Japan in the 1970s, this model did not reflect any more the reality of labor market dynamics. There are two main factors. First, the enrolment of women in higher education has increased, and it provided a avenue for greater career opportunity. The other factor is due to the interplay between the economic fluctuation and the family reaction. In fact, household income has been dulled in the 1970s, and the increasing number of wives went to work as part-time worker in order to address new situations. Therefore, the probability of wife’s employment was negatively correlated with husband’s income. In other words, a husband’s income is the derogatory predictor of wife’s choice to work.

In recent months, the Japanese cabinet and important affiliated advisory committees are discussing a more active immigration policy and the acceptance of more foreign workers in order to boost Japan’s long-term economic growth. Concretely, it has been proposed in policy making circles to enlarge the foreign trainee program and to open up new job categories for foreign workers like for example home helpers. The supporters hope that such an opening of the Japanese labour market will allow to overcome the predicted labour shortage in construction for realizing the infrastructure of the 2020 Summer Olympics in Tokyo and if these proposals are realized, they would mark another important step of Japan from an immigration country to an immigration state.

Sayaka SAKODA is a Fellow of JSPS Brain Circulation Project at Doshisha University (Kyoto) for the academic years of 2012-2015, and a visiting researcher at the France-Japan Foundation of the École des hautes études en sciences sociales (EHESS, Paris) from March 2014 to February 2015. Her publications include: 「夫婦格差社会—二極化する結婚のかたち」[Differentials among couples: stratified marriage], co-written with Toshiaki TACHIBANAKI (Chuuou Kouron Shinsha, Tokyo; 2013).

David Chiavacci is Mercator Professor in Social Science at the University of Zurich. Japan’s immigration policy is one of his main research interest. His recent publications include “Future Workforce? Discourses on and Realities of Foreign Workers in Japan”, in: W. Vosse, V. Blechinger-Talcott and R. Drifte (eds.), Governing Insecurity in Japan: The Domestic Discourse and Policy Response (London: Routledge, 2014; 115-140).

Carnet de Chercheur / Researcher’s Note

By David Chiavacci, University of Zurich / ダヴィッド・キアヴァッチ、チューリッヒ大学

In recent months, the Japanese cabinet and important affiliated advisory committees are discussing a more active immigration policy and the acceptance of more foreign workers in order to boost Japan’s long-term economic growth. Concretely, it has been proposed in policy making circles to enlarge the foreign trainee program and to open up new job categories for foreign workers like for example home helpers. The supporters hope that such an opening of the Japanese labour market will allow to overcome the predicted labour shortage in construction for realizing the infrastructure of the 2020 Summer Olympics in Tokyo and if these proposals are realized, they would mark another important step of Japan from an immigration country to an immigration state. Already in the late 1980s, Japan has been transformed into an immigration country. Although the share of foreign residents is less than 2% still today in international comparison, Japan has already for over a quarter-century a highly continuous immigration flow of foreign workers. In fact, in absolute numbers of yearly net immigrants, Japan is one of the important migration destinations among OECD countries. As many Western societies before it, Japan has struggled for years to cope with this new reality as immigration country. Officially its immigration policy is restrictive by accepting only highly qualified foreign workers in some professional fields, which are explicitly defined in Japan’s immigration law. Still, Japan has also three important side-doors through which foreign workers are entering the Japanese labour market in other sectors than those professional fields. First, since starting active recruitment of foreign students in the 1980s, most foreign students are working part-time and have become a crucial part of the work force in the urban service sector (convenience stores, restaurants etc.). Second, since 1991, nikkeijin (Japanese emigrants and their descendants up to the third generation) are exceptionally granted a renewable working visa and play a crucial role as highly flexible blue-collar workers in Japan’s leading export industries. Third, in the early 1990s, Japan’s foreign trainee program was expanded and enlarged and is since then a undeclared guest worker program for small and medium enterprises (SME) in many declining industries. [...]
Questions à Ito PENG / Questions to Ito PENG / イト・ベンギンさんへの質問
Ito PENG (University of Toronto) x Yoko MAKI (EHESS) / イト・ベンギン (トロント大学) x 牧陽子 (EHESS)

Professor PENG talks about her recent stay at the EHESS France-Japan Foundation, and her ongoing research on how reorganization of care influences government policies and movement of the people, and how migration in turn shapes on social policies and care in the East Asia. This interview was conducted, condensed and edited by Yoko MAKI (EHESS).

Could you explain about your current researches in Canada?
Currently I am heading a large research project titled «Gender, Migration and the Work of Care.» We are trying to investigate how the changes in the organization of care, both childcare and elder care as well as disabled people, are affecting government policies, and how policies in turn shape care work and the global migration of care workers. Care used to be a work done mainly by women, housewives and daughter in law in unpaid form at home. Today care is being increasingly externalized and commodified. We try to investigate what this reorganization means, in terms of international migration of care workers and of public policy, for family and for global governance. Our project focuses on Asia Pacific region: North East Asia, South East Asia, Oceania, as well as North and South America. It includes more than ten countries. There are nine core investigators, including myself. I talked, in one of my lectures at the EHESS, about my part of this project on five Asian countries: Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. This research project is primarily funded by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, a Canadian national research grant. We have also 13 partner institutions, such as two UN institutions, universities and research institutions, contributing to this research both in cash and in kind (such as providing us with their expertise). Kyoto University is one of our partners.

Can you share with us your experiences during your stay in France?
I was pleasantly surprised because researchers here are really interesting. I found many of them are interested in similar questions such as changes in care, migration, Asian economies, and Asian welfare States. This has been a fruitful time for me to share and compare my research with European's. I also found students very interested in my research, and they ask me a lot of very good questions at the lectures. I’m even getting emails from them to follow up the lectures. What is most interesting thing is the European perspectives to migration. Both in Europe and in America, we are facing same kind of phenomena of “care deficit”, and therefore increasingly becoming more dependent on foreign care workers to provide care. But approaches to foreign care workers are quite different in different countries. In North America, people approach this from a more liberal market economic context. You buy care from the market and there are many options, from cheap to expensive one. Real concerns are about the quality of care and access to good care. National childcare policy is not something most people think a great deal about. Maybe because many people in Canada or the US don’t believe the government will have national childcare policies any time soon. In Europe, in particularly in French context, people seem to be are more interested in how the government’s policies are facilitating care. I think that’s because there are more generous welfare states that provide a lot of care, like “école maternelle” in France. Europeans are concerned on how much the welfare states can provide and sustain public provision of care. So, there is a difference between North American and European researchers in terms of the focus of their research.

Did you find any difference between Asian researchers’ concern and that of Western researchers?
The topic of migrant care workers is a very new research concern in Japan and South Korea. In both countries, most people still don’t connect the need for care with foreign care workers, largely because hiring foreign worker to look after your children or elderly people is still not popular. The two countries have always seen themselves as not immigrant receiving countries; rather more immigrant sending countries. Receiving immigrants is therefore a new and challenging idea for these countries.

Please let me know about your career as a researcher.
I did my Ph.D in the UK in 1990’s when there was a huge interest in welfare regimes in Europe. At that time, most researches were captured by Gøsta Esping-Andersen's “The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism,” and their concerns were primarily focused on Western welfare states. Nobody was working on Asia and I felt, as an Asian, that a welfare regime in Asia was slightly different. I had spent several years of my childhood in Japan. So I compared social policies in Japan, Canada and the UK in my Ph.D thesis. After finishing my Ph.D, I began to focus on East Asian welfare regime much more closely. I taught in Japan for about 7 years: I did my postdoctoral work to Tokyo University, then taught in Hokusei-gakuen University and Kansei-gakuen University. I became interested in South Korea when I was invited by the World Bank in 1998 for a research project on post-economic crisis welfare state restructuring in South Korea. I continued to study on South Korea, because the speed of change was incredible, and the politics was so exciting. In Japan, there is very little change. I began to think that it would make a lot of sense to compare Japan with South Korea to understand why these countries are so different.

Why do you think Japan changes so little?
It’s a difficult question. I think one reason is that Japan has a much longer history of democracy. People don’t have much confidence that politics will change dramatically. There is a kind of an institutional inertia. South Korea is different. It just democratized in 1988 after a long period of authoritarian dictatorship. So in the 1990’s, there were still a lot of energy, excitements and also beliefs that they could change their society and conditions through politics. People were also much politicized because of the democratization process. It was much easier for Koreans to turn over the government because they had just turned over one. There was still no historical inertia in Korea. So context makes differences.

Could you give some advices for young scholars?
It’s important to actively look for opportunities. It means to look beyond just your area of specialization and to be more interdisciplinary. The future of the research is probably going to be more international and collaborative. You need to find new ideas, opportunities and new forms of collaboration. The second thing is to talk to researchers. If there is an article that interests you, just look at the source and talk to them saying “Could you talk a bit about your research?” Researchers are always looking for younger researchers too. I would like to know what younger researchers are interested in, and what they are doing. This could lead to a potential collaboration in the future. That kind of active engagements and contacts are really important.