

Title

**Reconsidering Orientalism/Occidentalism: representations of a Japanese martial
art in Melbourne**

Mayuko MAEKAWA

**Submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy**

October 2013

**Anthropology Program
(School of Social and Political Sciences)**

The University of Melbourne

Produced on archival quality paper

Abstract

My research analysed a small Melbourne community of non-Japanese practitioners of a Japanese martial art (*kendō*), and I focused on their understanding of their practice, of their community, and of Japan and Japanese culture. In particular, I focused on the way non-Japanese practitioners represent a practice of the Other and the way they interact with that otherness. More specifically, three key points are suggested in my research.

(1) While Orientalist stereotypes locate the Other from the spectator's objective perspective, I would suggest the way Melbourne *kendō* practitioners interact with the Other is through a process of creating 'familiarity'; locating oneself within surrounding differences and building subjective involvement into a practice of the Other. Such subjective involvement is further emphasised by their preference towards 'something new' and 'something different'. By selecting *kendō* as a thing to 'add' to their everyday life, they structure this everyday life by appropriating a new phenomenon as an activity to make their life enjoyable.

(2) Through participating in this practice of the Other, Melbourne practitioners recognise *kendō* as a form for 'expressing the self', 'developing the self', and 'challenging the self'. *Kendō* practice provides them a space to explore a different self which is somehow restricted in daily life. In contrast to Orientalist representations which seek 'authentic otherness', Melbourne practitioners are interested in self cultivation in which they seek a sense of the authentic moment of expressing their being 'here and now' through finding alternative belongingness in the *kendō* community.

(3) The practitioners' subjective involvement is further complicated by their recognition of themselves. The narratives of some practitioners show the way they interact with the Japanese Other by building the eyes to see themselves from the perspective of the Japanese Other, and thus they have a 'two-way' interaction in which their identities as *kendō* practitioners are constantly challenged, reflecting their foreign position among a minority of Japanese practitioners. In other words, their identities as *kendō* practitioners traverse the borderline between the Self and the Other.

Declaration

This is to certify that

- i. the thesis comprises only my original work towards the PhD,**
- ii. due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used,**
- iii. the thesis is fewer than 100 000 words in length, exclusive of tables, maps, bibliographies and appendices.**

Acknowledgement

When I visited *Kenshikan kendō* community for the first time to join in the training, I was bit worried, as a person who does not speak English fluently, that I may not be accepted as a member of the community. After training, however, my anxiety was gone, and I felt relieved by the members' cheerful laughter. They willingly introduced me to the community, and I witnessed their enthusiasm towards *kendō* practice. This open heartedness of the community was crucial for my fieldwork. Without their warm welcome and introduction to a network of friends, I would not have successfully finished my fieldwork. Additionally I was lucky to find *Kenshikan* people who were curious about my anthropological fieldwork and this helped make the participant-observation 'fun'. Now I humbly thank all the members of the *dōjō* for their kindness and support of my fieldwork. Also I would like to thank Yano *sensei* (master) and Peter *sensei* who kindly allowed me to become involved in the community as a practitioner and as a researcher.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Tamara Kohn, for inspirational conversations and advice. I thank her for being patient with my English-writing difficulties and for her careful reading of my thesis. I appreciate that she was always positive about my project. Throughout this entire process, I cannot count how many times I found myself struggling to carry out my research. Every time I encountered difficulty, she encouraged me with helpful words and guidance. I will not forget her words which allowed me to carry on: 'Your ethnography is the only record of your field site in the world — no one else would record your experiences at this particular moment with this special Melbourne community — only you'. I would also like to thank my co-supervisor Professor Ghassan Hage as a periodical inspector of my writing. Thank you for your time and critical analysis.

Thank you to the Department of Anthropology, Development Studies & Social Theory (in the School of Social and Political Sciences). In particular, I would like to thank Professor Andrew Dawson, Dr. Monica Minnegal and Associate Professor Carolyn Stevens (Asian Institute) for providing useful comments on my writing at different

points in its development.

A special thanks must be given to Professor Masanori Yoshioka of Kobe University in Japan. He is the one who first taught me the pleasure of studying anthropology. Thank you for always guiding me as a researcher and encouraging the spirit of my inquiry. I would also like to thank my dear friends Dr. Takako Yamaguchi, Dr. Tadayuki Kubo and Dr. Hiroshi Shimizu. Thank you for your time and kindness and sharing wonderful ideas and critiques with me.

Table of Contents:

Chapter One: Introduction and My Occidental Eyes.....	9
1. My Interest in Orientalism	12
2. <i>Kendō</i> and the Essence of Japanese Swordsmanship.....	17
3. The Unchangeable Unity of the Old <i>Kendō</i>	23
4. <i>Kendō</i> as a Communal Practice	28
5. My Positioning and My Occidental Eyes	32
6. Methodology: Textual Analysis, Participant Observation, and Focus Group.....	44
7. Additional Considerations for This Thesis.....	49
 Chapter Two: The Theoretical Background and Images of Japanese Martial Arts in the Western World	 52
1. Japanese Martial Arts in Anthropology	52
2. Japanese Martial Arts in Western Countries.....	54
3. A Genealogy of Orientalist Discourse.....	61
4. Desire and Disavowal for Japan	69
 Chapter Three: The Development of <i>Kendō</i> in Australia and <i>Kenshikan Dōjō</i> in Melbourne ..	83
1. All Japan <i>Kendō</i> Federation	83
2. History of <i>Kendō</i> in Australia and Victoria.....	86
3. General Description of <i>Kenshikan Dōjō</i>	91
(1) What do we do in the <i>Dōjō</i> ?	91

(2) Training Menu in our <i>Dōjō</i>	94
(3) Grading System	99
(4) Introductory Courses for Beginners	101
(5) Other <i>Dōjōs</i> in Melbourne	102
(6) Gender in our <i>Dōjō</i>	105
(7) Family Background	107
 Chapter Four: <i>Kendō</i> as Not Inevitably a Thing Japanese	111
1. An Interest in Real Combativeness	111
2. <i>Kendō</i> for the Jedi Knights	120
3. <i>Kendō</i> as an Accidentally Japanese Practice and as a Form of Contacting Newness	126
4. Familiarity to Things Japanese and Their Childhood Memories	131
5. The Third Meaning, Global Culture, and <i>Kendō</i> Practitioners	141
 Chapter Five: <i>Kendō</i> for the authentic Self but not for an authentic Otherness	147
1. <i>Kendō</i> as a Practice for Self-Expressiveness	149
2. Authentic Individuality and <i>Kendō</i> Practice as a Retreat from Everyday Life	154
3. Discussion on the ‘authentic Self’ and authentic Otherness	164
4. Practitioners’ authentic Self and an Orientalist View towards authentic Otherness	169
 Chapter Six: Exoticism, Fetishism and the Practitioners’ Objective Perspective	177
1. Japanese Practitioners in our <i>Dōjō</i>	177

2. The Practitioners' Awareness of themselves as Different	180
3. The Eyes of the Japanese Practitioners on Non-Japanese Practitioners	188
4. Recognising Difference in Fetishism and Identification	194
 Chapter Seven: Conclusion	 203
1. Orientalism and Occidentalism	203
2. Diversity of Interests in <i>Kendō</i> Practice and its Community	205
3. Subjective Involvement	207
4. Objective Involvement	210
5. The Current Discussion on Orientalism	213
 Epilogue	 224
Endnotes	228
References	242
Appendix 1: <i>Kendō</i> practitioners in <i>Kenshikan dōjō</i>	260
Appendix 2: Glossary of Japanese Terms	267

Chapter One: Introduction and My Occidental Eyes

Thirty years have passed since Edward Said's landmark publication, *Orientalism*, but the critical perspective he offered in the work continues to impact upon the world while it is at the same time refigured in current contemporary contexts. Borrowing the words from Rey Chow, 'Said's work, insofar as it successfully canonizes the demystification of Western cultural pretensions, is simply pointing a certain direction in which much work still waits to be done' (Chow 1998: 75). This thesis follows Chow's remark, and it attempts to elaborate on the issue of Orientalism as situated in a contemporary community in Melbourne.

Orientalism is a perspective that sees the culturally¹, ethnically² and historically different Other³ through the eyes of the Western Self⁴. In anthropological works, the perspective has been analysed in the context of colonialism in which a clear dichotomy of West and non-West is highlighted. However, my research is not only to focus on this simple geo-political dichotomous West/non-West structure that has been a central issue ever since the publication of Said's influential work, but also to pay more attention to the mingling world in which it is hard to draw a clear distinction between West and non-West. In particular, I am interested in the idea of the interwoven positioning of a subject. As Negri and Hardt have pointed out (2000)⁵, clear boundaries of what constitutes the West and the non-West have broken down. Bearing in mind Debord's *The Society of the Spectacle* (1995), they assert the importance of turning our eyes to the contemporary world which denies the clear differentiation of 'master and slave',

‘inside and outside’, ‘national and non-national’ and ‘observer and to be observed’. Negri and Hardt suggest that the contemporary spectacle world is structured not by a Hegelian dichotomy of master and slave (which means a continuous movement of internalising outside and externalising another outside)⁶ but by the absence of any ‘single locus of control’, a phenomenon which is, as Debord says, ‘both diffuse and integrated’ at the same time (cited in Negri and Hardt 2000: 323).

Thus my purpose is to examine how, within a dynamic contemporary cross-cultural setting, an Orientalist perspective is simultaneously embraced and contested. This thesis approaches the focus above by drawing upon fieldwork I conducted on a Japanese martial art practice outside of Japan. My empirical focus is on non-Japanese *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne and their representations of their art and Japan, and I conducted my participant-observation with a *kendō* community in *Kenshikan dōjō* (*kendō* is a Japanese martial art commonly recognised as Japanese fencing by the non-Japanese, and *dōjō* means a training hall).

Before I started my fieldwork, my head was full of information which I learnt from the literature on Orientalism. I had been most curious to examine how my observations in the *kendō* community could be explained within the critical literature on Orientalism. Thus, my fieldwork started to focus on the typical Orientalist narratives among the *kendō* practitioners which would naturally satisfy my curiosity and my expectations about Orientalist notions.

However, I have gradually realised that my expectations have been challenged by the narrative voices of *kendō* practitioners. The more I searched for an Orientalist

narrative among *kendō* practitioners, the more I noticed that the theory of Orientalism cannot be simply applied to explain the reality of non-Japanese practitioners in Melbourne. Eventually that made me realise that I was unconsciously presuming how those non-Japanese people would see Japanese martial arts. I was projecting an Occidental⁷ gaze on the world around me.

Kendō practitioners in Melbourne are those people who sometimes stereotype *kendō* practice as the practice of the exotic Japanese Other while they also see the practice as representing their self-identity without consciously noticing *this is my culture and that is someone else's*. Since the practice has been transported from Japan in the 1960s, it has become an activity among other Australian leisure activities such as cricket, AFL (Australian Rules Football)⁸, tennis and soccer. For the practitioners, the culture of *kendō* is there to absorb, and this practice of the Other is embraced within Australian everyday life. Borrowing an idea from Debord, what I have encountered is 'both diffuse and integrated' at the same time (cited in Negri and Hardt 2000: 323).

As such, my fieldwork has provided a process for me to realise that I unconsciously observed practitioners in Melbourne with my Occidental eyes, and I tried to fit them into a frame of Orientalism without clearly recognising this bias. In other words, my field has extended itself beyond research on the non-Japanese practitioners, but is also about the process of how I may overcome my Occidental eyes that inform my mind and understanding. In the remainder of this chapter, I will take you back to the beginning to introduce what I saw and understood with my Occidental gaze upon non-Japanese practitioners of Japanese martial arts.

At this stage too, I would like to refer, the reader, to a couple of important appendices to this thesis (Appendix 1 and 2). In these I provide a list of key characters to provide a useful reference on the personal characteristics and backgrounds of the individuals that are the field informants in this study. The second appendix provides a glossary of Japanese and martial arts related terms that may be usefully consulted throughout the reading of this work.

1. My Interest in Orientalism

I first came to Melbourne from Japan where I was born and raised in February 2008 as a PhD student. Initially I was thinking to work on Whiteness studies. Having been inspired by writers such as Fanon and Said, I was interested in the idea that individuals are not free from the objective gaze and that they are narrated within imagined racial frameworks. In particular, I focussed on the category of *White* and the process of othering. The category seemed to be a key for understanding modern racial ideologies given that the dominant racial frameworks of present-day academic discussion were produced with reference to the category of White. The category White was framed in the context of modern doctrines (such as medicine, anatomy, taxonomy, anthropology, eugenics, literature, the mechanism of nation-states and nationalism). With the *White race* at its top, the rest were labelled as subordinate races (*black Africans, yellow Asians, red Indians*). Distinguishing all human beings within a racial framework, namely the

modern system of White-centricity, I thought, has created unnatural human relationships (an unnatural distance that separates us from each other).

A starting point that made me think about the idea of the distance that human beings keep from each other was Arendt's idea of 'world alienation'. This gave me a perspective for thinking about human relationships within the concept of 'distance'. Arendt argued that world alienation began when Europeans went out to explore the world and discovered unheard-of continents and undreamed-of oceans (Arendt 1998(1958): 249). She argued that the discovery of the earth meant mapping its land and charting its waters, and that in this process one took 'full possession of his mortal dwelling place and gathered the infinite horizons' (ibid: 250). The more one can measure everything on the earth, the more the distance between him/her and the earth which used to be measureless space is abolished. In Arendt's own words, 'only the wisdom of hindsight sees the obvious, that nothing can remain immense if it can be measured, that every survey brings together distant parts and therefore establishes closeness where distance ruled before' (ibid: 250). World alienation of this kind led to expropriation and resulted in certain groups being deprived of their place in the world, and their 'naked exposure to the exigencies of life' (ibid: 255). Expropriation created 'both the original accumulation of wealth and the possibility of transforming this wealth into capital through labor' (ibid: 255), and therefore, in Arendt's view, it interfered with 'the very worldliness of man' in which people generated natural relationships with their family-owned land. 'The greater the distance between himself and his surroundings,

world or earth, the more [man] will be able to survey and to measure and the less will worldly, earth-bound space be left to him' (ibid: 251).

Applying Arendt's notion of distance, I started to think that the human relationship between one person and another is also affected by diminishing distance. For example, European colonial expansion to the rest of the world created dynamic contacts among us. The non-Western Other, which used to be fantasy-like, existing in travelogues, novels, and pictures, ceased to be obscure and ambiguous. Those bones of *primitive people* which anthropologists gathered in the innermost depths of the Amazonian region (and elsewhere) were measured and studied. Within the context of evolutionism (and racism), all human beings were objectively analysed and labelled. By measuring human skulls, their sizes and forms, the height of the nose, the colour of the eyes and so on, the relationship with the Other became materialised and reified, taking visible shapes (Blumenbach 1865; Gould 1981:50-72; Takezawa 2005:54). In other words, the ambiguous—and measureless—distance between one and another was abolished. This did not mean simply that human beings were categorised as white, black, yellow, or red, but also, as Fanon argued, that the other became essentialised and was fixed in a certain racial category without his or her will (Fanon 1967). As such, human beings were alienated from each other, and from any natural face-to-face relationship where there is no interference by the imagined frameworks of race.

Pursuing the notion of distance, I started to look at empirical evidence of such relationships. Anthropological discussion on the development of ethnographic museums was a topic that interested me. Since the ethnographic display in a museum is a process

of othering where the observer can see how people have represented culturally and ethnically different Others by materialising them (by means of objects), this seemed to be a good example with which to examine attitudes to, and narratives of, the Other. As I will argue in the following chapters, the process of othering in museum displays is a style of contextualising the history of the Other within a Western universal time-frame, and it produces a discourse in which the non-Western Other is imagined as not existing in the same reality with the West but rather somewhere in a timeless past (Fabian 1983: 30-31, 143). Through examining these attitudes in racial categories and representations of the Other, I gradually realised that a constant problem in the racial categorisation discussed above is an objective perspective vis-à-vis the Other in which individuals are represented from outside, labelled objectively as antique, old, primitive, and therefore inferior.⁹

Such interest in Whiteness as the process of othering turned my attention to the Japanese as a target of Western exoticism when I saw people in Melbourne who were involved in a community that practises a Japanese martial art. Soon after my arrival in Melbourne I joined one such community, and I started thinking about how a practice originating in Japan is represented within Australian White culture as well as keeping my daily routine (I had been practising *kendō* in Japan). At the very beginning, I was somewhat surprised to find that the community was predominantly non-Japanese and was extremely multicultural. This encounter with these *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne turned my focus away from Whiteness studies to a situation where the category of White is not so clear: where people from various backgrounds enjoy a

practice that is originally from a country that is not their own country of origin, and where people are subjectively involved in a practice of the Other.

Initially I thought that these people would just see Japan as something exotic, as in a museum display, observing it from a spectator's perspective. I believed that for those *kendō* practitioners, *kendō* as a part of an exotic *samurai* culture would seem to be a rare spectacle, just as it was for the early anthropologists studying exotic cultures in the non-Western world. I was looking for ways these practitioners would stereotype the Japanese Other. Indeed, during my fieldwork I often heard people mention the uniqueness of *kendō* practice, and some conversations which I had with those *kendō* practitioners did not disappoint my Occidentalist expectations. Through conversations I found some attitudes toward *kendō* culture in relation to typical Orientalist discourse on non-Western practice. In particular, practitioners' conversations on *kendō* as it is related to other martial arts practices gave me an impression that they indeed mystify the art as 1) the exotic practice of *samurai* swordsmanship, 2) an unchanged tradition from the past, and 3) the Asian *olden days* teaching of communal harmony. Such attitudes were found when I talked with practitioners such as P.S. (senior practitioner/Polish-German background), S (senior practitioner/Greek background), T.C. (senior practitioner/Irish-Japanese background), P (senior practitioner/Egyptian background), and S.F. (senior practitioner/ Irish background). Below, I introduce three cases describing my first impressions of the Melbourne practitioners and my early conversations with them.

2. *Kendō* and the Essence of Japanese Swordsmanship

The topic of *judō* as competitive sport in the Olympics is one hot topic among *kendō* practitioners. One day at lunch time, Practitioner S, a senior *kendō* practitioner, clearly stated that he does not agree with making *kendō* an Olympic sport. In S's view, as soon as *kendō* were to become an Olympic sport, it would 'lose depth'. Practitioner S further continued that *kendō* has to reject involvement in the Olympics, otherwise the art would become like *judō*. According to his understanding, *judō* is losing its 'old and good style' after becoming an Olympic sport and has changed to new rules as a result. P.S., another senior practitioner who was there agreed with S and explained that as soon as *judō* entered the Olympics, it became 'a points-scoring' sport.

P.S.: as soon as *judō* gets into the Olympics, the techniques that people are trying to do is purely for scoring ... point scoring...so lots of the rules and lots of the techniques were changed to make that easy ... gets away from trying to show real skills and proper techniques.

He said that 'proper techniques' were brushed away and the 'old teaching' of *judō* has now been pushed aside by those who are 'not true *judōka*¹⁰ and technicians'. Some instructors try hard to get their students into state competitions and national competitions. P.S. repeatedly insisted that *judō* is now an 'ego-based' sport in which practitioners only think in terms of 'win, win, win!'

A similar narrative was heard on another occasion when I talked to senior practitioner T.C. He expressed his view against sports in relation to commercialisation.

T.C.: In comparison to the other martial arts ... the development and spread of *kendō* is very controlled. For the vast majority of martial arts ... the original concept and the practice of it have been changed ... and commercialised. It's business ... in the countries like the States where it becomes business and becomes true sports ... The commercialisation doesn't really exist in *kendō* ...

What P.S. and T.C. express here seems to be a wish to maintain the *old-style* of teaching and techniques which they believe must remain non-commercialised and non-competitive. Judging from the above, *kendō* to them is not just a sport but something else—something special that is rooted in an Orientalist past. (We will in later chapters hear from ideas expressed by P.S. and T.C and others are far from Orientalist, but in this instance and early in my work I was attracted to examples like this one.)

While we were talking about another topic, P.S. stated that *kendō* has three components which explore what this something else might be. These are, in P.S.'s own terms, 'a sport side of it', 'a techniques side of it' and 'a way'. He particularly emphasises that we learn 'a way of living' or 'a philosophical approach to your life and your training' through *kendō* practice and that *kendō* is a place to create 'a better person for a society'.

Kendō, however, was indeed transformed with relation to its position in the sporting world at the beginning of the 20th Century. Through the process of modernisation, *kenjyutsu*¹¹, the previous form of *kendō*, was reformed into a more *sportive* activity for the physical education of a younger generation (Sugie 2005). Rules, techniques and grading systems were newly regularised as a modern sport, and most of the old techniques in each swordsman school which focused on the effectiveness in real fighting situations were abandoned (Bennet 2004: 15). Even though *kendō* derives from the physical and ethical discipline of old Japanese swordsmanship keeping the tradition of *samurai*, and people like P.S. and T.C. identify with this, it is also true to say that modern *kendō* is something else as well—something modern and competitive. As some Japanese researchers point out, when practised in the West, Japanese martial arts are sometimes associated in relation to a mysterious image of the *traditional* fighting culture of the East, which most Japanese practitioners in Japan engage in martial arts for physical education or just for pleasure (Suzuki 2005 16-17; Yamada 2001: 2-3). In my personal experience of practicing *kendō* in Japan too, most of Japanese practitioners whom I have practised with do not mention the culture of old swordsmanship. Through listening to the opinion of P.S., I confirmed that P.S. projects his desire for the superhuman capacity of a cool *samurai* who could reach philosophical enlightenment through confronting his enemies, and he projects a conviction that there is something *distinctively Japanese* in *kendō* practice.

My understanding of practitioner P.S. was also confirmed by my reading of some other researchers who represent orientalist discourse in relation to Japanese martial arts.

For example, Eugen Herrigel (1884-1948), a symbolic icon in *kyūdō* (Japanese style archery), was a German philosopher (Neo Kantian school) who came to Japan as a lecturer at Tohoku Imperial University in 1924. Herrigel then started learning *kyūdō* under the master called Kenzo Awa, and he was an eager practitioner. According to Yamada, Herrigel approached *kyūdō* practice in order to understand ‘the intellectual life of the Japanese’ which he believed to be unique to all Japanese arts (Yamada 2001). Like practitioner P.S. who practises as ‘a way of living’ the way of the old swordsman, Herrigel also searched for a kind of enlightenment through his practice. In his famous book, *Zen in the Art of Archery* (1953), Herrigel explained the relationship between his interest in *kyūdō* and the philosophy of Zen. He also sees *kyūdō* as something that represents the *samurai* culture of Japan.

In his *Essays in Zen Buddhism*, D.T. Suzuki has succeeded in showing that Japanese culture and Zen are intimately connected and that Japanese art, the spiritual attitude of the samurai, the Japanese way of life, the moral, aesthetic and to a certain extent even the intellectual life of the Japanese owe their peculiarities to this background of Zen and cannot be properly understood by anybody not acquainted with it (Herrigel 1953: 22-23; 1982: 16-17).

He further explains the reason why he came to practise *kyūdō* to understand Zen:

Why I set out to learn *kyujutsu* and not something else requires some explanation. Already from the time I was a student I had assiduously researched mystical doctrine, that of Germany in particular. However, in doing so, I realised that I lacked something of an ultimate nature ... Thus, when I was asked whether I wanted to work for a space of several years at Tohoku Imperial University, I accepted with joy the opportunity to know Japan and its admirable people. By so doing I had the hope of making contact with *living* Buddhism ... to understand in somewhat more detail the nature of that “detachment,” which Meister Eckhart had so praised but yet had not shown the way to reach (Herrigel 1982: 23-24).

However, recent studies on Herrigel show that Awa, whom Herrigel believed to be knowledgeable about Zen, did not have any background in Zen, and it was only Herrigel’s misunderstanding in which he personally interpreted mysterious Zen teachings in the words of Awa (Yamada 2001). Indeed, Herrigel was not a fluent Japanese speaker and he could not communicate properly with Awa without the transliteration by his Japanese friend. Heijiro Anzawa, the most senior student of Awa, left his account on Herrigel’s training with Awa. In the account of Anzawa, one of the most famous spiritual episodes in Herrigel’s book is explained as an accidental happening in which Awa did not intend to show such performance to Herrigel. While Herrigel enthusiastically informed Western readers about the episode as a mystic

practice of *kyudō*, Awa later told Anzawa that ‘No, that was just a coincidence! I had no special intention to demonstrate such a thing’ (Komachiya 1965 quoted in Yamada 2001: 18)¹².

Herrigel’s misinterpretation toward *kyudō*, however, has broadly been shared by the contemporary non-Japanese *kyudō* practitioners. As Yamada argues, his book became a powerful myth (Yamada 2001:27). For example, the research on an opinion poll which Tsukuba University conducted in 1983 shows the influence of Herrigel’s *Zen in the Art of Archery* among the non-Japanese *kyudō* practitioners in West Germany. Among the 131 practitioners, 84 per cent responded that they practise the art for spiritual training. 61 per cent answered their interest in Zen and 49 per cent particularly mentioned that they started practicing the art because of *Zen in the Art of Archery* (Kyudo Kenkyushitsu, Tsukuba University 1983 cited in Yamada 2001: 3).

Even though the case of Herrigel is much more extreme than my initial introduction here to *kendō* practitioner P.S. in terms of seeking *mystical doctrine* in relation to Zen, it is important to point out that both practitioners share an attitude in which they see Japanese martial arts as a practice to work towards their philosophical enlightenment. The narrative of both practitioners reveals that the philosophical side of Japanese martial arts is often highlighted as if it is an essence of the Japanese martial arts, and it has attracted many people who are particularly interested in philosophical and spiritual learning. As I discuss in later chapters, it was only much later in my fieldwork that I noticed that the philosophy of swordsmanship which *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne present through their discourse is constructed somewhat differently from the one

presented by this German philosopher. In contrast to Herrigel who searched for the essence of *Japanese* mystic philosophy in *kyudō*, *kendō* practice for Melbourne practitioners such as P.S., S and T.C. is not inevitably searching for an essence of *Japanese* practice.

In the next section, another aspect of an Orientalist gaze in the present is illustrated.

3. The Unchangeable Unity of the Old *Kendō*

While P.S. talked about the philosophical aspects of *kendō*, he also told me that the ‘proper *kendō*’ which he has tried to keep has now been lost in Japan. Then he explained about his findings during his long-term (over thirty years) involvement in this art. He asserted much like Suzuki and Yamada (above) that, in comparison to Japanese practitioners, non-Japanese practitioners are much more aware of the philosophical side of *budō* practice.

P.S.: I’ve met and trained in France with people back in the early 80s ... when I went to France and did some *keiko* there ... and I have found that France and even in England ... people are doing *kendō* for more than just physical and sports component side of it but doing it because of philosophical and ideological behind it ... but yes there is still a competitive side of it which is shown by those who are participating in

competition, but not all ... I don't believe the numbers are large that is driven by the sports side of it ... whereas in Japan yes it's part of culture ... but Japan is losing because high school and university *kendō* is pure sport ... (those Japanese) might move into more deeper aspects that the art gives you ... but most kids always think competitions are coming up!

By mentioning practitioners whom he met in France and England, P.S. is explaining his regret that Japanese *kendō* has changed and that the old culture of Japanese swordsmanship has not been adequately preserved in Japan. The narratives indicate that he is presupposing *what kendō should be like* as if there is something not to be lost.

For some practitioners, preserving Japanese *kendō* means resisting the internationalisation of the art. While discussing the issue of the Olympics, someone brought up the topic of *The World Kendo Championship*. Instead of joining the Olympics, *kendō* now has its own international championship, which is held once every three years. Senior practitioner V disagrees that Japanese *kendō* has gradually been changed due to internationalisation through the World Championship. V mentions an old Japanese *sensei*, who holds the rank of 8th *dan* and whom he saw in a video. He describes the *sensei* as 'so powerful and so beautiful to watch' and complains that the younger generation only focus on scoring points to win the championship. He says, 'now it's more ... Korean-style *kendō* ... yea ... bang! bang! bang!' According to him, Korean-style *kendō* is 'not real *kendō*' and focuses too much on quick and tricky cuts in

order to obtain scores.

In the case of practitioner T.C., a result of the internationalisation of *kendō* is the loss of the unusualness of the art. For T.C., internationalisation through the Olympics is related to *kendō* becoming mainstream. He would like to keep the *kendō* community smaller than other martial arts that have been internationalised.

T: Other martial arts like *judō* has changed completely because of competitions for Olympics ... and it's interesting to see that *kendō* has been requested to join the Olympics and it has turned this down a few times in order to preserve the true content of *kendō*. It is why *kendō* is not a mainstream martial art, and it's very very small ... which I think is quite a good thing. This is one aspect of *kendō* which makes it unique. When the first proposal [for the Olympics] was made, I understand that people were asking about sensors ... electronic sensors to put on to *bogu* (*kendō* armour) just like fencing. So if things like that happen it would be disastrous for *kendō* ... and I'll refuse to compete.

According to his narrative, T.C. prefers that the *kendō* community remains small. While he is worried about *kendō* becoming an Olympic sport, he is also worried that the *kendō* practice will become excessively popularised. The narrative of practitioner T.C. suggests that he enjoys *kendō* as a non-mainstream Australian practice, and his disagreement with *kendō* as an Olympic sport is related to his aversion to making *kendō*

a *usual practice*. In addition, comparing *kendō* to fencing, which uses electronic sensors, T.C. does not want to see *kendō* resort to technology. *Kendō* is characterised by its retention of its old style, which makes the art *unusual*. As such, *kendō* as a Japanese martial art maintains an image of being *unchangeable*, which is very different from popular modern sports. He believes *kendō* to be *old and feudal* in its purest state.

Those attitudes towards non-Western culture can be analysed by attending to Orientalist discourse on the non-Western Other. In anthropological works, the idea of preserving non-Western people and cultures has often been criticised in relation to essentialist dichotomies more generally. For example, Levi-Strauss's description of 'cold' and 'hot' society (distinguishing West and non-West) has been criticised, claiming that it unconsciously presupposes the non-West as an unchangeable entity (Levi-Strauss 1976: 29-30; Chandler 1999: 97; Carrier 1995: 3). In the dichotomy, the non-West is located as pre-modern; it could be said that the non-West was presupposed as the pure remnant of an ancient or *primitive* world. Compared to the Western world where cultures are represented as having constantly changed and improved, the non-West is imagined as a closed society where no dynamic change occurs. In other words, the non-West is enclosed in what anthropologists would later call the 'ethnographic present'. As Fabian observed, the 'ethnographic present' describes the non-West as pure (authentic) culture, which has not encountered Western civilisation (Fabian 1983). Levi-Strauss' description has been accused of presuming that there is a pure entity in non-Western cultures. It also essentialises non-Western cultures as *always-already primitive*, a condition produced by the Western imagination of the Other.

The purely preserved and untouched *primitive* societies of this imagination are sometimes depicted as utopian, sometimes barbarous, and sometimes pre-modern. Against these critiques one could approach *kendō* practitioners' narratives on *unchangeable kendō* as an intention to seek authenticity in the culture of the Other, which they try to preserve what they believe to be real.

Such attitude toward an authentic culture of the non-West is also linked to an idea that such a unique entity as a whole must be preserved to avoid fully *vanishing*. Boas's salvage anthropology regarded non-Western cultures as 'vanishing cultures' and aimed to preserve *primitive* cultures (Erickson and Murphy 2008:95). North American anthropology in the early 20th Century was eager to discover and document non-Western cultures. As Boas himself worked for museum collections, those cultures became a subject for museum display. Criticising salvage ethnography in relation to the 'ethnographic present', James Clifford has pointed out that a 'salvage ethnographer could claim to be the last to rescue "the real thing"'; 'authenticity, as we shall see', he continued, 'is produced by removing objects and customs from their current historical situation' (Clifford 1988:228).

Likewise, the *kendō* practitioners' words above reflect a similar Orientalist and salvage practitioners' desire to try to save *a vanishing culture of kendō*. Their narratives read (to me) as if they believe in an authentic essence at the heart of *kendō*, and such attitudes towards the art can easily become a target to be criticised by someone like me who, due to my own cultural background and education, is prone to listen out for Orientalist stereotypes.

4. *Kendō* as a Communal Practice

For some practitioners in Melbourne, *kendō* does not only refer to an unchangeable tradition that needs to be preserved, but also represents the uniqueness of the art as a well-mannered, disciplined practice. Practitioners like P see *kendō*, which is not sports-oriented, as a well-mannered martial art. According to P, *kendō* is supposed to follow the old style, and that, he suggest, gives *kendō* practice a ‘controlled manner’ and ‘true *kendō*’ is practised with a ‘gentleman’s agreement’. In addition, when P talks about what *kendō* should be like, he often compares it to other martial arts, such as *taekwondo*, *karate*, and *judō*. By categorising those martial arts as sports, he obviously differentiates what he does in *kendō* practice. According to practitioner P, someone might consider *kendō* to be, as he put it, ‘as barbaric as *karate*, and he added ‘it’s just a bashing up of each other’. However, P says,

P: When you first see *kendō* that’s what you see. People are hitting each other with sticks. They may not think it’s in a controlled matter, but it is very controlled. With *kendō* there are certain rules ... Although I haven’t done other martial arts, one of the things I found with *kendō* is the etiquette that’s involved. I went to see my cousins doing taekwondo training ... Is there etiquette in there? Cause I didn’t see any. The way you conduct yourself ... which is walking to the *dōjō*, bow, hand out as you are passing someone ... and bowing when you’re starting and

bowing when you finish ... to me it's pretty unique in *kendō*.

P repeatedly asserts that what *kendō* practitioners learn is the 'etiquette' of human relationships whereas he had not found any such things in *karate* (although most karate practitioners would protest this assertion). According to P, one can learn 'politeness' and other manners of dealing with other people at the same time as learning *kendō* techniques. Practitioner S.F., who was also participating in our conversation, added to P's comment, and he contrasted *kendō* with other activities such as tennis. S.F. emphasised that in *kendō* we train as 'a community' in which people help each other, whereas the relationship in tennis is just between you and your coach (another assertion that a tennis player would likely protest). What S.F. was celebrating for *kendō* was a Japanese style of social relationship, '*senpai*' (senior practitioners) and '*kohai*' (junior practitioners), in which senior practitioners are expected to help the learning process of junior practitioners.

For these *kendō* practitioners introduced here, practising *kendō* is not only about learning bodily techniques; it is also represented as a communal interaction regarding how one interacts with fellow members. Thus the *senpai/kohai* relationship is recognised as something that represents *kendō*. 'Politeness' and 'etiquette' are other important communal elements that practitioners often remark on or flag as significant in *kendō* practice. By considering these narratives of communal interaction with the previous narratives of practitioners on *kendō* more generally, I confirmed at early stage in my research my own stereotype of non-Japanese practitioners in Melbourne as

Orientalists. I had come to an Orientalist representation of *kendō* in the Western imagination: a *harmonious Eastern culture* that maintains communal ties.

Donohue, a cultural anthropologist whose speciality is martial arts, gives a critical view of the contemporary popularity of Asian martial arts. He argues that Asian martial arts culture is often represented by means of concepts of spirituality and communal obligation (Donohue 1994). He notes that there are stereotypical images attached to martial arts in the contemporary world, which in his case focuses particularly on the U.S (ibid: 53-67). Especially in media such as films, martial arts are sometimes depicted as a tool for a warrior hero to recapture social harmony and celebrate individual freedom. With reference to films such as *Perfect Weapon* and *Above the Law*, in which martial arts warriors fight against evil and protect their communities, Donohue demonstrates this as a pattern in American culture, where Asian martial arts is used as a type of metaphor (ibid: 53). In ‘the enduring American fascination with the mythic warrior’, Donohue argues, ‘there is a dichotomy between individual freedom and social cohesion. The warriors who could use martial arts fighting skills to protect their fellows take a role to fuse the gap between the two’ (ibid: 53, 67). Through the martial arts heroes who serve the community, American culture can fuse the dichotomy: ‘the martial arts symbolically present the potential for individual enhancement through fighting skill, and perpetuate the notion that the sometimes violent impulses of individualism are, in a way, an integral part of social life’ (ibid: 67).

What I would like to highlight in Donohue’s argument is the fact that American individualism, which is seen as sometimes violating Asian *harmonious* communal life,

can only be fused into social cohesion by the metaphoric work of martial arts. As Donohue explains,

By dint of training, martial artists are considered to have both the physical capacity to deal with (and deal out) violence ... The arsenal of these martial arts heroes are often more rudimentary than those of their American predecessors, since they borrow heavily from classical arsenals of Asian culture (Donohue 1994: 64).

It is, in fact, in the violent action undertaken by the warrior that he finds a type of connection that briefly effects a type of commitment to the larger social group ... in the very act of directing his skills and force towards the service of others, he creates a brief fusion between individual action and group commitment. (ibid: 66)¹³.

These representations are not simply a hero's physical strength that is individually built up, but also mental strength that an individual builds up through training in Asian martial arts. In other words, it can be observed from Donohue's argument that Asian martial arts are: 1) represented as a path that leads a person to physical strength; and 2) represented as a path to recover social harmony which can be maximised when a person studies martial arts deriving from Asia, and 3) deriving a good way of life that humans possessed in the old *classic* days in Asia. Although Donohue's argument is particularly

focused on American culture, it also resonates with the attitude among some of my *kendō* practitioners. His argument helped to demonstrate to me the tendency of the Melbourne practitioners to connect Asian martial arts with the image of *a good way of life and communal harmony* leading me to believe that some *kendō* practitioners, such as P and S.F., are specially attracted by the *Asian aspect* of *kendō*.

Throughout my early fieldwork, I tended to focus on those narratives which I believed to be *typical* Orientalist features among *kendō* practitioners without paying as close attention to other features. What those *kendō* practitioners presume in these conversations is, I believed, a martial art culture that is characterised in terms of swordsman's philosophy, non-sportive, non-international, continuity with the past, non-commercialisation, and communal relationships. By referring to the criticism of the Orientalist gaze by researchers such as Yamada, Clifford, and Donohue, I was enthusiastic to elaborate on my initial findings to explain the discourse on contemporary Orientalism in a martial art community.

5. My Positioning and My Occidental Eyes

My perspective toward the *kendō* practitioners as simply Orientalists, however, was initially questioned when I spoke to practitioner T.C. Through his narrative, I realised that his attitude toward *kendō* is constructed and interwoven with an attitude shared by the Japanese practitioners at the *dōjō*. Both attitudes help create an image of what *kendō*

should be like. In other words, the image of *kendō* is a construction by both outsider and insider. This finding also led me to turn attention to myself. I started considering the degree to which I am able to see non-Japanese practitioners through the eyes of one who is both outsider/insider, influenced by what each side experiences around *kendō*.

One day T.C. explained to other members about comments he received from a Japanese *sensei* who visited the dojo and told T.C. that he is amazed that Japanese style *kendō* is maintained and practised in Australia. T.C. proudly asserted the importance to preserve the tradition of Japanese *kendō* in our *dōjō*. He then referred to another Japanese *kendō sensei*'s published work:

He was saying that ... he believes that the concept of *nihon* (Japanese) *kendō* has actually emerged down the track. So there is *kendō* and there is *Japanese kendō*. The Japanese national team would have to adopt the *kendō* style when they're competing in the World Championship.

By naming *Japanese kendō*, what this Japanese *sensei* does is to distinguish *Japanese kendō* from the rest in order to preserve his image of what *kendō* should be like. He realised his perspective through encounter with the outside. Agreeing with the Japanese *sensei*, practitioner T.C. asserts his opinion that he also believes to preserve this *Japanese kendō* through rejecting internationalisation.

This made me realise that the narrative of practitioner T.C. could not be fully explained within the discourse of Orientalist representation of the non-Western Other.

Practitioner T.C. essentialises *Japanese kendō* through quoting the words of the Japanese *sensei*. It indicates a situation in which non-Japanese practitioners have been influenced by what the Japanese practitioners have announced about *kendō*, while at the same time the Japanese practitioners become aware of *the Japaneseness of kendō* through encountering the outside world. Then I gradually realised that my *kendō* friend did not only see *kendō* from his own foreign perspective but also by taking the Japanese view into his account of what *kendō* should be like. In other words, I found that the perspective of practitioner T and the perspective of the Japanese *sensei* are interwoven with each other, eventually producing a shared affinity to and recognition of *Japanese kendō*.

This brings me to a consideration of the concept of *bushidō*. *Bushidō* has been broadly known to the West as distinctively Japanese, and it has been a symbolic concept which is believed to explain the unique character of the Japanese. The book, *Bushidō: The Soul of Japan*, was published in 1899 in English, and it was written for English speakers (Funabiki 2010: 70-71). According to Funabiki, a Japanese anthropologist, the concept called *bushidō* originally was an invention by a Japanese person who saw a significant difference between his country and Western countries at the end of 19th Century. Inazo Nitobe, who was a Christian with an American wife, started to work on how to introduce Japan to the West while he stayed in the U.S. His encounter with Western cultures gave him a chance to consider the relationship between the West and his country. By referring to Western writers and theorists such as Hegel and Veblen (in order to aid Western readers' understanding of the Japanese mentality), he started to

frame what the Japanese character might be (Nitobe 1936: 54¹⁴, 155; Funabiki 2010: 71). This illustrates what James Carrier has called a process of ‘self-definition through opposition with the alien’ (1995: 3). Furthermore, Nitobe’s work on *bushidō* has become one of the most widely read books on Japan in the Western world (Pandey 1999:44)¹⁵. Since the publication of the book, the concept has been repeatedly resurrected in the Western world and has continued to spread an idea of what the Japanese should be like. As such the image attached to the concept of *bushidō* is not only the invention of Nitobe, but it is also invented by the mutual encounter between him and the West. It is the product of a dialectic spiral.

Likewise I recognise how I too am involved in this dialectic spiral, and I have unconsciously self-defined *kendō* as a practice for the Japanese through encountering the non-Japanese practitioners who are in turn influenced by the self-definition of Japanese practitioners. Then, referring to the literature of Orientalism which I studied, I might further confirm that those non-Japanese practitioners fit my image of what non-Japanese Orientalists should be like. Indeed as Nitobe did, I also, in my thoughts and expectations, produce the dichotomy between the Japanese and the non-Japanese.

The work of Nicholas Thomas who critically examines this mutual defining of an image introduced me to the notion of Occidentalism (1992a: 213-232; 1992b:64-85). Thomas focuses on the context of the self-definition process of Fijian identity of *kerekere*¹⁶, and he shows how an Occidental view is produced through the process of ‘essentialized constructs of selves and others within which particular customs and practices are emblematic’ (Thomas 1992b: 82)¹⁷. The point here is that the encounter

with the colonisers as outsiders encourage the local Fijians to reify the practice of *kerekere* as their *tradition*, and the reification gives the locals a perspective or how to see the West as the different Other. This mutual categorisation from each side is a reformulation in which both sides essentialise themselves against each other. Carrier, who analyses the work of Thomas, examines the process of *kerekere*, and he warns that one who is consciously aware of Orientalist narratives might risk falling in the hole of Occidentalism. Carrier explains the work of Thomas thus:

His point is that the conceptions that indigenous Pacific people have of themselves, conceptions that include notions like *kastom* and the centrality of *kerekere*, are not simple reifications of aspects of social life. Rather, they are reifications in context, and the context is the encounter of the village and intruding colonial Western social life. But of course Pacific islanders no more perceive the intruding West in neutral, objective terms than intruding Westerners perceive those islanders in neutral, objective terms. Instead, these orientalist imaginations of islanders emerges as part of a dialectic that also produces occidentalisms (Carrier 1995: 7).

So, to return to my story that sets the scene for the thesis ahead, the narrative of practitioner T.C., which led me to Nitobe and Thomas, made me notice my Occidental gaze. Indeed I became aware that I had unconsciously categorised who is an

insider/outsider, presupposing that the interest in *kendō* for non-Japanese people must come from their desire for exotic otherness. Paradoxically, my own attempts to critique Orientalism were actually helping to invent Orientalists among the *kendō* practitioners. This resonates with the case of the historian Hobsbawm (1983) whose eagerness to discover ‘the invention of tradition’ was criticised by Jolly because his argument paradoxically highlights the dichotomy between authentic and inauthentic traditions, presuming a substitute entity of traditions which is not termed authentic¹⁸ (Jolly 2000: 276).

Dismantling the East/West dichotomy is an expected goal for anthropologists ever since the appearance of Said’s discussion on Orientalism (c.f. Hendry 2006:1-7). However, individual anthropologists like myself are often confronted with unsettling experiences inherent in self/other identification. For example, it is odd to observe a scene where one’s familiar culture is also part of the familiar culture of the Other, and it is difficult to avoid contemplating the borders between self/other and East/West in such an environment. Of these challenges, the trickiest one to embrace might be the instability of identification *against* the presence of the Other.

This realisation was difficult for me, as I feared that interaction with non-Japanese practitioners would awaken my subconscious Occidental eyes. Dorinne Kondo, a Japanese American, also encountered this fear when she lived with a Japanese informant family as part of her fieldwork in Japan. Kondo found that the family preferred to treat her as Japanese rather than American. The interaction, Kondo says, allowed her American identity to be rewritten according to what the family wanted her

to be (Kondo1990: 15, 18). Kondo continued to behave like a Japanese person until she could no longer tolerate her discomfort with this identification. She eventually ended up distancing herself from the family by finding an apartment of her own, a space where she was free to be an American in a Japanese environment. While Kondo gradually strengthened her American identity *against* the Japanese informants, I, with my Occidental eyes, shaped my identity upon arrival in the Australian *dōjō* with a strong sense of Japaneseness *against* non-Japanese informants.

I decided that my fieldwork must begin by abandoning the aspect of my Japaneseness that demands attachment to one's origin: it fixes one's identification to a particular place, history, border and people. I then came to understand that two opposed parties do not 'necessarily indicate the holistic character of either party as a substantial entity', and the apparent East/West dichotomy is just 'contrasted features of both parties' (Shimizu 2006: 20). Dismantling this dichotomy, in other words, becomes possible when we realise that the dichotomy is actually the angle of reflection at the site of intercultural contact.

Once I arrived at this understanding, I was able to stop thinking *what the non-Japanese practitioners should be like* and open my Japanese eyes more fully to non-Japanese people. By getting involved in the *kendō* community, I gradually came to understand that the practitioners were sharing their everyday reality with the culturally and ethnically different Other. They were not necessarily aware of a dichotomised self and other, and they did not appear to consciously observe a racial dichotomy of *who is Western and who is not*. Focusing on a local situation where people constantly pick up

various things without consciously noticing what is on one side of the dichotomous frame and what is on the other side, I demonstrate in this thesis how otherness can be represented within a contemporary *spectacle* world where there is no fixed we/them dichotomy and there may not be a clear cultural boundary to define what is *my culture* and what is *the Other's*. In examining the way people subjectively appropriate a tradition of the Other into their everyday life, my field research demonstrates an alternative way of contacting the Other. The *extraordinariness* of the Other is not necessarily highlighted, and relations with the Other can break down the structures of observer and observed.

In Chapter Two, I first review the European contextualisations of the Other within particular time-frames produced by Western modernity in order to present a general understanding of how one narrates (or represents) the Other where one confronts the culturally and ethnically different Other. I particularly focus on the way the Orientalist imagination of the Other helps to systematise a recognition of the world that differentiates non-Western people and their culture from the Western present. Focusing on the technique of time-framing the Other, I trace the technique of contextualising the Other from the 16th Century's *cabinets of curiosities* to the 20th Century museum display. Then I narrow down the topic to representations of Japan. I review literature and historical documents that demonstrate how Japan as a non-Western Other has been represented in the context of the Western past and future and as something far different from the West. Literature ranging from academic to non-academic texts written by non-Japanese will be analysed. The purpose of this chapter is to clarify some distinctive

issues in the discourse of Orientalism. The discussions here are repeatedly referred to in later chapters in order to draw a comparison with *kendō* practitioners in contemporary Melbourne.

In Chapter Three, I introduce the development of *kendō* in Australia, before discussing particular cases in Chapter Four. The historical stories, which I collected from documents and interviews with contemporary practitioners, illustrate the background of the Melbourne *kendō* community (*Kenshikan dōjō*). Along with an historical understanding, I also provide a general description of the atmosphere of *Kenshikan dōjō*. Here, I provide basic information, including rituals taught in the *dōjō*, the daily training menu, and relationships with other *dōjōs* in Victoria. This chapter helps readers grasp what practitioners in Melbourne normally do.

In Chapter Four, I examine the reality that practitioners are not necessarily aware of Japaneseness, but rather that they enjoy the *kendō* practice as a way to add spice to their daily life. According to some practitioners with whom I have formed particularly close relationships, the attitudes of these *kendō* practitioners have changed occasionally, and different practitioners interpret their practice in different ways. For some practitioners, *kendō* is perceived as simply something new. In particular, their interest in Japan and *kendō* as something new was interwoven with their childhood memories of a TV drama aired in Australia called *The Samurai*. With the obscure expression something, which Roland Barthes might call ‘the third meaning’ (Barthes 1977: 54, 61), they interpret the *kendō* practice as something extra in their lives, which is in some way related to their familiar memories. On other occasions, I found that practitioners enjoy the practice as

something to satisfy their desire for combative excitement. Inspired by sword fighting scenes in the film *Star Wars*, the narratives of some practitioners show that they accidentally come across *kendō* in the process of seeking to be a cool Jedi Knight. These media generated curiosity about *kendō* culture and gave some individuals a starting point to get involved in the *kendō* community. The narratives I introduce in this chapter imply that the practitioners' interest in the art is not inevitably derived from their curiosity toward things Japanese.

In Chapter Five, I further investigate the view that practitioners are *not inevitably interested in Japanese culture* from another angle by examining their interest toward the self. While I was observing how the practitioners narrated things they had learned in *kendō* practice, I found that the concept of an authentic Self was a key term for them. Within the narratives that I have analysed, I often found the practitioners mentioning the terms such as express the self, challenge the self and discipline the self. These indicate a consciousness about themselves and not the Japanese Other. This could be interpreted to suggest that someone else's culture (the practice of the culturally and ethnically different Other) is not simply an exotic phenomenon that differentiates the Other from the context of one's own present. Instead, the practice of the Other is reshaped into the practitioners' everyday life, framing their identity as a mentally and physically healthy self. This being the case, I started to wonder if the *kendō* practitioners were perhaps breaking the Self/Other distance by embodying a practice of the culturally and ethnically different Other, suggesting their subjective involvement in the practice of the Other. Moreover, such involvement is further elaborated on through the narratives of

certain practitioners. They have said to me that the reason why they keep practicing *kendō* is because of its positioning of an alternative space to belong. As I discuss later, some practitioners enjoy their involvement in the *kendō* community to allow them to separate from their everyday hectic lives. Terming their interest in this separation as *temporary retreat from everydayness*, I found that they are epistemologically individualists distancing themselves from the dominant discourse that determines their positioning in society. With the help of concepts that are distinctive among New Agers, I suggest in the chapter that their sense of alternative belongingness is a strong desire for *here and now to be an authentic Self* without being disturbed by an authority outside of themselves.

In Chapter Six, I focus on the practitioners' awareness of themselves as foreigners to the practice. Even though they have subjectively become involved in the *kendō* practice and its community, they are also keen to understand how they are seen as outsiders by Japanese practitioners. In *Kenshikan dōjō*, there are some Japanese practitioners, including masters. The presence of Japanese practitioners constantly challenges the presence of non-Japanese practitioners. In other words, the *kendō* practice gives non-Japanese practitioners the perspective of seeing themselves reflected in the eyes of Japanese. Their objective ability to see themselves from the perspective of the Japanese Other also places them in a unique position. This position will be shown to be different from those of Orientalists, who I introduce in Chapter Two. In the discourse on Orientalism, the view of Orientalists is a one-way interpretation of the non-Western Other in order to preserve the position of those from the West as the spectators. In

contrast, the *kendō* practitioners will be shown to vacillate between the Self and Other. As Victor Segalen notes, an encounter with cultural and historical differences can sometimes destroy one's identity, which is held before the encounter (Segalen 2002). In this context, *kendō* practitioners experience the process of *reset and restructure* of their identities by constantly reflecting on themselves through an objective perspective. In other words, the practitioners create the eyes of the Japanese in their own mind. This stance of intersubjective positioning, shared with the Japanese Other, implies that non-Japanese practitioners in Melbourne try to transcend the frame of *I* as the Self/Other.

In Chapter Seven (Conclusion), I review the discussions in each chapter. By recalling each chapter, I reconsider the importance of my fieldwork findings with regard to the long genealogy of Orientalist representation of the Other. Additionally, I challenge current academic discussions on the Orientalist discourse on Japan. The purpose is to position my fieldwork findings within contemporary Orientalist representations, and I lead readers to a larger picture of non-Japanese people who have engaged in something Japanese. In particular, I focus on the critical arguments of the contemporary trend in the Orientalist representations by Brett de Bary and Rey Chow. According to de Bary, Saidian criticism toward Orientalism can be further elaborated. The racial identification that has produced *what White Western man is* no longer promises a definite identity, instead becoming a rather unstable position with the emergence of the Oriental Other who talks back to the White Western subject. In such a contemporary world, the narratives of old-style Orientalists are criticised with didactic

reflection, which is what Chow and de Bary call ‘anti-Orientalist didacticism’ (Chow 1998; de Bary 2006). However, de Bary argues that the didacticism promotes a careless conclusion that the problem of the Japanese Other is ‘already accomplished’, as if it was happily solved. My purpose in the chapter is to add an alternative perspective to anti-Orientalist didacticism. With my field analysis, I emphasise the importance of examining *kendō* practitioners, whose attitudes toward *kendō* as a culture of the Other cannot be simply discussed in the same framework as that of de Bary and Chow.

6. Methodology: Textual Analysis, Participant Observation, and Focus Group

Regarding methodology, I employ three different methods: textual analysis, participant observation, and focus-group analysis in order to add the everyday perspectives of martial arts practitioners in Melbourne to the text-centred analysis of representations of Japan. The three methods assist my examination of representations of Japan and martial arts culture through the combination of the textual analysis with fieldwork. My fieldwork research set out to demonstrate the ways in which practitioners re-structure their present through appropriating a practice of the Other, thus breaking down the extraordinariness of otherness.

First, the various narratives attached to the non-Western Other, Japan, and martial arts culture in written texts will be carefully investigated. Analysing texts is one effective method for examining representations. When Foucault examines discourses

(that is, groups of discursive narratives which represent knowledge and meaning about a particular topic at a particular historical moment), he focuses on language and the way language is used in a particular period, and then he carefully examines texts as a formation of discursive language (Foucault 1972; Hall 1997: 78). Said explores this Foucaultian discourse analysis from the perspective of colonialism, imperialism, and Orientalism. In order to analyse the patterns that Orientalists narrate about Orientals, Said also pays attention to language as the mode of knowledge (Said 1979; 1994). Said asserts the importance of reading such texts as a part of the imperial enterprise over the colonised (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia 2000: 92). By exposing the interrelationship between the empirical world and the texts, Said tries to re-read the mechanism of colonial authority seen behind the texts by examining who speaks of what, where, and when (Said 1994: 51). This critical method is what he calls ‘contrapuntal reading’ (ibid: 66). I follow this in my interest in *reading* both texts and real life expressions as uncovered in focus group discussion. Therefore I have focused on works written by people in the English-speaking world¹⁹. Documents that discuss Japanese and martial arts culture are broadly analysed. The narratives I analyse are taken from both academic and non-academic texts on martial arts culture. For example, the scope of scholarly work includes those texts produced by early Japanologists from a range of fields including history, politics, anthropology, and sociology. At a more popular and public level, texts produced by journalists, novelists, and travel writers are examined.

The fieldwork component of my research was conducted at a small training hall in Melbourne where I have practised *kendō* for 24 months. *Kendō* is a Japanese martial art

that makes use of swords made of bamboo. The training hall where I practise *kendō*, called *Kenshikan dōjō*, was founded in 1990 by Japanese businessman Kenshiro Otsuka and his family. During my fieldwork (from 2009 till 2011), I participated as a practitioner of *kendō* in thrice-weekly training sessions held at *Kenshikan dōjō*. I further interacted with the other practitioners during social activities such as tea gatherings held on Sundays after training, occasional drinking sessions on weekends, barbeques held on special occasions, championships held at both state and local levels, and focus group sessions that I organised. Even though my fieldwork is different from some other types of fieldwork where anthropologists stay for some months in a community with his or her informants, the 24 months of my training with practitioners and my fieldwork is a different way of working that emerges from the focus on how a practice such as *kendō* is positioned in the time and space of contemporary Melbourne. Through fieldwork interaction with *kendō* practitioners, I add the multivocality of present-day communicative experience to the analysis of textual representations as discussed above.

In addition to participating in the community and engaging in casual conversation, I also embarked upon a focus-group exercise. Focus-group analysis is a widely used method in social science to consider a specific theme or concern through guided conversation among a group of people who share a common interest. According to Krueger, focus-group analysis is regarded as useful for observing the narratives of a certain group of people who vary by age, gender, and occupation but have commonalities such as being adults, residents in a community, non-users of a public service, and so forth (Krueger 2001:344). The focus-group analysis has therefore been

developed to explore ‘insights into the attitudes, perceptions, and opinions’ of a group of individuals who come from a variety of social backgrounds but have certain similarities vis-a-vis a particular topic (Krueger 2001:345). As such, the focus group seems well suited to assist my research in finding out the perspectives held by the martial arts practitioners who come from different social backgrounds but share common features such as living in an English-speaking country, practising Japanese martial arts, having an interest in Japan, and so forth.

In my focus-group exercise, I coordinated five casual gatherings after training where I audio-taped (with permission) the practitioners’ conversation. In order to induce natural conversation, I invited participants to have an open-ended casual discussion about their understanding and interpretation of Japanese martial arts culture. I examined the patterns they associated with martial arts culture in the context of their daily life. Along with the open-ended discussion, I introduced group discussion material such as youtube videos relating to *kendō* training, stories about Japanese *kendō* players, demonstrations from a senior instructor, and so forth. Roughly setting the starting point for the talk, I analysed how the participants interpreted the materials, how they linked the materials to their understandings of *kendō* practice, what images of *kendō* practice they picked up in relation to their everyday life, what images of *kendō* were avoided in talking about their everyday life, and so forth.

Also, given that a representation is a collective mode of individual narratives, observation of a group conversation can be interpreted as a kind of a narrative analysis where I could analyse a certain pattern of thinking from the way in which participants

responded and talked (Krueger 2001: 345). The anthropologist Joseph Tobin has attempted to analyse the voices of the people whom he observed as part of his fieldwork, where he shot videotapes of a typical day in a preschool classroom setting. After editing the videotapes Tobin took them back to the school staff members and solicited their interpretations and explanations of their own behaviour and their own culture. He used the voices of the ‘insiders’ as ‘a series of narratives, a series of interpretive and evaluate statements told in different voices’ (1989:176). In his view, the multiple voices that tell about themselves and their cultural institution are their own texts telling their own stories (ibid: 179). Following Tobin’s style, I investigated the patterns in the practitioners’ conversations in the focus-group where members exerted mutual influence on each other to create certain narratives about their understandings of martial arts culture. These narratives could at times correspond to those elicited more privately or not depending on many factors that will be explored through the ethnography.

In particular, what I wanted to examine carefully was the practitioners’ selectivity when they discussed a particular topic. Following Hall’s analysis of the function of discourses in media, a narrative of discourse is not simply and passively inherited by individuals (1980:128-138). In the process of decoding the discourse, each individual will negotiate and oppose the discourse. This process takes place in what Hall calls a ‘margin of understanding’ (ibid: 128-138). In short, the narratives of each individual are selections of individual interpretations. Representing the Other is also considered to relate to a complex process of decoding. I argue that by analysing the process of decoding where the practitioners selectively pick up one image that suits the tacit

understanding on each topic, it is possible to have a better understanding of the patterns in which people in the English-speaking world narrate martial arts and Japan within the context of the contemporary non-Japanese practitioners in Melbourne.

7. Additional Considerations for This Thesis

Although this thesis particularly focuses on a small community of Melbourne in which non-Japanese practitioners narrate a Japanese martial art and things related to it, there are many angles from which to examine a martial arts community in Melbourne.

Melbourne, as a city in Australia known for its multiculturalism, is a dynamic place encompassing people from culturally, historically, and ethnically different backgrounds. Thus the *kendō* community in Melbourne can be examined from various perspectives within the larger framework of Australia, and the practitioners' attitude towards *kendō* practice should be investigated in relation to their ethnicities, their daily life outside of the *dōjō* in multicultural Melbourne, their attitudes towards social hierarchies in Australia, and so on.

In addition, the representation of Japan is diverse as I will be demonstrating in Chapter Two, and different narratives are presented in each historical period. For example, those older generations who lived through the war with Japan might have negative images towards things Japanese. By comparison, the younger generation may be much more friendly towards Japan and its culture. Indeed, during my fieldwork I

heard from some practitioners that they felt distanced from their parents' generation. The practitioners in *Kenshikan dōjō* are distanced from World War II by between one and three generations. They have grown up with an Australian government policy that promoted economic ties with Japan. Indeed, when these practitioners were children, Japan was one of Australia's biggest trade partners (Terada 2000; Oliver, P. 2004).

Furthermore, the issue of gender could be pursued to provide an even more finely tuned understanding of martial arts practice. As I state in later chapters, the Melbourne *dōjō* contained many more male practitioners than female ones, and I had a closer relationship with male practitioners than with female ones. People of different gender sometimes have different purposes in practising the art (as briefly introduced in Chapter Three). As such, the narratives of the *kendō* community, which I analyse for this thesis, could also have been described within a much longer history involving shifting relations between Japan and Australia and the many complicated perspectives in relation to gender difference that exist in both nations.

Although the points above are still open for further investigation, I choose to focus in this work on Melbourne practitioners as a group of people who are interested in *difference*. Since my primary focus has been on how *kendō*, as a Japanese martial art, has been practised, narrated, and adopted outside of Japan, I pay particular attention to a situation in which non-Japanese practicing outside of Japan interact with cultural and historical differences. Then I present evidence about the way non-Japanese people in Melbourne represent things Japanese, including their practice. In particular, I focus on how non-Japanese people from various backgrounds gather in this small community

without particularly dwelling on their family backgrounds (at least when they are involved in the community), and have homed in on their personal interests expressed through their physical involvement in the art. My research succeeds in highlighting the *dōjō* as a firsthand contact zone in which non-Japanese constantly refresh their images of the Japanese Other by maintaining a proximity with Japanese practitioners.

In the next chapter, I provide the theoretical background of my research. First, I introduce studies of Japanese martial arts in anthropology and suggest the significance of my research. Thereafter, I provide a brief history of how Japanese martial arts have been recognised in the Western world. Then, I move on to consider theories of traditional Orientalist discourse on the non-Western Other in order to understand the bigger picture of how Japan and its martial arts culture are represented in the West. By examining the discourse, I suggest that Orientalism has provided an objective perspective toward the Japanese Other by using a strategy that frames the concepts of time and space.

Chapter Two: The Theoretical Background and Images of Japanese Martial Arts in the Western World

1. Japanese Martial Arts in Anthropology

Even though martial arts are so often associated with Japan and there have been many different images attached to them, there are relatively few studies focussed on them in comparison with other topics in relation to Japan such as religion, ritual, nationalism, kinship structure, social hierarchy, political systems, economic systems, and tourism.

Researchers such as Cox, Chapman, and Kohn are among the few anthropological researchers²⁰ who specialise on Japanese martial arts, and they have published ethnographic studies on the topic (Cox 2003, 2010; Chapman, K, P. 2004, 2005; Kohn 2001, 2003, 2007, 2008, 2011; Donohue 1994). In particular, Cox²¹ and Chapman²² focus on the practitioners' individual agency within communal interaction, examining how martial arts as a Japanese practice has been interpreted by contemporary Japanese practitioners. By building a communal identity, each practitioner individually interprets their own experience of participation, and they integrate their 'personal spheres of interaction' with the socially prescribed roles and rules (Chapman 2005: 86). Thus, Chapman characterises martial arts (*kyudō* and *karate*) 'as a site of agency' (ibid: 100). The work of Cox adds another perspective to Chapman's research. Cox focuses on Japanese national/cultural identity in relation to Zen practices (*shorinji kempo* and *chadō*), and he analyses the way each individual constructs and embodies the image of

Japaneseness through ‘shared structures that the participant learns to think of as “Japanese” ’ (Cox 2003: 12, 194).

However, as Kohn points out in examining current studies on martial arts in general, ‘most studies of disciplined practices have tended to be located in the arts’ respective homelands’ (Kohn 2011:65). She continues that the studies focus on practitioners who engage in the practices of their local culture; thus, ‘they do not set out to fully question the degree to which ideas of self, culture, and society may be variously transformed through embodied “foreign” cultural practice in different locales’ (Kohn 2011: 148). Instead, Kohn focuses on multiple *dōjō* (training halls) outside Japan. In particular, she discusses *aikidō* practitioners from the perspective of embodied discipline (Kohn 2003). Focusing on non-Japanese practitioners in the US, UK, Australia, and Japan, she demonstrates the way the bodies of aikido practitioners become sites of communication, locally and globally, through shared bodily practice, presenting an alternative to a Foucauldian model of body discipline in which ‘the world may impress itself (à la Foucault) on the body’ (ibid 2003:150).

Seeking a better understanding of how Japanese martial arts are represented, my research augments ideas explored in these three studies. Focusing on the practice of a Japanese martial art outside of Japan, I take up Cox and Chapmans’s concern that each practitioner (in my case, non-Japanese practitioners) interprets their practice by involving the Japanese martial art community. In particular, following the work of Cox, which examines practitioners’ subjectivity in relation to their image of Japaneseness, my research brings together such issues of representation to current studies on images of

Japaneseness by non-Japanese practitioners. Through carefully observing narratives of Japanese martial arts practitioners at a small training hall in Melbourne, I suggest how Japan may be variously represented in the contemporary world.

2. Japanese Martial Arts in Western Countries

Information on Japanese martial arts cultures has been widespread and well-recognised outside Japan as a Japanese cultural and physical practice, or even a spiritual practice²³. As I will explain in detail below, there are some distinctive representations of an aesthetic Japan and an ascetic Japan and its martial arts culture that finally leads us to the representation of martial arts being linked with something often regarded as the *mysterious and romantic philosophy of the East*. Let me first illustrate the brief history of an encounter between the West and Japanese martial arts.

Tracing the history of this encounter, the Japanese martial arts received attention as early as the end of the 19th Century. In 1885 the Japanese Village at the London exhibition included martial arts performances that provided lively entertainment for the people of London. The exhibition was non-governmental and was organised by Charles H. Dallas and Tannaker Buchicrosan (Scholtz 2007). More than 100 Japanese men and women were brought to the city for the exhibition. They were hired to build houses, make sweets and do pottery work, while others performed *sumo* wrestling, *kendō*, sword-play, and *kabuki* at the exhibition (Scholtz 2007: 73). As Scholtz discusses, the

Village performance succeeded in attracting audiences in London, and English newspapers such as *The Times* reported this living representation of the Far East with immense enthusiasm (ibid: 78). Scholtz argues that what the British imagine to be ‘the essence of Japanese style’ was widely introduced at that time (ibid: 83).

The interest in Japan and its martial art culture increased, and Japan received many visitors from the West who were not satisfied with just the artificial village in London. One of the visitors was F.J. Norman. In 1888, he visited Japan to teach English at the *Etajima* Naval College (Bennett 2006:9). He published an account of the few years he spent in the country in a book entitled *The Fighting Man of Japan* in 1905. The book introduces the practice and history of Japanese martial arts. In combination with stories of the samurai culture and how they serve their lords, such as the custom of *seppuku* (or ritual suicide), Norman introduces *kenjutsu*—the pre-modern version of *kendō*—as Japanese fencing; he describes the *samurai* as the ‘gentleman soldier of old Japan’ (Norman 1905: 32). With his experience of practicing *kenjutsu* in Japan, Norman’s experience is one of the earliest first-hand books on Japanese swordsmanship that was written by a non-Japanese martial arts practitioner and tells readers how ancient Japanese swordsmanship is continuously taught in Japan.

The stories of Japanese martial arts, and in particular, swordsmanship as the practice of a gentleman soldier, are often spread together with the iconic image of *samurai*. For example, one of the most famous samurai stories was first translated into English by A.B. Mitford in 1871. Along with the old fairy stories of Japan, such as the foxes’ wedding and the battle of the ape and the crab, the book introduces the story of a

samurai group—the tale of 47 *samurai*—who killed a lord. The story tells of the revenge of the samurai in which they fight for the honour of their dead lord. Depicting the nature of the loyal *samurai* and their swordsmanship, the story ends with the death of the *samurai*, who commit *seppuku* in order to assume responsibility for killing a man in authority—the enemy of their dead lord. As such, the culture of Japanese swordsmanship has been translated and introduced to western countries with these aesthetic images, idealised as the nobility of Japanese knights who carry the beauty of an ancient feudal morality, or as an ascetic self-sacrifice in which individuals devote themselves to the lords, family and society (Mitford 1871; Nitobe 1936; Repington 1905:378; Stead 1906: 21, 36). Swordsmanship is represented as part of the aesthetic character of Japanese culture, or as a remnant of ancient feudal Japan (Cox 2003; Chapman 2005:23-24,32,118; Mitford 1871; Repington 1905: 379).

The beauty of the Japanese swordsman's loyalty is further expanded with the creation of a concept called *bushido*, which has also been narrated as an aesthetic ethical code and mysterious philosophy. As I explained in the previous chapter, Inazō Nitobe first summarised the concept of *bushido* in written form (for English readers). With the concept of *bushido*, martial arts culture is sometimes narrated alongside such concepts as 'sophisticated philosophy', 'advanced individual and state discipline [such] as Christianity provides' (Lehmann 1978: 174-175; Chapman 2005:118; Holmes, C. and Ion 1980: 256, 323). Charles a Court Repington, a news correspondent for *The Times*, mentions *bushido* in his explanation of the reason why Japan transformed into a modern nation-state at unexpected speed (1905). He writes that *bushido*, a philosophy of

humankind, was a driving force for Japan to achieve quick modernisation and even defeat Russia in the Russo-Japanese War (ibid). Repington also characterises *bushido*²⁴ as a ‘modern philosophy’ which cultivates the system of the modern military and develops the nation to be as strong as European nations while still maintaining the long tradition of the Japanese knightly moral code (ibid: 379).

However, such images of the Japanese in relation to a swordsman culture are occasionally represented as fanatic asceticism. Books such as *Knight of Bushido* (1958), *A Bar of Shadow* (1956), and *The Naked Island* (1951), which are written on the basis of the stories of prisoners-of-war, partly highlight the extreme nature of the Japanese as ascetic, self-destructive, and mindlessly disciplined people. Lammers, in *A Bar of Shadow*, writes,

As a nation they romanticised death and self destruction as no other people. The romantic fulfillment of the national ideal, of the heroic thug of tradition, was often a noble and stylised self-destruction in a selfless cause. They were so committed, blindly and mindlessly entangled in their real life and imaginary past that their view of life was not synchronised to our urgent time (Lammers 1990: 211 quoted in Cox 2003: 26).

Even in the Second World War, the *samurai* ethos with its Zen²⁵ ideology as the Japanese national identity was interpreted by the Mussolini regime of Italy as a

characteristic of Italian fascism (Clarke 1997:196; Cox 2003: 26-27). J.J Clarke argues that, identifying with the creed of *samurai* in combination with Zen, Italian fascism justifies its dictatorial policy and promotes ‘the utopian theme of nostalgia for a more authentic mode of existence and a deep antagonism to the modernising tendencies of individualism, urbanisation, and liberal democracy’ (Clarke 1997:196).

After the two wars, this fanatical image of swordsman culture associated with Japan is continuously emphasised and embodied by iconic persons. Cox finds a good example of this representation in the well-known novelist Yukio Mishima (Cox 2003:27). Having found success as a novelist, Mishima, also an activist against Americanisation in post-war Japan (Mishima 2006). On the 25th of November 1970, conducted a *coup d'état* at the headquarters of Japan's Self Defence Force (a coup that became known as the *Mishima Affair*). With a few assistants, Mishima went into the headquarters and took a hostage. By subsequently committing ritual suicide, *seppuku*, Mishima aimed to alert the Japanese nation to the danger of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty (Mishima 1976: 422).

Cox analyses a description in *Newsweek* on the life of Yukio Mishima, in which the figure of Mishima in the article is described as ‘a quintessential icon of the Japanese’ in ‘the western popular imagination’ (ibid: 24). The following is a quote from the article:

He was a living example of the contrast between historic Japanese force—the spiritual and the worldly, the aesthetic and the Martial. And it was his attempt to put aside the Chrysanthemum and bring back the

sword that led to his doom (Littlewood 1996: 40 quoted in Cox 2003: 24).

As Cox mentions, the figure of Mishima clearly indicates a pattern of representation in the Western discourse on Japan: the pattern that is described with two iconic symbols *chrysanthemum* and *sword*. Invoking a 'pre-modern-scape' by feudal *seppuku* suicide, the fanatic activism of Mishima left an ominousness in 'the clean-and-proper order' of Japan's post-war modernity, and demonstrated to Western audiences the essentially different otherness of Japanese culture (Otomo 2001:32)²⁶.

Newsweek's representation of Mishima, with its focus on the *chrysanthemum* and the *sword*, is continuously revived in contemporary films²⁷, such as Jim Jarmusch's *Ghost Dog The Way of the Samurai* (2000). The film depicts the cool heroism attached to *samurai* culture through the eyes of a contemporary hip-hop African American. Ghost Dog is an African American who works as a hired hitman in New York. The film is a typical battle story between a hitman and the Italian mafia. What makes the film unique, however, is that Ghost Dog is a black *samurai* in contemporary New York, who is a serious devotee of a spiritual path inspired by an ancient samurai book and faithfully follows this ancient code until the moment he is killed. Ghost Dog's driven commitment to the *samurai* code forces him into a pseudo-feudal relationship with a Mafia boss who once accidentally saved his life, and he willingly devotes his life to this boss to whom he believes he is bound by 'an unwritten contract' (Otomo 2001: 35). Throughout the story, the film evokes, with this hitman, the extreme nature of Japanese

aestheticism/asceticism.

Over a hundred years of continuous interpretation of both Japan's ascetic and aesthetic nature, what is now called *Japaneseness* has been invented. As Oscar Wilde points out in the discussion on Japan, it is 'a mode of style'²⁸ when the West describes Japanese nature. Whether positive or negative, the Japanese martial arts culture has been used to fantasise Japan and produce a stereotypical way of seeing the country and its people.

However, such a pattern of discourse—*beautiful and dangerous*—on Japanese martial arts culture is not unique to the representation of the martial arts. It is commonly seen in the much larger scale of Orientalist projects that represent Japan in terms of what Bhabha has called 'desire and disavowal' (1983), and it is deeply rooted in the Western technique of labelling the non-Western Other. This technique is part of a project that aims to create and promulgate the Western universal time-frame. By locating the Other within this time-frame, Orientalists rule the space and time of the non-Western Other. In order to understand the Orientalist attitude toward Japan as the Other, which is deeply related to the Western image of Japanese martial arts, it is very important to examine the background of the long genealogy of how Japan has been stereotyped and narrated by the West. In the next section, I first examine the general background of the Orientalist tradition of locating the non-Western Other, before moving to a discussion focusing on the representation of Japan.

3. A Genealogy of Orientalist Discourse

In his works, Said describes the systematic technique of placing the Oriental Other into the European context of the past. In his own terms, the technique is called ‘a style of thought’ or ‘a mode of knowledge’ (Said 1979: 2; Dabashi 2008: 97). He links the style with the development of modern systems of categorical hierarchy such as taxonomy, anatomy, archaeology, ethnology and museum collecting, though he does not demonstrate in detail the historical development of systematising the Oriental Other with techniques of categorisation (Said 1979: 65, 119). In other words, Said suggests that by being categorised into the system, the non-Western Other is labelled as an ideological subject; as a collective entity which is imagined by taxonomy, anatomy, museum collecting and ethnology (Said 1979). Borrowing Althusser’s theory of ideology²⁹, this technique of labelling the Other is to represent ‘the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence’ (Althusser 1972: 153). This is made clear in Fanon’s famous statement in which he observes that he is going to be ‘fixed’ into a subject by imaginary racial labels and essentialised as an inferior negro (Fanon 1967: 109). Here, Fanon’s complex conditions of existence (French citizen, Martiniquan, psychiatrist, philosopher and revolutionary) are all erased and he is simply fixed into the Western collective imagination to become just ‘a negro’. Discussing the Western ‘civilised’ technique of systematising the rest of the world, Bhabha suggests that this technique ‘is the ability to appreciate cultures in a kind of *musée imaginaire*’

which is ‘the capacity to understand and locate cultures in a universal time-frame’ (Bhabha 1990: 208).

Pomian and others have examined the process of categorising the Other from the perspective of collecting exotic and grotesque objects (Pomian 1990 (1987), Feest 1984, Chapman, W. 1985, Schulz 1994:175-187). Their research illustrates the process whereby things that are collected from outside of Europe are gradually categorised into the context of a Western universal time-frame. Throughout the 16th and 17th centuries in Europe, the elites began to enjoy displaying those objects brought from the outside (Evans and Marr 2006). At that time in Europe, these objects were assembled in private houses and displayed in rooms called *cabinets of curiosities*. In these cabinets, the objects were randomly exhibited; there was no systematic categorisation such as we expect in contemporary museums (Yaya 2008: 173-188, Evans and Marr 2006). Daston and Park see these cabinets of curiosities as a site of representation and knowledge; they were not simply a room for storing the exotic marvels but were more like a space for transferring ‘the emotion of wonder from the objects themselves to their erudite and discriminating owner’ (1998: 158 quoted in Yaya 2008: 177). A similar observation is expressed in the works of Shelton. Shelton argues that these collections in their cabinets were derived from medieval scholasticism regarding ‘the innate meaning of things and the nature of revelation, and ... its vision of the relationship between the microcosm and the macrocosm’ (Shelton 1994: 181). In other words, these early collections of the Other can be interpreted as a ‘summary of the universe’ based on the perspective of each collector (Pomian 1990 (1987)).

By the 18th Century, this formerly random collection became more systematic with the development of natural science (Stagl 1995: 96; Pomian 1990 (1987): 139; Evans and Marr 2006). From the 18th Century through the 19th Century, which Said has called the period of modern Orientalism, collecting objects was increasingly the concern of scientists (Feest 1984:90; Clifford 1988: 227). In 1758 Carl Linnaeus, a botanist and physician, developed a biological classification scheme which laid the foundation of modern taxonomy. Linnaeus's scheme gave each organism a unique name made up of two Latin terms. The first indicated the organism's genus (a group sharing basic characteristics) and the second its individual species within the genus. The typical character of taxonomic classification was to categorise objects in a hierarchical structure arranged by parent-child relationships. By exhibiting natural beings from youth to old age or from the lower to upper class in a hierarchical manner, it offered an understanding of order in the universe (Fara 1997: 39-46). The system allowed for clear descriptions of plants, animals and minerals and was soon taken up by amateurs, professionals, and museums. The British Museum was the first public museum to adopt Linnaeus's taxonomic method to its natural specimen collections. By exhibiting familiar and exotic natural specimens in a systematic hierarchy, museums provided the general public with a framework for understanding and interpreting the natural world.

This hierarchical worldview can also be seen in the social sciences. For example, the 19th Century ethnographic classification by Jomard and the typological museum display of Pitt Rivers showed objects collected from different parts of the world in a hierarchical order where non-European people and cultures were positioned at an early

stage of human evolution (Chapman, W. 1985: 24-25)³⁰. For social scientists too, the collecting of data about non-Western lifestyles (including food, clothing, and weapons) became important scientific evidence for pre-modern human life (Feest 1984: 90; Chapman, W. 1985: 24-25; Said 1979: 87). With the development of scientific categorisation, the inferiority and pre-modernity of the Other was *proven*. In other words, scientific techniques had systematised the objects as things representing *the Other* within a Western genealogy of knowledge.

Clarke analyses Orientalist discourse in relation to racism, suggesting that ideologies such as evolutionism categorise non-Western people as pre-modern, highlighting the pre-eminence of the White race (Clarke 1997: 193). For some scientists at that time, classification in hierarchical order was valuable in order to exemplify the evolution of both the human and natural worlds. Takezawa, a Japanese anthropologist, notes that the classification of humankind into five varieties (Caucasiae, Mongolicae, Aethiopicae, Americanae, Malaicae) by Blumenbach, a German physician, anthropologist and physiologist, was widely accepted among Western scientists (Blumenbach 1865 cited in Takezawa 2005:54). Although Blumenbach may not have believed in racial hierarchy, his human classification system later encouraged scientific racism (Blumenbach 1865:312; Fredrickson 2002: 57).³¹ For example, Samuel G. Morton, who broadly introduced the science of craniology, claimed that he could judge the intellectual capacity of a race by skull size and he considered the Caucasian race to be the *highest grade of humanity* (Takezawa 2005: 54; Gould 1981:50-72).

This negative racial perspective toward non-Europeans was reinforced by Darwin's Theory of Evolution (Stocking 1982: 238). Although it is too simple to assert that Darwin himself advocated racial hierarchy, his theory was very influential among those who affirmed an evolutionary categorisation of the human and natural world, and the idea became widespread (Rogers 1972: 271-272). Among its advocates were politicians, clergy, medical doctors, and anthropologists who justified European superiority over the *inferior races* (Crook 1999: 648-651; Hunt 1867: 110-120; Schaaffhausen 1868: cviii-cxviii). In his essay *Occasional Discourse upon the Nigger Question* (Carlyle 1853),³² Thomas Carlyle, an influential historian at that time, insisted that it was the *White man's burden* that humans at the lowest stage of evolution (like the *Negro*) needed help from the White race, the most advanced of humankind, to have a better social environment (Carlyle 1853:25).

Such *inferior races* as subjects to be saved by the *White man's burden* was further emphasised through the process of colonisation. Breckenridge provides the example of the 19th Century British officials in India and their cognitive understanding about the colonial objects.

This privatized world of longing was tied to public strategies. For individual colonial officials, the act of collecting and the building of a collection created an illusion of cognitive control over their experience in India—an experience that might otherwise have been disturbingly chaotic. Since many officials collected, it can be argued that collections

promoted a sense of moral and material control over the Indian environment. At the same time, collected objects could be fed into the two growing institutions of the second half of the nineteenth century, the exhibition and the museum, thus allowing this sense of knowledge and control to be repatriated to the metropolis. In the metropole, fairs and museums could serve, over time, as reminders of the orderliness of empire as well as the exoticism of distant parts of the Victorian ecumene (Breckenridge 1989: 211).

As such, the colonial officials, together with the emergence of the institutions, helped confirm the relationship between the West/non-West in a cognitive sense; it is now repeatedly represented among the public of the metropolis.

Categorising the Other, however, is not only about how science produces negative images but also about how Western interest in art produces aesthetically rich images. The 20th Century *primitive art* movement is a useful example. It has been suggested that *primitive art* was discovered by early avant-garde artists such as Picasso, Matisse, Braque and Brancusi (Errington 1998: 74; Rubin 2006:133-134; Perkins and Morphy 2006: 5). These Western artists found aesthetic values in the objects collected from Africa, the Americas, the Pacific region, and Asia (Clifford 1988:228). Williams points out that, along with this discovery, the negative image of the Other gradually changed from grotesque, crude, curious, and antique to beautiful and valuable *primitive art* (Williams 1985). From the 18th to the 19th Century, these non-Western artefacts were

only valuable in terms of scientific evidence that showed the process of human cultural evolution. With the emergence of 20th-Century *primitive art*, however, the objects became *beautifully* valuable (Williams 1985; Feest 1984: 90; Chapman, W. 1985: 23-25; Clifford 1988: 227).

Clifford further explores the concept of the aesthetic representation of the non-West (Clifford 1988). Clifford has examined the correlation between the definitions of what is *beautiful* and *interesting*, pointing out that the discovery of *beauty* parallels the process of salvaging rare, interesting cultures, or *vanishing cultures*³³ (ibid:223).

Clifford concludes that whether the objects are consumed for scientific reasons or aesthetic reasons, the meaning of these objects for the West is a fount of imagination which constitutes ‘what is European and modern / what is not European and modern’. The ‘“Orient” always plays the role of origin’ which is necessary in order for Europeans to conceptualise the ‘modern’ (ibid:228, 272). As such, it can be said that the non-Western Other has been constructed to be always *ancient* and exotic as the *origin* for the imagined community of modern Europe as a collective. Whether beautiful or grotesque, the exotic Other is conceptually fitted into the *past*. The Other is ‘a common past confirming Europe’s triumphant present’ (ibid:228).

A constant theme in the literature discussed above is that the non-West is described and classified as *old*, *antique*, *pre-modern*, and of the *past*. Indeed, Edward Said also critically points out in *Orientalism* that the Western antiquarianism of travel literature, geography, ethnography, archaeology, and natural science can be seen as ‘specially modern structures of Orientalism’ (Said 1979: 116 quoted in Tessone 2002: 169). Said

is not the only scholar who has criticised the gaze of Western Orientalist antiquarianism towards the non-West. Fabian, in *Time and the Other*, tells us how the non-Western Other has been cut off from 'coevalness', imagined as not existing in the same present with the West but rather somewhere in a timeless past (Fabian 1983: 30-31, 143). From this standpoint the non-Western Other: 1) is *someone far different from the Europeans*, which reinforces the supremacy of the Western *present*; and 2) lives *somewhere far beyond* and is no more than the leftover of an ancient time.

Bearing in mind Althusser's assertion that labelling the Other elides the human relationship of 'real conditions of existence', it can be said that the development of Western systems of classification converted the face-to-face relationship with the Other into merely *phenomena* and *objects* to observe by measuring human skulls, collecting Oriental cultural artefacts and explaining the process of human evolution. Arendt presented a similar idea about human relationships. Referring to the development of modern science, Arendt stated that 'all real relationships are dissolved into logical relations between man-made symbols' and that logical relations produce 'the phenomena and objects it wishes to observe' (Arendt 1998 (1958): 284). With a systematic worldview and a framework of mathematical formulas to apply to his/her actual surroundings, modern individuals developed an objective view of the topsy-turvy world of which he/she used to be a part and thus could not see objectively. This could only be possible, Arendt says, when one had an 'ultimate point of reference' in his/her mind which enabled him/her to be the observer (ibid). In other words, modern individuals had an ability to take himself/herself out their surroundings and create a

point of observation. Applying these points to the context of Orientalist classification, we can conclude that Oriental Others and their cultures are these phenomena and objects to be observed. The structure of Europeans as the observers and Orientals as the observed is systematically fixed and reinforced by taxonomy, ethnography, evolution theory, art and museum collecting.

In the following section, I narrow down my discussion to Orientalist representations of Japan. The pattern of discourse—*desire and disavowal*—regarding things Japanese, as with the discourse of *beautiful and dangerous* seen in Japanese martial arts, is key to examining the way Orientalists time-frame the Japanese Other. I analyse both academic studies on representations of Japan and non-academic sources such as newspapers and novels in order to understand the way people in the Western world, especially the English-speaking world, have seen Japan as the Other.

4. Desire and Disavowal for Japan

Since becoming widely known by European countries as early as the mid-1800s, Japan has commonly appeared as *the object for antiquarianism* in European countries. After Japan opened up its ports to the countries in the last half of the 1800s, more Europeans had the chance to gain access to Japan and its culture in many ways. In particular, the country first attracted European public attention in the field of art in the last half of the 1800s. Indeed, from the mid-1800s Japan often featured in Western

literature, theatre, poems, and pictures within the description of aestheticism (Weisberg 2001: 109-125, Watanabe 1991: 11-17, de Gruchy 2003). At this time in Europe, Japanese fine art items (such as woodblock paintings, porcelain, paper works, silks, fans and kimono) were widely introduced as examples of Eastern beauty (Weisberg 2001, Watanabe 1991). The term *Japonisme* encapsulates the popularity of these things in European countries. Most prominently, impressionists and post-impressionists, such as Monet³⁴, Degas, Pissaro, Sisley, Whistler, Mary Cassatt, Gauguin, Toulouse-Lautrec and Van Gogh, produced many paintings inspired by Japanese *Ukiyoe* (woodblock paintings) and were influential in promoting the aesthetic values of Japan (Weisberg 2001; Watanabe 1991; de Gruchy 2003; Walker 2009 (1999) :56).

An early key figure who introduced Japan to artists like Van Gogh and Monet was Sir Rutherford Alcock. From 1859 to 1864, he was a British Minister to Japan. For the International Exhibition held in 1862 in London³⁵, Alcock organised a large collection of Japanese art objects and crafts for British audiences. The Japanese objects in the exhibition attracted the attention of the British public and inspired many leading artists at the time. Among them were William Rossetti of the pre-Raphaelite movement, Edward William Godwin, an architectural designer, Arthur Liberty, of Liberty Prints, and so on (Walker 2009 (1999): 54). At the same time, some influential British publications, such as *The Art Journal*, featured Japanese art that was introduced with great enthusiasm (Meech and Weisberg 1990: 36). In his later account, Alcock notes such rapid popularity of things Japanese after the exhibition that ‘within a very few years, on my return from Japan a second time, I found Japanese fabrics, silks, and

embroideries, Japanese lacquer, china, faience, bronzes, and enamels exhibited for sale in the shops of every capital in Europe' (Alcock 1878:3)³⁶.

Japonisme was not only Japanese painting and artefacts that attracted Western public notice. Much mysterious and romantic literature was written about Japan (including travel books on Japan), and it further stimulated the Western imagination about the exotic other in the Far East.

The books and articles of Lafcadio Hearn, an Irish journalist who lived in Japan from 1890 until his death in 1904, were a corpus of widely published works on Japan at that time in Europe and the USA (Shiozaki 2004). Hearn's works were based on *old Japan*, describing the landscapes he saw in rural areas and the ancient folklore he heard from locals during his long stay in Japan; titles included *Exotics and Retrospectives* (1898), *Out of the East: Reveries and Studies in New Japan* (1895), *Kokoro: Hints and Echoes of Japanese Inner Life* (1896), *Gleanings in Buddha-Fields: Studies of Hand and Soul in the Far East* (1897), and *Japanese Fairy Tales* (1898). Hearn's works fantasised Japan and its people, giving Western readers the image of an earthly paradise. He particularly loved the mysterious folklore in which the ghosts and fairies of ancient Japan appear. Kim, who has studied Japanese influences upon Western modern art, literature, theatre and fashion, suggests that images of Japan in Hearn's representations of the exotic Far East present 'a repository of (supposedly) untouched, timeless beauty and ancient custom' in the eyes of Western Orientalists (Kim 2006: 381).

As seen in Hearn's aesthetic antiquarianism towards Japan, the style of representing Japan as a *timeless beauty* is further emphasised with the work of Pierre Loti³⁷. In this

work, Japan is represented as a place to escape for love or romance with exotic Japanese women. Ono calls Loti's work a 'colonial novel' or 'novel of desertion' in which Western heroes escape from early industrial Europe and adventure into exotic non-Western places (Wilkinson 1983:114; Ono 1972). For example, in 1887, Loti published a novel called *Madame Chrysanthemum*³⁸. The story of *Madame Chrysanthemum* is based on Loti's experience in which he temporally married a Japanese woman in Japan. Loti's first-hand account with exotic themes on this newly opened country tells Western readers about the details of marriage; Japanese customs and people are described through the eyes of this French naval officer.

Turberfield analyses Loti's novels saying that Loti's Japan is characterised as impressionistic (Ohira 2008: 203; Turberfield 2008: 114). Quoting Isabelle Daunais³⁹, Turberfield notes that 'travel writers very often write retrospectively, that is, on their return, or after a certain amount of time has elapsed' (Turberfield 2008:113). By analysing the writing style of Eugène Fromentin, a famous French travel writer, Turberfield further examines the writing style of Loti. According to Turberfield, Fromentin 'considers the passage of time as an essential part of the process of artistic creation'. He states that Loti's writing style resembles that of Fromentin in terms of the lack of accuracy and the blurring effect of description 'as he used his journal entries, and occasional drawings as tools with which to remember, and write often after the lapse of many months or even years' (ibid: 113-114). Turberfield calls this style 'the impressionistic style of Loti and Fromentin' (ibid: 114). With blurring effect, Loti's work produces something that might be called *Oriental time* and it succeeds in nicely

wrapping up Japan and its people within a retrospective framework that is clearly separated from the present.

Like Loti's other books, which are written on the basis of his experiences in non-Western countries, *Madame Chrysanthemum* was widely read in Europe⁴⁰, and it had a considerable influence upon European readers including artists, intellectuals, and novelists (Wilkinson 1983: 114). After its first publication, several writers refashioned the novel, including John Luther Long. Compared to Loti's version of *Madame Chrysanthemum*, Long's *Madame Butterfly* (1898) is much more romantic and tragic. In Long's version, the story is about a Japanese woman who married an American sailor. The sailor abandons the Japanese wife with their baby, while she awaits his return to Japan. After she learns that the sailor has married a White American woman, she attempts suicide and fails. Depicting Japan as a country of old feudalism, fairy customs, and exotic, Long particularly highlights that the female Japanese heroine obediently takes care of her foreign husband, and is represented as being devoted to being submissive to him. It is this Long's version that inspired Puccini to write his famous long-running opera, *Madama Butterfly* (1904)⁴¹. With this imaginative fantasies about Japan was generated by Loti, Long and Puccini, this romance between a Western man and a Japanese woman has stimulated readers' imagination of the hyper-feminine Japanese woman.

Turning our eyes to the academic field, one of the most influential early Japanologists, Basil Hall Chamberlain (and a friend of Lafcadio Hearn), published a book called *Things Japanese*. The first edition of the book was published in 1890. In his

book, Chamberlain expressed his regret about the modernisation of Japan, asserting that the authentic Japan which he preferred had vanished in the process as the country followed Western modernisation. He lamented that,

All the causes which produced the Old Japan of our dreams have vanished. Feudalism has gone, isolation has gone, beliefs have been shattered ... new and pressing needs have arisen ... Old Japan is dead, and the only decent thing to do with the corpse is to bury it (Chamberlain 2009(1905): 6-7).

Our European world of thought, of enterprise, of colossal scientific achievement, has been as much a wonder-world to the Japanese as Old Japan could ever be to us. There is this difference, however. Old Japan was to us a delicate little wonder-world of sylphs and fairies. Europe and America, with their railways, their telegraphs, their gigantic commerce, their gigantic armies and navies, their endless applied arts founded on chemistry and mathematics, were to the Japanese a wonder-world of irresistible genii and magicians (ibid:4).

What he grieved for was the fact that those phantasmatically ancient *beauties* had been violated with the country's modernisation. The aesthetic consumption that placed Japan

into the context of the Western past had also been shared in the academic field. Chamberlain also identified Europe with modernity (*our European civilised world*), differentiating Japan as the world of fairies. For him, Japan is in opposition to the *we of Europe* to which he thinks he belongs.

As I examine in detail in Chapter Six, stereotyping the Other, described in particular by Homi Bhabha, is a form of fetish desire that establishes one's identification based on recognition and disavowal of difference. According to Bhabha, the possession of *stereotype* produces a position 'which is predicated on mastery and pleasure' (Bhabha 1983: 27). In order to confirm such positioning, one desires the existence of difference as a means of control while at the same time one disavows that difference as the absence of perfection (Bhabha 1983: 27). As seen in the early *Japonisme* in literature, exhibitions, and paintings, things Japanese are welcomed by the European public and fixed onto the stereotypical image of *timeless beauty, delicacy, mediaeval, fairy, and romantic love*, which must not be subverted by Western modernity. For European audiences like Chamberlain who (see his statements above) characterise Europe as the mathematicians, the chemists and the capitalists, the possession of the fantasy-like feudal Japan fulfilled a desire for mastery and pleasure over the non-Western Other. 'They were fascinated with some exotic parts of Japan' (Iwabuchi 1994). That is why Chamberlain and other Western Japanologists, such as Samson and Reischauer, according to Iwabuchi, show dissatisfaction when their image of Japan was violated, and 'lamented the loss of "authentic" Japanese tradition in the process of modernisation' (ibid)⁴². In other words, Chamberlain's regret over this *loss* is situated within the

stereotype of Japan *as the recognition and disavowal of difference* and is actually a regret that his transformed image of Japan can no longer support his European identity.

Despite Chamberlain's longings, the emergence of Japan as a modern nation-state was becoming very evident around the turn of the 20th Century. The Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) added another aspect to the image of Japan in the minds of the western public; Japan's victory over Russia attracted serious Western attention, and the reasons for the victory of this Far Eastern country became a matter of concern to European nations (Holmes, C. and Ion 1980: 309-329). The aspects of a modern, advanced, industrialised, powerful Japan were further stressed during the two World Wars with an emphasis on militarism. Lord Redesdale's book *Garter Mission to Japan* is an early example of this new narrative of Japan (1906). Redesdale had been sent to Japan in 1906 as an attendant to Prince Arthur on a mission appointed by King George V to carry the Order of the Garter to the Emperor of Japan, and his book was published after his return to Britain. It depicted Japan as a nation—state firmly united under modern institutions—such as the railway, department stores, the well-trained Western-style army and navy, and university education—along with the Emperor's strong leadership (ibid: 7, 9, 38, 39, 241). Compared with the image of the aesthetic, timeless country, here the image of Japan is depicted as closer to Western modern nations. Although it is too simple to suggest that Japan became recognised as the equal of modern Western nations, it is also true to say that images of something *modern* are attached to the genealogy of representation of Japan. Later, the image of such a *modern nation* is negatively perceived, concomitant with Japanese military expansion into the

Asia and Pacific regions⁴³.

Japan's position became further complicated with the rise of Japanese economic growth beginning in the 1970s. Praised in Ezra Vogel's bestselling book *Japan As Number One* (1979), Japan's success was held up as a model even for the American economy. Supporting Vogel's evaluation, phenomena such as Sony's and Matsushita's buy-outs of Hollywood studios, the increasing power of Japanese investment banks and the world's best-selling car companies drew a great deal of attention from Western countries (Herman and McChesney 1997: 104).

At the same time, however, Japan-bashing gradually increased along with trade frictions. We can see from several statements by politicians and in newspapers how frightening Japanese inroads into world markets were; Japan's success seemed unacceptable and unthinkable to Western countries (Alexander 1991 *Sunday Times*, 23 June). In the *Sunday Times* in 1991, the French Prime Minister, Edith Cresson, called Japanese people 'ants', describing them as 'our common enemy' who 'stay up all night thinking about the way to screw the Americans and Europeans' (Alexander 1991 *Sunday Times*, 23 June). Two Americans (and famous Japan-bashers), Michael Silva and Bertil Sjögren, likened Japan's rapid economic growth to the Pearl Harbor attack (Silva and Sjögren 1990: 156) to show how shocking and dangerous Japan's economic growth was to western countries. James Fellows also likened Japan's engulfing of world markets to the Pearl Harbor attack, asserting that Japan's cunning had contributed to its isolation from the rest of the world (1989:40). Van Wolferen saw this reaction in terms of Japanese particularity and strangeness for the rest of the world that does not share its

universal values of business, etiquette and customs (1990). Aoki, a Japanese anthropologist, has critically examined van Wolferen's argument (Fellows 1989; van Wolferen 1990; Aoki 2007 (1990): 152-153) to suggest that it was simply a Western reaction to the success of Japan as an Oriental Other challenging Western domination over the rest of the world (Aoki 2007(1990): 149,153). He points out that van Wolferen's argument implicitly presupposes 'this is not what we do in Europe' and standardises European values to cover Japan (Aoki 2007(1990): 153). With reference to Zygmunt Bauman's theory that Western modernity is a project of executing the alien other to achieve the future perfect (Bauman 1991(1989), quoted in Blackshaw 2005: 43-44), Japan presented an existing threat against the Western future perfect. In other words, Japan at that time was not merely a fetish object of some ancient and antique Far Eastern island but a country identified as alien that shared the same present as the West and was able to distort the reality of Western domination over the world. Using emotive terms like *ants* or references to Pearl Harbor, the *Japan bashers* of the time tried to re-label Japan as an abnormal Other that was very different from Europe and therefore could not share the same present as *us Europeans*.

Such representation of Japan leads us to a further complex narrative, producing a gap between older and younger generations⁴⁴. Since the 1990s, Japanese popular culture has come into the spotlight among the younger generation around the world. Certain popular culture phenomena in the fields of animation, computer games, pop-music, hyper-violent movies, cyber-punk novels, and fashion have attracted notice as being unique to Japan. For example, in his research on the Japanese anime *otaku* in Australia⁴⁵,

Craig Norris indicates there has been a significant gap in the attitude towards the Japanese Other between different generations. Through his research, Norris found that the Australian *otaku* commonly expresses ‘difference from the parent dominant culture’ (Norris 2000: 225). They express White Australian racist and essentialist attitudes towards Japan, the former enemy in the Second World War of their parent culture. Norris introduces an interview with an Australian younger *otaku*:

S3: Well, I have a real problem at the moment, because my parents are English and my grandparents are English and they all grew up during the war, and you mention anything Japanese and you’re out the door, basically. I can’t watch anime when they’re home, I have to wait until everyone’s gone before I can watch anything. Whether it be porn or not (Norris 2000: 226).

Norris points out the mention of porn, having found out that Japanese anime is seen by parents to be as equally bad as porn. From this interview, he notices an attitude towards the otherness that encompasses Australia’s desire (younger generation) and disavowal (older generation) towards Japan.

Among the younger generation that consumes Japanese sub-culture⁴⁶, some distinctive images of Japan (or *techno-Japan*) are generated, and we particularly cannot ignore the futuristic image of Japan that has become influential with the success of cyberpunk anime (such as *Akira* and *Ghost in the Shell*). The success of anime has

caused a dynamic change in the representation of Japan⁴⁷.

Researchers such as Morley and Robins have elaborated on the aspect of techno-culture in the representation of Japan with the term ‘techno-Orientalism’ (Morley and Robins 1992: 136-156; Iwabuchi 2002: 448-449). According to Morley and Robins, ‘techno-Orientalism’, which is a special Orientalism applied to Japan, appeared in the 1990s and represents Japan and Japanese in terms of high technology (Morley and Robins 1992: 153,136-156). Morley and Robins argue that Japan as ‘the greatest “machine-loving” nation of the world’ became a symbol of the progression of a postmodern world where people enjoy the benefit of technology (Morley and Robins 1992:153,136-156). Certainly, some of the literature critics of cyber-punk novels and films (such as *Neuromancer* and *Blade Runner*) point out that Japan often appears there as a place somewhere in a hyper-modern future (Yoshimoto 1989: 18). To quote Iwabuchi, who cites the work of Johannes Fabian, ‘Japan is marked by temporal lag and consumed in terms of a sense of loss’ where visitors to the magical world can enjoy the taste of a future world and fulfil their desire to leave real life (Iwabuchi 2002: 456). Furthermore, the image of *Otaku*—information junkies who are associated with vacuous hyper-reality—has now become another powerful symbol indicating an image of inhuman, robotic Japanese. Technology and advancement in relation to futuristic life has become characteristic of Japan (Morley and Robins 1992:154; Grassmuck 1991:199, 201, 207).

Although in techno-Orientalism Japan is represented within the time-frame of a future where people live amidst advanced technology, representations of the Other as

different still remain. Japan is depicted as hyper-modern, but also as simply a place where one can observe extraordinariness or hyper-reality. Indeed, the image of inhuman robotic Japanese is a device that *Others* Japan as something racially abnormal. Through the creation of an fetish image of a Japan full of unhealthy information junkies, Japan, in a sense, is constructed as *a disease* as dangerous as the Yellow Peril of a hundred years ago, and very different from the Western normal *Self*.

Analysing a diverse range of representations that are available in the narration of Japan and Japanese, I point out that Japan is represented as either *desirable or disavowed*, labels that call forth such concepts as *ancient paradise*, *exotic folklore*, *romantic place*, *dangerous ants* and *inhumane robots*. By labelling the country with those fetish stereotypes, the concept of the Orientalist *present* is highlighted by categorising the Other (Japanese) into either *the past* or *the future*, while still differentiating the Other from coevalness with the *norm* of the Western present. As similarly discussed in the previous section, the techniques of labelling the surrounding world within European universal timeframes are an Orientalist strategy to represent the non-West, in which the Japanese Other is represented as 1) *someone far different from the Europeans*, which reinforces the supremacy of the Western *present*; and 2) *someone who lives somewhere far beyond*, who is either no more than the leftover of an ancient paradise or a visitor from an abnormal hyper-modern future.

In the following chapters, I focus on a contemporary daily scene in Melbourne. Examining the narratives of *kendō* practitioners with whom I interacted in my fieldwork, I make a comparison between the scholarly and literary representations that I analysed

along with the genealogy and the representations I collected from these contemporary Melbourne practitioners. Below, I first give details of the *kendō* community in which I conducted my fieldwork.

Chapter Three: The Development of *Kendō* in Australia and *Kenshikan Dōjō* in Melbourne

In this chapter, I introduce the atmosphere of the *kendō* community (*Kenshikan dōjō*), in which I undertook participant observation for 24 months. Providing a brief historical background on the development of *kendō* in Australia, I take you into the lively space of contemporary practitioners in Melbourne. However, let me first introduce the All Japan *Kendō* Federation and its internationalisation before describing the Melbourne community.

1. All Japan *Kendō* Federation

The period in Japan's history from 1868 to 1912 is known as the Meiji era (Kiyota 1995: 94). Under the rule of the Meiji Emperor, a group of *samurai* set about dismantling the old feudal system of the *shogunate*⁴⁸ in order to promote the modernisation of Japan (Kiyota 1995: 94-95). The new government advocated modernisation so as to catch up with Western nations. *Samurai* and people of other social classes were asked to learn how to be citizens of modern Japan. The carrying of swords was no longer allowed.

In the *Meiji* era, ex-samurai (who were skilled swordsmen) were hired by the police force and *kendō* was adopted as the primary training regime for police officers (ibid: 95).

Before the *Meiji* Restoration, there were many schools of traditional swordsmanship across Japan. After the Restoration, it was decided by several schools to develop a modern form of swordsmanship. In 1895, The Great Japan Martial Virtues Association (*Dai Nippon Butokukai*) was founded, while various other schools still remained. The *Butokukai* unified the various techniques of the old schools and standardised techniques of swordsmanship, which came to be known as *kendō* (Kiyota 1995: 94-106; Donohue 1994: 39). Around this time, *kendō* increased in popularity and it came to be practised in clubs at middle (secondary) schools, vocational schools, teachers' colleges, and universities. By 1931, *kendō* had been officially adopted as a form of physical education in middle schools and teachers' colleges (ibid:96).

After the Second World War⁴⁹, when Japan was occupied for 7 years by the Allied Powers, Japanese martial arts were considered to be vehicles for militarism, patriotism and imperialism (Donohue 1994: 41; Kiyota 1995: 96). Therefore, the *Butokukai*, which was an umbrella organisation for a variety of martial arts including *kendō*, *judō*, *kyudō*, *aikidō* and *naginata*, was banned by the allied powers in 1946. Only *karate*, which had originated in Okinawa and was therefore considered by the Allies to be less patriotic, continued to be practised and was quickly spread across the world by American servicemen (Donohue 1994: 41).

In 1953, a year after the US-Japan Peace Treaty, a new organisation for *kendō* was set up by some of the former *Butokukai* members. It was called the All Japan *Kendō* Federation (*Zen Nihon Kendō Renmei*) (Kiyota 1995: 96). *Kendō* came to be practised again in such places as middle schools, high schools, universities, police stations and

private training halls.

Unlike some other Japanese martial arts such as *karate* and *judō* ⁵⁰ (Kiyota 1995: 98), *kendō* is not an international sport. It has, however, gradually spread across the world. In 1970, the International *Kendō* Federation (FIK) was established and now, as a result of colonisation, migration, and an interest by non-Japanese in Japanese culture, 47 countries officially participate in the FIK (Ota and Kamakura 2008: 55). Outside Japan, *kendō* is popular in countries such as Korea, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Taiwan, Brazil and Australia (ibid: 57-59)⁵¹.

In the case of Australia, the first *kendō dōjō* was founded in Sydney circa 1963. The founder was Jim Paterson, a *karate* student, who had studied *kendō* for his *karate* training (Oliver, G. 2007: 29). However, there was no *kendō sensei* in Sydney at this time, and Paterson's *kendō* had been learnt only from books. For the further development of *kendō* in Australia, we needed to wait for the 1970s (ibid: 29). Below I summarise the history of both *Kenshikan* and *kendō* in Victoria, based on personal documents written by practitioners such as Gary Oliver and John Butler. The former still practises the art as a *sensei* at the Ballarat *Kendō* Club, and the latter passed away a few years before I came to Melbourne. This historical section is combined with the personal memories and experiences of *kendō* practitioners with whom I spoke during the course of my fieldwork.

2. History of *Kendō* in Australia and Victoria

Although the study and practice of *kendō* in Australia took shape gradually through the 1970s to 1980, one of the earliest introductions of *kendō* to Australia had occurred much earlier. On April 28th 1881, *The Evening Post* of Ballarat (in Victoria) introduced the topic of Japanese swordsmanship⁵². According to the newspaper, swordsmanship was performed at a party held by a Japanese naval captain, Fukushima, as part of a Japanese naval visit (ibid: 55). Although *kendō* at that time was not in the form we now know, the description in the newspaper clearly shows that a style of swordsmanship recognisable as *kendō* was performed.

Kendō in Australia started during the early 1970s. Specifically, *kendō* was established officially in New South Wales, forming the starting point for the Australian *Kendō Renmei* (the official association of *kendō* in Australia, affiliated with the All Japan *Kendō Renmei*). Rex Lawley contacted the Japanese Consul General to find a *kendō* teacher. Mr Mori from the Consul General's Office promised Rex that he would arrange a meeting when he found a suitable *kendō* teacher. In 1968, Mr Mori contacted Rex with the good news that he had found a *kendō* teacher for him: Mr Yoshida who was the Principal of the Japanese school at French's Forest in Sydney. Mr Yoshida, along with another *kendō* teacher, Mr Shoji, started teaching *kendō* at a *dōjō* in Canelly Vale. Soon after, the Sydney *Kendō Renmei* was established (ibid: 28-29).

In 1969, Rex Lawley asked Mr Yoshida to write a letter to Japan seeking recognition of *kendō* in Australia by the All Japanese *Kendō Renmei*. Mr Yoshida wrote

the letter as President of Australian *Kendō Renmei* with Rex as Vice President. In January 1972, the request was granted and the Sydney *Kendō Renmei* changed its name to the Australian *Kendō Renmei*. The official *kendō* association, Australian *Kendō Renmei* (AKR), was established in Sydney and became part of the International *Kendō* Federation (IKF).

In Sydney, another important person joined in the practice of *kendō*. *Sensei* Jun Takeuchi, an employee of Mitsubishi Corporation who was posted to Australia from Japan, joined Sydney *Kendō* Club in Willoughby and practised *kendō* there from 1971 to 1975. *Sensei* Takeuchi was 4th *dan* in grade when he began training at the club. He became the leading figure in this martial art as he taught *kendō* to early Australian *kendō* practitioners in both Sydney and Melbourne.

Victoria's first *kendō dōjō* was started in 1973. Paul Guerillot, a French man who migrated to Australia, then a *Shotokan karate* instructor, had an interest in *kendō* and began to learn the art from John Moore, and Guerillot set up the Auburn Road *dōjō* in Hawthorne. After Moore suddenly disappeared with *dōjō* funds, Guerillot asked John Butler, a *kendō* practitioner who had studied *kendō* in London, to join his *dōjō* as a *kendō* instructor. According to Butler's printed article documenting his personal history of *kendō*, relationships between Guerillot and himself were not very smooth. Despite these tensions, the culture of *kendō* in Melbourne was able to form around Butler and Guerillot during those early years (Butler's personal essay: year unknown).

In 1975, *sensei* Takeuchi was transferred by Mitsubishi to its Melbourne office and he was introduced to John Butler. Together with Butler, *sensei* Takeuchi visited

Guerillot's *dōjō*, which was at the time the only one available for *kendō* training in Melbourne. According to Oliver's account, when *sensei* Takeuchi saw practitioners 'stick fighting' with each other, he was 'horrified' by what he saw: 'Rough, crude stick fighting. Men in *kendōgi*⁵³ trying to beat each other into the ground' (Oliver, G. 2007: 30 quoting Butler). This was corroborated by stories I heard from other *sensei* regarding those early years. One of these *senseis* was *sensei* P.S., now a master in *Kenshikan dōjō*, and Guerillot's first *kendō* student. He sometimes recalled the early years and said that *kendō* in Melbourne at that time was very 'primitive'.

From P.S.' accounts, it would also seem necessary to highlight the relationship between *kendō* in Sydney and *kendō* in Melbourne when describing the early development of *kendō* in Australia. According to *sensei* P.S., these two cities were the earliest places where *kendō* in Australia originated, and the personal relationships between practitioners in the two cities form an important dimension of the development of the *kendō* scene in Australia. He explained that the early practitioners of Melbourne and Sydney visited each other's *dōjōs* to receive training from *sensei* Takeuchi. Some practitioners even came from Sydney to Melbourne by driving throughout the night and they returned to Sydney immediately after what P.S. personally called the 'primitive' training. Without the enthusiasm that those early practitioners showed towards *kendō*, said *sensei* P.S., Australian *kendō* would not have developed into what it is today.

In 1976, *sensei* Takeuchi together with Butler rented a new venue at Little Bourke Street in Melbourne, and their Melbourne *Kendō* Club and Victorian *Kendō Renmei* was officially registered by Australian *Kendō Renmei* (Oliver, G. 2007:33). However, in

December 1976, *sensei* Takeuchi was recalled to Tokyo. After he left, Melbourne *Kendō* Club went through a period without any proper *sensei*. John Butler then heard of *sensei* Nagae, who was at that time 5th *dan* in *kendō* and had arrived in Australia with his wife one year before *sensei* Takeuchi left. *Sensei* Nagae came to Australia as Vice chairman of *Snow Brand* (one of the biggest Japanese dairy products companies) in Victoria⁵⁴. At that time, the president of Snow Brand, who was also Vice President of the All Japan *Kendō* Federation, asked *sensei* Nagae to introduce *kendō* to Australia. From that time *sensei* Nagae became involved in the development of *kendō* in Victoria and in Australia. *Sensei* Nagae then started making occasional visits to training sessions at Melbourne *Kendō* Club.

In 1979, *sensei* Nagae was chosen to be the Australian national team coach for the World Championships of *kendō* held in Sapporo, Japan. According to Oliver, *sensei* Nagae ‘provided charismatic leadership and lifted the standard and abilities of all who trained there’ (ibid:36). Many arrangements were organised for Victorian practitioners by *sensei* Nagae, including training with the Tokyo Metropolitan Police and a dinner party with the President of Snow Brand. Oliver quoted John Butler that ‘*sensei* Nagae was not a young man in the literal sense; he’d been 5th *dan* for some 35 years, but he was young in mind, young in heart and with a young body and youthful spirit he beat us all quite without effort’ (Butler’s personal essay, year unknown: 27). Judging from the conversations that I have had with many senior practitioners and *sensei*, it seems that most of them who now train the younger generations were enormously influenced by *sensei* Nagae’s *kendō* and his philosophy as a *kendō* practitioner.

In 1980, *sensei* Nagae moved to Melbourne with his wife to reside permanently. From that time he continued to train at Melbourne *Kendō* Club and to polish the *kendō* techniques of its members as well as their understanding of *kendō* culture. In 1988, *Tokai* Television (a Japanese TV network) broadcast a documentary about Japanese people living in Australia. *Sensei* Nagae and Melbourne *Kendō* Club were featured. After the documentary was broadcast, a Japanese businessman, Mr Kenshiro Otsuka, offered *sensei* Nagae a four million dollar donation to build a suitable *dōjō*. When the documentary was made, Melbourne *Kendō* Club was renting a venue for training at the YWCA. The new *dōjō* was built with a help of the Otsuka family and given the name *Kenshikan dōjō* where we train now. The name *Kenshikan* was taken from the first name of the founder of the *dōjō*, Kenshiro Otsuka. After a few relocations, Melbourne *Kendō* Club finally settled in West Melbourne, and the opening ceremony of *Kenshikan dōjō* was held in 1990 (Programme, Opening Ceremony of *Kenshikan dōjō* 15/07/1990)⁵⁵. At the time of my research, *Kenshikan* had over a hundred regular and irregular members, and according to some senior practitioners, was one of very few *dōjō* in Australia built purely for Japanese martial arts. The biggest *kendō* training hall in Victoria, it has become a hub for inviting many *kendō* practitioners from Japan, including *sensei* C.M. and *sensei* O (two very famous *kendō* practitioners in Japan and the world) who visit the *dōjō* annually, as well as practitioners from a Japanese university.

During my research, the head of the *dōjō* was *sensei* Y (7th *dan* grade in *kendō*). Other than *sensei* Y, there were several other *sensei*: *sensei* F, 7th *dan* grade, was a

visiting medical researcher for a year (but returned to Japan in 2010); *sensei* P.S., 6th *dan* grade, instructed both *kendō* at *Kenshikan dōjō* for a long time; *sensei* B.S., 5th *dan* grade, was in charge of Tuesday training in the place of *sensei* Y and *sensei* P.S.; and *sensei* H.S., 5th *dan* grade, was a visiting businessman for a few years. Other *sensei* from other *dōjō* would visit the *dōjō* occasionally and train with the members there.

3. General Description of *Kenshikan Dōjō*

In the following section, I describe *Kenshikan dōjō* and its members to familiarise readers with my field site. The descriptions will help readers to understand my discussions in subsequent chapters in which I focus on some distinctive cases.

(1) What do we do in the *Dōjō*?

Kenshikan is a one-storied building on Rosslyn Street in West Melbourne. It is approximately 15 minutes walk from the Central Business District of the city. The street is very quiet, even during the day. There is no signboard or advertisement to indicate the *dōjō*. One could easily imagine that visitors have problems finding *Kenshikan*.

Most of our *dōjō* members came from different suburbs, within an hour's travel away. However, some came from remote areas, such as Ballarat and Apollo Bay, just to

train one night a week. One male practitioner from Geelong once told me that he usually stayed over at his friend's house in the city when he came to the weekday training. According to this practitioner, he preferred to come to *Kenshikan* to train with famous Japanese masters, even though he originally belonged to another *kendō dōjō* near his hometown. There were only a few practitioners, including myself, who could walk from their home to the *dōjō*.

Inside the *dōjō*, there is a small alcove at the entrance, or *tokonoma* in Japanese, which is decorated with a flower arrangement. To the left of the alcove is a place to take off our shoes. This section becomes full by the time we start training. After taking off his or her shoes, each practitioner bows to the *dōjō* space (which is a floor where practitioners actually train), and walks across the *dōjō* to the locker room (male and female).

The bowing ritual is commonly seen in Japanese martial arts, including *kendō*. Usually, practitioners are asked to bow to the *kamiza*. The term *kami* means *upper* and *za* means *seat* in Japanese (Tokeshi 2003:74). The ritual represents one's respect for the masters (*sensei*) who should be good models for junior practitioners and is also related to Shintoism. *Kamiza* is normally a space in which a household Shinto altar (*shinzen*) is placed; traditionally, each martial art *dōjō* has at least one altar in the training space (ibid:74). According to an old Japanese custom, *kamiza* is linked to the idea of Shintoism, which involves worshipping the sun. Originally, *kamiza* faces to the east where the sun rises, and *shimoza*, in which junior practitioners line up, means the west, where the sun sets (ibid:74). In our *dōjō*, the Shinto altar is not placed in the training

space, but in the office (we do not have a proper space for the altar in the *dōjō*).

Practitioners are taught to bow to the *shōmen* (front) where all the masters sit. *Sensei* Y is responsible for cleaning the altar once a month. The office is placed next to the entrance and is where members who are in charge of administrative jobs have a meeting once a month. Here, they schedule training menus and up-coming events for the next month.

The *dōjō* space is a serious space in which laughing, chatting, singing, humming, smoking, drinking, and eating are all prohibited. Through the prohibitions, practitioners are taught to take the *kendō* practice seriously. In addition, practitioners are also prohibited to wear necklets, earrings, and rings, as I learnt in my *dōjō* in Japan. When I first came to Melbourne, I saw some female practitioners wearing such accessories and also met a girl who occasionally paints her fingernails (another practice that is discouraged). *Kendō* etiquette is not fully understood among junior practitioners. During my observation period, senior practitioners, including the *sensei*, seemed to ignore these juniors until they became seriously involved in the *kendō* practice and its community.

Behind the *dōjō* space, there is a viewing area, kitchen, storage, and separate locker rooms for males and females. In contrast to the *dōjō* space, the viewing area, kitchen, and locker rooms are spaces to chat and gossip. Most practitioners gather in the viewing area after training. Some of them even stay there for hours to gossip (particularly after Sunday morning training). Most of my casual interviews were undertaken in these areas during general conversation.

(2) Training Menu in our *Dōjō*

From Monday to Friday, training in *Kenshikan dōjō* is conducted from 7:30 P.M to 9:30 P.M. Practitioners usually arrive at the *dōjō* around 7:00 P.M. Getting to the locker rooms, they change into their *kendōgi* (*kendō* attire) and *bogu* (*kendō* gear), such as face masks, gloves and protectors for the body. Face masks are laid on the top of gloves, placed neatly in a line on the edge of the *dōjō*. At 7:30 P.M., practitioners start warm up exercises (at this stage no masters participate) with the sound of a Japanese drum⁵⁶ as the signal to begin. First, they run in a circle until a senior practitioner who is in charge of warming-up for the day tells them to stop. After running, practitioners form three or four lines for further exercise chosen by the person in charge of the session. The exercise normally lasts between 15 and 20 minutes.

After the exercise, practitioners rush to queue up, carrying their mask and gloves under their right arm and holding their bamboo sword (*shinai*) in their left hands. The position in the queue is decided by grades, with people in higher grades followed by people in lower grades. Standing up to face the *kamiza* or *shōmen*, where the masters are seated, all practitioners bow to the *sensei*. With the words (*mentsuke*) by *sensei* Y, who is the leading master in our *dōjō*, practitioners kneel (*seiza*) and put on masks and gloves. Within a few minutes, practitioners are fully armed and ready for the sparring session.

Sensei Y asks practitioners to form three lines in the middle of the *dōjō*. The first line is normally occupied by senior practitioners, and junior practitioners are allocated

the second and third lines. The person in the second line spars with the person in the first line. Thus, sparring is practised between a senior and junior practitioner. Each sparring session lasts for 2 to 3 minutes. After a sparring session ends, each practitioner in the second line goes to the third line and the practitioners who were in the third line come up to the second line to spar with those in the first line. The first line is also rotated. In the first line, the practitioners move to their right after each sparring session, with the last person in the line moving to the top of the line.

Sparring exercises are mainly categorised into two forms: basic sparring and free sparring. The menu of basic sparring is constructed by a combination of each technique. Before each technique is practised, *sensei* Y (or *sensei* P.S.) demonstrates it to show practitioners the proper way to do. Mostly, *sensei* Y focuses on the basic techniques, such as *kirikaeshi*, *kotemen*, and *kotemendou*. *Kirikaeshi* is an important exercise that contains all the basic movements of *kendō*. With the practice of *kirikaeshi*, practitioners learn how to strike, about posture, how to time an attack, how to move their feet, how to put distance between them and the opponent, and how to control their breath. In Japanese, *kirikaeshi* means ‘continuous cuts’ (Broderick 2004: 49). The practice of *kirikaeshi* is usually the first technique that is taught when a sparring session begins. Although the order of practicing the techniques depends on each *sensei*, *kirikaeshi* should always be the first exercise in *kendō* training. Like other *kendō* techniques, *kirikaeshi* is practised with a partner. The receiver is called *motodachi*, and the person who starts moving is called *kakarite*. *Kirikaeshi* is a set of strikes, and practitioners

repeat several sets of this technique. In *Kenshikan dojō*, students practise some sets of *kirikaeshi* within the first few minutes of training.

Before the first set of *kirikaeshi*, there is a special etiquette to be followed since it is also the first exercise of the day.

Step 1. Stand up, carrying your *shinai* (a bamboo sword) by your left side.

Face your *motodachi*.

Step 2. Bow to your *motodachi* and then ask him/her, *onegaishimasu*, to train together.

Step 3. Bring your *shinai* up to your left hip. While you keep the *shinai* on your hip, take three steps forward. On the third step, draw your *shinai* and point it at your *motodachi*. At this time, the tip of your *shinai* has to touch that of your *motodachi*.

Step 4. Stand down in a posture called *sonkyo*. *Sonkyo* is a deep squat position with one's knees open at approximately 40 degrees. The tip of the right knee is pointed at the centre of the opponent's body. When in the squatting position, the heels must be approximately 10 cm up from the floor. Keep a straight posture with your upper body.

Kirikaeshi is done in the following steps:

Step 1. Take the *sonkyo* position.

Step 2. Stand up from *sonkyo*. Stand at the appropriate distance, called *ittshoku itttou no maai*, between you and your *motodachi*.

Step 3. Take a deep breath and make a strong shout, called *kiai*.

According to *sensei F*, *kiai* is to show a sign to your opponent that you will start striking him/her in the next split second and also functions to make you attentive.

Step 4. Take a large leap forward to the opponent. Give a strike to the centre of the opponent's forehead (*shōmen*) with a loud shout (*kiai*) of *men*.

Step 5. Then, keep attacking into your opponent's *centre*⁵⁷ while bringing your hands down to your lower abdomen. The intention to crash through your opponent is called *tai atari*.

Step 6. While your opponent takes one step backwards just before your *tai atari*, you immediately again strike at the opponent's left forehead. The angle of your *shinai* has to be at 45 degrees.

Step 7. Again your opponent takes one step backwards at the last moment with your left strike, and you immediately strike the opponent's right forehead with a big *kiai* of *men!* (a shout with *kiai*). At each strike your feet slide. Normally, in *kirikaeshi*, one keeps striking forward four times, followed by moving backwards with five strikes.

Step 8. After nine strikes (four times forward and five times backward), re-establish the posture, standing at the correct distance from the opponent. The final strike is given to the centre of the opponent's forehead with a big shout of *men*. This time *kakarite* gets through the left-hand side of the opponent. Turning to face your opponent, *kakarite* makes the posture of *zanshin*, which is the posture to get ready for the next movement. Now, it is your turn to be a *motodachi*, receiving the opponent's *kirikaeshi*.

In the middle of the basic sparring, *sensei* Y divides practitioners into two groups: senior and junior groups. Normally, *sensei* Y teaches the junior group to continue basic techniques, while the senior group is taught by *sensei* P.S. The senior group practises

applied techniques such as *haraigote*, *haraimen*, *suriagegote*, *suriagemen*, *tsuki*, and *makiagemen* (see Appendix 2).

In the last thirty minutes of the training, free sparring occurs, simulating a real match. During free sparring, practitioners can ask to train with anyone and they randomly pick whoever they want to spar together with. After forming one line in the middle of the *dōjō*, practitioners spread across the floor. This time *sensei* Y and P.S. join the training too. These *sensei* spar in a fixed place, and both senior and junior practitioners form a long queue to spar with the *sensei*.

(3) Grading System

In Australia, outside of the *kendō* community, there is apparently a belief that *kendō* uses different coloured belts to show rank, but this is not the case. Indeed, I have been asked several times by non-Japanese friends what belts I have. Without the use of coloured belts, we still have a hierarchy of ranks. In the hierarchy, all the ranks are divided in two categories: *kyu* grades and *dan* grades. There are six ranks in the *kyu* grades, while *dan* grades have eight ranks.

Kyu grades are lower than *dan* grades. Within the *kyu* hierarchy, the lowest rank is 6th *kyu* and the highest is the 1st *kyu*. *Dan* grades begin from the 1st *dan* and finish with the 8th *dan*. The International *Kendō* Federation (IKF), which follows the regulation of the All Japan *Kendō* Federation, establishes guidelines for the requirements for each

grading. From 1st *dan* and above, there is a preliminary requirement of time. For example, a person who is 1st *kyu* cannot take an examination for 1st *dan* before waiting at least three months after taking 1st *kyu*. For the grading of 2nd *dan*, one has to wait a minimum of two years after taking his/her 1st *dan*. In the case of the grading for 8th *dan*, one must practise for ten years as the holder of 7th *dan*.

In Australia, the Australian *Kendō Renmei* has the responsibility of supervising grading examinations. All beginners have to take the examination for 6th *kyu* under the supervision of the *Renmei*⁵⁸. Like other countries, examinations for higher *dan* (5th *dan* and above) grades are not held in Australia because of the lack of referees. Those who take higher *dan* grades have to visit Japan, acquiring certificates from the All Japan *Kendō* Federation. *Kenshikan dōjō*, as the hub *dōjō* in Victoria, takes charge of grading examinations. Every year, several examinations are held in the *dōjō*.

When I was in the *dōjō*, there were only a few 5th *dan* and above in Australia who were allowed to teach *kendō*. In most *dōjō* in Australia, it is rare to have multiple higher *dan* holders at one time. However, in the case of *Kenshikan*, we were lucky to have five 5th *dan* and above holders. This is one of the reasons that the members of other *dōjō* visit *Kenshikan* to train with those higher graded *sensei*. In particular, as I discuss in Chapter Six, some are particularly keen on learning *kendō* under the well-authorised Japanese *sensei* of *Kenshikan*.

(4) Introductory Courses for Beginners

In our *dōjō*, people who first begin *kendō* need to attend a course organised for beginners. In the course, those beginners learn the very basic knowledge and movements of *kendō*: how to step back and forward, how to grip a *shinai*, how to shout *kiai*, and the names of each technique in Japanese.

There are several introductory courses (eight weeks long) for beginners taught by senior members throughout a year. The training is held twice a week for beginners: on Wednesday and Sunday. For the instructors of the introductory courses, senior practitioners who have free time on each training day for beginners take charge of the course. In particular, seniors such as C.C., L. and R.L. play an important role in the courses, and *sensei* Y and *sensei* P.S. do not teach the beginners until they complete one of the introductory courses.

After finishing an introductory course, beginners are allowed to join the normal training with junior and senior practitioners. However, they are not allowed to wear armour. Instead, they just wear sportswear. Thus, beginners do not fully participate in the sparring and are separated from the fully armed practitioners. Gathering in the corner of the *dōjō*, the beginners have some senior practitioners teach them how to spar with armed practitioners.

(5) Other *Dōjōs* in Melbourne

The relationship between *Kenshikan* and other *dōjōs* is important in understanding the positioning of *Kenshikan dōjō* in Victoria. Around Melbourne, there are five *dōjōs*, including *Kenshikan*. Each *dōjō* has its own distinct character, and *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne select one of them on the basis of their preferences⁵⁹.

Fudoushin dōjō is located in the block next to The University of Melbourne. The *dōjō* was founded in 1994 by *sensei* B and *sensei* D.S. Unlike *Kenshikan dōjō* that has its own dedicated (owned) space, they hire the Upper Gymnasium at the University High School. *Fudoushin* is a *dōjō* that particularly focuses on the aspect of competition in *kendō*. The leading master for *Fudoushin* is *sensei* B who holds the grade of 6th *dan*. B was a famous *kendō* competitor in Australia and he was a member of the Australian national team. Compared to other *dōjōs*, some practitioners who train in *Fudoushin* focus on national and international championships. Indeed, some *Fudoushin* practitioners compete as members of the national team. In my own experience, I felt there is a difference in the teaching style of *kendō* between *Kenshikan* and *Fudoushin*. Every time I sparred with *sensei* B, I felt that the training menu in *Fudoushin* is much more difficult than that of *Kenshikan*. Having practitioners who compete at national level, the training inevitably becomes stricter. Borrowing words from the members of *Kenshikan*, who often gossip about the teaching style of *Fudoushin*, the training in *Fudoushin* could be highlighted by words such as *point scoring*. *Kenshikan* practitioners tend to keep their distance from point-scoring *kendō*.

Nanseikan dōjō is located in Heidelberg West, and the *dōjō* was started in 2002.

Nanseikan is run by *sensei* B.S. who holds a 5th *dan* grade. *Sensei* B.S started the art in 1983 and he has instructed *kendō* since 1995 (initially at the Melbourne University Club). As a former President of the Victorian *Kendō Renmei*, he has long been involved in the *kendō* community of Victoria. *Sensei* B.S focuses on teaching *kendō* to children. *Sensei* B.S also teaches *kendō* at *Kenshikan* on a Tuesday in the absence of *sensei* Y and P.S.

In Australia, universities are also good places to start practicing *kendō*. *Kendō* clubs may be found at large universities. The *kendō* club in the University of Melbourne (UMKC) was started in 1989. The club is led by *sensei* Y.M, who was one of the early founders of *kendō* in Victoria and is now a 6th *dan* grade practitioner. When I first came to Melbourne in 2008, I joined UMKC for a few months. Based on my experience there, most students are university undergraduates. In addition, I found that most student practitioners come to training regularly, but tend to stop practicing after graduating from the university. The more time goes by, the more the members of UMKC change, with a few exceptions. For example, practitioners K.S.U and A.L. are graduates from the university and have continued practicing the art. They are now in charge of instructing younger students at the University *dōjō*.

The University of Monash is another university in Melbourne where one can train in *kendō*. Unlike other *dōjōs* in Melbourne, Monash does not have an official *sensei*. Instead, senior practitioners, such as M (a Japanese male scientist at the University of Monash) and K.S., take care of the *kendō* club. Practitioner M (3rd *dan*) is a Japanese

practitioner who is a famous competitor in local and national championships. In 2010, M won first place in the Australian National Championship for male individuals. Practitioner K.S. (4th *dan*) is a female practitioner who is a member of *Fudoshin*. She is also a member of the Australian national team. *Sensei* Y from *Kenshikan* also supports the Monash *kendō* club by attending their training once a week.

Like *sensei* Y and *sensei* B.S., those Melbourne practitioners interact well with each other, even though they practise at different *dōjōs*. It is not only a network among practitioners that they establish, but also the technique: the techniques of a *sensei* are shared by practitioners in different *dōjōs*. For example, the members of *Fudoshin* often join the Sunday training in *Kenshikan* to learn the *kendō* of *sensei* Y.

Of all the *dōjōs* in Melbourne, *Kenshikan* is the most significant for Victorian *kendō* practitioners since the *dōjō* functions as the hub. All the important events in the Victorian *kendō* community are held in the *dōjō*. For example, the meetings of the Victorian *Kendō Renmei* (the Victorian *Kendō* Federation), grading examinations, and *shinpan* seminars⁶⁰ are all organised here. One of the characteristic aspects of *Kenshikan dōjō* can be found in the policy of *sensei* Y. In contrast to *Fudoshin*, which focuses on hard training for competitions, *sensei* Y, who follows the policy of the previous master of *Kenshikan*, highlights the basic techniques. According to *sensei* Y, he tries not to be strict on the practitioners of *Kenshikan*. He told me that hard training is too much, and it does not attract Australians. He wants Australians to enjoy *kendō*, and his purpose as one who is in charge of the *dōjō* is to introduce the art in Victoria. Such a policy is understood well by most members of *Kenshikan*, although others are

less happy. For example, a male practitioner actually changed his membership from *Kenshikan* to *Fudoshin*; he told me that he prefers the much harder training than that of *Kenshikan*.

As such, each *dōjō* maintains its characteristic features, while at the same time interacting with each other. Having *Kenshikan dōjō* as the centre of the Victorian *kendō* community, the network among all *dōjōs* is well established.

(6) Gender in our *Dōjō*

Now one might wonder how gender features in the *Kenshikan dōjō*. In the *Kenshikan dōjō*, male and female practitioners train together, as in Japan, having the same training menu. Men and women are only separated in competitions. Although the females are expected to perform as much as males, some junior females tend to have a short break in the middle of training, with permission from the *senseis*. *Sensei Y* does not force them to train hard as long they show their eagerness. Currently female practitioners in Victoria encourage each other to increase their skill level and spar more often with male practitioners. The women's special training⁶¹ is part of their challenge, and senior female practitioners, such as K.S.,⁶² are enthusiastic about improving the ranking of Australian female practitioners within global *kendō* practice.

The distribution of gender in *Kenshikan* shows a typical aspect of *kendō* culture. As explained earlier, *kendō* originally developed from the *samurai* culture in Japan and so

has been a predominantly male culture. Since the post-war period, women have been encouraged to participate in *kendō* practice in Japan. Ten years after the establishment of the All Japan *Kendō* Federation, the championship for female practitioners in Japan was inaugurated⁶³. However, compared to the number of male *kendō* practitioners, the number of female practitioners is relatively low. For example, the total number of practitioners in Japan between 1976 and 1991 was 883,544, of which only 27 percent were female (Guttmann and Thompson 2001: 176). In addition, the number of women who receive higher *dan* grades is much lower than that of male practitioners. According to the All Japan *Kendō* Federation, the successful candidates for the 7th *dan* grade are approximately 10% of all candidates. Female candidates who pass the grading examination are approximately 10% of the successful candidates⁶⁴. In the case of the examination in 2010, the pass rate was 12.5%, with 147 successful candidates among the 1179 practitioners⁶⁵.

Similarly, in *Kenshikan dōjō*, there are far more male practitioners than females. In addition, in comparison to the regular female practitioners, the male practitioners in our *dōjō* are longer-term practitioners. Some have trained in *kendō* for over 30 years. Those longer-term male practitioners have a personal connection with practitioners in Japan and have experienced training in Japan. In contrast to the female practitioners in our *dōjō*, the network between the Australian male practitioners and Japanese male practitioners is well established. Most Japanese visitors, including higher-grade *sensei* who are invited to our *dōjō*, are from the network of *Kenshikan* male practitioners.

Half the female members are irregular practitioners. According to practitioner R.L.

who is part of the administration of our *dōjō*, out of approximately 50 practitioners who regularly come to *kendō* training, 14 are females in total (including myself). Three out of those 14 regular practitioners are Japanese. The irregular practitioners either fade away or only intermittently come to training. In addition, some regular female practitioners sometimes take long breaks to take care of private matters, such as a long-term business trip, family matters, nursing, or menopausal problems.

During my fieldwork, I generally focused on male practitioners. As will be evident in the subsequent chapters, I only worked with a few females, such as practitioner K who features in later chapters. The reason for focusing on male practitioners is because they were most present.

(7) Family Backgrounds

Along with gender differences, there is another difference in our *dōjō*. Being located in the cosmopolitan city, Melbourne, our *dōjō* reflects what is called *multicultural Australia*, and practitioners have a range of different ethnic backgrounds.

Most practitioners are those people who have either permanent residence or Australian citizenship. Examining the *dōjō* in the context of discussions by scholars such as Ghassan Hage (1998), the members of our *dōjō* are both *Anglo-Celtic Australians* and *non-Anglo-Celtic Australians*. Non-Anglo-Celtic Australians include migrants from European countries, such as Greece, Italy, and Poland. There are also

many Asian permanent residents who were originally from Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Indonesia, and Vietnam. Those practitioners with whom I was particularly close were mostly born in Australia (or brought up in Australia), but they could trace their family back to different countries.

Another thing I noticed was the plural ethnic identities for most practitioners. When I asked one male practitioner about his family, he told me, ‘My mother’s side is French, Dutch, and Sri Lankan, and my father is Australian, German, and French-Jewish. Did I answer your question?’ Even though this practitioner is the most distinctive example, he is not the only one who has a plural background.

Although belonging to multiethnic backgrounds, some *kendō* practitioners are not consciously aware of their family backgrounds. When I asked them about their background, I found that some practitioners, who had multiple ethnic backgrounds, had difficulty answering the question at that time. When I spoke to one male practitioner, he asked me if he could ‘go back home and confirm it with my family? I’m not 100% sure...’. Regarding family background, I also found that practitioners do not always grasp each other’s background. When I happened to join a conversation with some practitioners, they were gossiping about a male practitioner. Although the practitioners showed an interest in his early career as a *kendō* practitioner, his job, and his children, they did not seem to be interested in his ethnic background. Rather, they simply judged him as a local Melbournian by his English accent. I later investigated his background and found that he has a Scottish background.

In addition, there were few people in our *dōjō* who only temporarily stayed in the

country, and they were mostly overseas students from Asian regions (including me) studying at universities in Melbourne. Those students constantly exchanged information on permanent resident visas (PR). After training finished, the locker rooms and the viewing area became an information exchanging space for them. From what I heard, it is no exaggeration to say that almost every student was eager to gain PR and stay in the country after their graduation. I was almost fed up with being questioned about my plans to stay in Australia after graduating from the university.

Although it is significant to further explore the multi-ethnic aspect while discussing a site in Melbourne, in this thesis I rather focus on examining those practitioners who have different ethnic backgrounds from non-Japanese practitioners to highlight a point about how *kendō* as something Japanese has been understood outside Japan. As referred to earlier at the end of Chapter One, my research aims to analyse the *kendō dōjō* as a site for examining contemporary representations of the Japanese Other in order to further elaborate the framework of the long genealogy of Orientalist representation of Japan.

Kenshikan dōjō is a place of difference in which a diverse range of people with various family backgrounds and *kendō* abilities gather together. Despite the diversity, however, I found a range of overlapping attitudes towards *kendō* expressed by practitioners. In the next chapters, I focus particularly on specific cases in relation to my concern regarding the representation of the Other. Focusing on their narratives, I explore how *Kenshikan* practitioners have recognised *otherness* in a variety of different ways through practising

the art. In the following chapters, I begin to challenge my Occidental eyes introduced in Chapter One, and I explore some distinctive narratives that have emerged from *kendō* practitioners with whom I am particularly close. As explained below, I categorise each narrative differently: something new, combativeness, self-expressiveness, and a way to engage in or retreat from everydayness. These narratives reveal some interesting ideas of some contemporary *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne about this art, which leads me to the idea that some practitioners in Melbourne do not necessarily seek the Japanese Other with an objective viewpoint, but subjectively seek an interpretation of *kendō* as a personal practice.

Chapter Four: *Kendō* as Not Inevitably a Thing Japanese

1. An Interest in Real Combativeness

In light of my initial (Occidentalism?) expectations that my informants would exoticise the Japanese other (based on my understanding of Orientalism), I was most interested to discover that many Melbourne *kendō* practitioners do not frame their practice as intrinsically Japanese or as particularly exotic, but rather explain that *kendō* allows them simply to experience *a sense of combat*.

During my fieldwork I first noticed their interest in the combat side of *kendō* when I talked to practitioner D. He is a young male who came to Melbourne from Israel as a university student, majoring in engineering. D loves talking about martial arts at every opportunity. According to D, he has been interested in martial arts since he was child. Before coming to Melbourne, he practised Chinese martial arts in Israel, and in Melbourne he continues his Chinese martial art practice alongside *kendō*. Usually in my fieldwork (participant-observation), I did not ask direct questions. Rather, since I was interested in practitioners' narratives in natural settings, I tried to be part of each conversation and to listen to what people were saying to each other. I remember, however, that I asked D a relatively direct question when he and I talked about martial arts one day after *kendō* training. When I asked him whether his initial interest in *kendō* was because of his interest in things related to Japan or not, he told me a little story. Even though, he explained, his interest in things Japanese was not particularly strong,

he was inspired by a military officer in Israel who trained in various martial arts including Asian martial arts. Then he said that he is interested to train his body like the military officer, to gain physical fitness and to know effective ways to attack an opponent in a combat situation. *Kendō* is a way to train his body while also learning a Chinese martial art. Contrary to my expectation that *kendō* practitioners are more interested in learning things Japanese, D appears to focus on the technical aspect and is more interested in physical strength. My conversation with him showed me the practitioners' interest in fighting, and I started to explore the narratives of other practitioners interested in the combat side of the art.

This interest in the effectiveness of fighting can also be observed in the other *kendō* practitioners such as L (senior practitioner/Indonesian background), V (senior practitioner/Malaysian background), P (senior practitioner/Egyptian background) and S.L. (senior practitioner/Chinese-Malaysian background who grew up in New Zealand). On one day, we gathered at older woman K.D.'s house (senior practitioner/ Japanese background). While K.D. were preparing dishes for us at her kitchen, we casually talked about *kendō* in her dining room. In our conversation, I asked L what he meant when he said that *kendō* is something different compared to other martial arts. He answered, 'Of course! We have *shinai*! (a bamboo sword)'. Then V insisted that 'We can actually hit someone!' with it. They believe that *kendō* practitioners can *actually* attack someone with a weapon while practitioners of other martial arts cannot really do the same. P then added 'what a violent bunch of people!' and we all laughed. The narratives of L and V indicate two different points: 1) L thinks *kendō* is distinguished from other martial arts

because of the use of *shinai* and 2) V implies that, in terms of using weapons (*shinai*), the practices of *kendō* are much more combative than other martial arts.

Responding to the conversation about their comments on *shinai*, a young female practitioner, S.L., who used to practise *taekwondō* in high school, explains her love of *kendō*, highlighting the combat aspect of *kendō* practice:

P: *bogu* and *shinai* makes *kendō* stands out, yea? ...

S.L.: I think *contact* as well ... In the other martial arts you don't really spar with each other ...

P: yeah!

T.C.: yeah!

S.L.: Like *taekwondō* and *aikidō*, when you train you just train pretty much on your own ... and even sparring is like ... not real contact whereas *kendō* ...

Here the combative aspect, which P terms 'violent', is highlighted and seen as significant for the *kendō* practice of S.L. Agreeing with S.L.'s memory of practicing *taekwondō*, which she thought not interesting at all, the *kendō* members repeatedly highlighted the excitement of *kendō* sparring, through which they can experience intensive body contact. They are attracted by an aspect of *kendō* which allows them to wear full armour and directly attack an opponent with their *shinai*. What practitioners are enjoying in *kendō* practice is its real combativeness, and they are people who look

for real physical experiences⁶⁶.

It is important to point out, however, that what those practitioners believe about other martial arts is actually not true. Most martial arts include sparring sessions during which practitioners have intensive body contact with their opponents. Many studies examining the injury rate of sparring have been conducted. For example, research on the sparring in *karate* has revealed the intensity of its combat aspect (McLatchie 1977; Critchley and Mannion 1999). Practitioners often suffer both major and minor injuries throughout the year, indicating the high-risk in the art's body contact. What is revealed by those studies is that *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne *believe* that *kendō* is distinctive among other martial arts in giving them real contact in sparring.

Furthermore, the narratives of some other practitioners indicate that they are interested in real contact in sparring which is premised on a sense of full commitment to the attack. Practitioners expect to participate in not merely a game of win or lose but a serious battle producing a (mimetic) real combat situation in the *dōjō*. Unlike Japanese high school *kendō*, which they perceive as a mere sport (as mentioned earlier concerning practitioner P.S.'s view, Japanese high school *kendō* is recognised as a point scoring game), these practitioners see what they do as real fighting.

Once, I spoke to senior practitioner T.C. (senior practitioner/Japanese-Irish background), a self-proclaimed *budō otaku*. After a sparring session with him, he expressed his dissatisfaction with sparring with someone like me. He said, 'your *kendō* is like Japanese high school *kendō*!', and he made many comments about 'what *kendō* should be like'. One point he highlighted was that my *kendō* was 'small', implying that

every technique and movement of my *kendō* was not good enough to be imposing (or that my *kendō* was not dignified). What he expected was ‘big *kendō*’ (occasionally I have heard him saying to other *dōjō* members that ‘*kendō* is like *kabuki*’, explaining the importance of ‘showing a powerful presence’). Then T.C. demonstrated what my *kendō* looked like. He showed me a very quick cut in which his body did not move much. This quick and sharp cut can often be seen in Japanese high-school competitions, in which students focus on scoring a point to win a match. By way of contrast, he demonstrated ‘a good example’ with good posture in a dignified straight way (and with a nice big *kiai* or spirit), and he asked me to attack him with full power.

Regarding Japanese high school *kendō*, some other practitioners in our *dōjō* further explained their perspective to me. One day I went to the *dōjō* for special training only for senior practitioners (It was the day a Japanese sensei (an instructor) visited the Melbourne *dōjō*). I was just observing senior practitioners (both Australian and Japanese practitioners) training with the special visitor. After their training finished, I had a casual chat with one senior practitioner, S (senior practitioner/Greek background), who was one of the early founders of both Australian and Victorian *kendō*. S used to work in Japan and speaks Japanese (we always talk to each other in half Japanese and half English). Then he suddenly asked me about a Japanese girl who came for our training for the first time on that day. Obviously her *kendō* was good enough to train with higher-grade practitioners and she looked very young, perhaps between high school and the first year of university. S asked me in Japanese ‘she is Japanese, isn’t she?’, ‘where in Japan do you think she comes from?’ and ‘what is her name?’. At first I

thought from his reaction that he must think the Japanese girl was very good at *kendō* and that is why he had asked me about her. Then S asked me what I thought about her *kirikaeshi*. I answered him in English ‘very good!’ Shrugging his shoulder, S then told me (in half Japanese and half English) to be honest, saying ‘we’re not in Japan! Please speak the truth!’. It seemed to be generally understood by non-Japanese practitioners that direct communication has to be avoided in Japan. I then honestly said to him in English ‘much much better than me!’ Then, he responded that there is no *kiai* in it. It was very strange to me because it was as if he expected me to answer differently. This became clearer when I spoke to others on the same day.

On the same day I was chatting with another senior practitioner, E.L. (senior practitioner/Taiwanese background), after training. Practitioner E.L. had at that stage practised *kendō* for approximately ten years with his cousins, and, like practitioner L, he continues the art for exercise. Our conversation naturally turned to her and her *kendō* style (she left the dojo earlier than us), and he indicated the importance of ‘commitment’. E.L. told me that ‘her *kendō* is like typical Japanese high school *kendō*!’ and continued ‘that’s why she does many tricky techniques and her cut is “not really a cut”’. According to E.L., ‘a good and real cut’ needs to be done with *kiai*. He then (little bit proudly) described me how he beat the Japanese girl in the training with his nice, straight, ‘real cut’.

The *kiai* is a sharp shout with exhalation, performed when cutting. Generally in *kendō*, *sensei* (instructors) teach their apprentices to put their full commitment into every single movement, cut, and technique. In our *dōjō* too, all the *sensei* repeatedly

told us that ‘you’re not putting yourself in it!’ or ‘you need more *kiai!*’. Ideally, as is taught in Japan, ‘the unification of spirit, sword, and body’ (*ki ken tai no ittchi*) is fundamental. Senior practitioners (such as S and E.L.) at our *dōjō* interpreted high school *kendō* as if it was a sport activity that students participate in purely for the glory of winning competitions rather than for any deeper identification and thus lose the seriousness in combat which is, they believe, necessary for real *kendō*. Relevant here is that the Australian *kendō* practitioners practise *kiai* in order to produce something real when compared with their idea about high school *kendō* in Japan where they believe that students do not honour this tradition. Such an attitude of seeking realness is also seen in the practitioners’ idea of sword fighting as explained below.

Along with this sense of full commitment, some practitioners are keen on effective technique. They often discuss and imagine real sword fights when training, and they believe *kata* training to be important. In relation to *what kendō should be like*, practitioners like T.C. often talk about *kata* training. *Kata* (*Nihon kendō kata*) is not a normal training, but it is a training in which practitioners learn paired sets of forms, movements, and etiquette with wooden swords. In contrast to the normal training in which practitioners wear full armour and physically attack each other, in *kata* practitioners do not wear full armours. Practitioners are expected to learn and understand the structure of body movements and the usage of Japanese swords. The *kata* training is practised on the assumption that we have real sword fights. Indeed, in the culture of *kendō*, *shinai* symbolises real Japanese swords, as *iai* does. Even in our training, practitioners are asked to treat their *shinai* as if they were real swords that can

kill if misused. Thus, the proper etiquette for *shinai* is repeatedly taught. If the seniors catch someone not treating his/her *shinai* properly, the person is rebuked with the words ‘this is a sword that can kill someone’, and ‘you need to treat it in the proper way!’

I was told by practitioners T.C. and C (senior *kendō* and *iai* practitioner/ Greek background) that I needed to focus more on *kata* training. They pointed out that my *kata* ‘cannot cut anything’. ‘With the techniques of your *kendō*’, T.C. said, ‘you cannot cut anything. It’s just a hit and not the correct way of using a sword’. T.C. looked at practitioner C and asked him for a supplementary explanation from his experience of *iaido* (*Iai* is an Japanese sword art in which practitioners learn how to draw the swords quickly and how to control the sword to cut an opponent. In terms of learning the way of controlling swords, *kata* training in *kendō* is very similar to what people in *Iaido* practice). Then C explained more with *iai* examples. It seems to me that they recognise *kendō* as a kind of sword art, as if *kendō* were a high-risk activity. Indeed they repeatedly insisted that my *kendō* would be useless in a real sword fight. In other words, T.C. and C consider *kata* training important for the practice of *kendō* in order to keep the art as a real form of sword fighting. For them, *kata* training is an extension of what they consider real *kendō*, and it enhances *effectiveness* in a real fight. It could be suggested that the narratives of these *kendō* practitioners (in which they seek a sense of real sparring) show their desire for full commitment in fighting through the physical effectiveness of the body or an attempt to reproduce real fighting as much as they can in mock combats.

Borrowing words from Charles Lindholm, who has analysed the desire for an ‘adrenaline thing’⁶⁷ among edgeworkers⁶⁸ who participate in high-risk activities such as white-water rafting, kayaking, bungee jumping and mountain climbing, these *kendō* practitioners seek the ‘stimulation of powerful body sensation’⁶⁹ through an ‘out of body experience’ (Lindholm 2008:48-50). Referring to studies conducted by sociologist Stephen Lyng, Lindholm explains that these edgeworkers mostly ‘differentiate themselves by their spiritual desire for “a real experience” that can be only experienced ‘in such circumstances, in the most majestically indifferent settings on earth, accident and necessity unite under the sign of mortal danger to yield the purest possible encounter with the real’ (ibid:48). Lindholm characterises edgeworkers as enjoying the ecstasy of danger, which can only be felt through a ‘body experience’ (ibid:49), and he concludes that seekers who search for extreme experiences demand ‘real feeling’ in hyper-reality (ibid:51).

As *kendō* practitioners also seek a sense of real combat in a mock fight, the analysis by Lindholm is helpful here. *Kendō* practitioners in Melbourne seek a real feeling when sparring against each other, and they enjoy mock combat as if it were real combat. The practitioners mimetically use the *shinai* as a dangerous weapon to kill someone, indicating that they try to mimetically expose themselves to dangerous situations. What they are expecting in *kendō* practice is *a sense of danger*, which is why practitioners T.C. and C asserted the real effectiveness on the body of their opponents in their training. They see *kendō* as part of the old swordsman culture of serious life-and-death battles. Through their *kiai*, practitioners like E.L. judge how seriously their opponents

are sparring, while female practitioner S.L. sees the enjoyment of intensive body attack in *kendō* practice. What is important for some *kendō* practitioners is having a full fight, challenging the opponent with an effective attack, and meeting an effective defense against that attack for as long as possible. The ‘stimulation of powerful bodily sensations’ gives them a sense of real experience with deep feelings of physical involvement in extreme (mock) situations (Lindholm 2008: 48, 50), and it highlights their *kendō*’s combativeness that is enlivened by *excitement* and commitment in comparison with Japanese high school *kendō*.

2. *Kendō* for the Jedi Knights

While analysing *kendō* as a practice satisfying an interest in combat, I found that, in contrast to the argument by Donohue in Chapter One, *kendō* practice in Melbourne is sometimes engaged in by male practitioners (such as P.S. and S) interested in the hero stories of sword fighting, particularly men in their 40s and 50s who are influenced by the fighting scenes in films such as George Lucas’s *Star Wars* (1977).

Practitioner S, for example, told me that he ‘wanted to be a Jedi knight’ when he saw the film as a child. His interest in *kendō* was inspired by *Star Wars*, and he believed that *kendō* was the way to become a Jedi knight. The young S did not want to be a *kendō* master or a samurai soldier, but a Jedi. In the first documentary of the making of *The Empire Strikes Back*, Mark Hamill, a leading actor in the *Star Wars* films,

comments that the actors had lessons in *kendō* for the fighting scenes. Some *dōjō* practitioners told me that they saw a documentary of *Star Wars* and were influenced by the scene in which the actors trained in *kendō*. They recalled that the actors trained in *kendō* for 12 months although I could only find one scene in which Mark Hamill mentions that he had to train in *kendō* and *karate*.

S, who is in his early 50s, migrated to Australia from Brazil with his Greek parents when he was a child. His first contact with Japan was through a Japanese neighbour in Brazil. Recalling a warm friendship with an old Japanese woman, he told me that he has been familiar with many aspects of Japanese culture, because of his early contact with second-generation Japanese in Brazil. And with the 1970s popularisation of the martial arts, when he was around fourteen in Australia, through movie stars like Bruce Lee and Chuck Norris, S became interested in Asian martial arts in general, starting *karate* in high school.

At the same time, S told me that he had been always interested in sword fighting as a boy. Citing historical Greek combats against the Turks and the fighting tradition of Sparta, he said that, as a Greek, he thought he might have inherited the Mediterranean tradition of swordsmanship. Other members of the *dōjō* who had joined our conversation added that it was a very ‘boy thing!’, claiming that children of their generation were fascinated by swordsmanship and TV programs such as *The Three Musketeers*. S and other members agreed that most boys who watched sword fighting at that time had been fascinated by the idea of these *cool* knights and every boy had once thought ‘I want to be a Jedi!’.

After practicing *karate* at high school for a while, S stopped and started looking for something else. Coincidentally, the documentary on the making of *Star Wars* was on TV while the film was showing in the cinema. Following Mark Hamill's comment that the cast had had *kendō* lessons, S started looking for martial art training halls in the city (Melbourne). From a list given to him at one hall, S found the phone number of John Butler, a British migrant, who later became the founder of *kendō* in Victoria. S joined Butler's *kendō* training at the YWCA.

Star Wars is a series of science fiction movies based on an adventure story, and it has been described as a nostalgic film weaving different themes into the story (Jameson 1998:7). In a discussion of the characteristics of the development of mass culture in postmodernism, Fredric Jameson points out that the film reinvents old American hero stories which contain an alien villain, heroines in distress, strong heroes, cliffhangers, and doomsday (ibid:8). According to Jameson, *Star Wars* is constructed by the pastiche effect of representation, borrowing bits and pieces from the stories of the past which evoke nostalgia in audiences. In other words, a pastiche story is a story which is constructed 'without parody's ulterior motive, without the satirical impulse, without laughter, without that still latent feeling that there exists something normal compared with which what is being imitated is rather comic' (ibid:5).

One such example is the medieval knight romance of King Arthur. Even though it is a sci-fi story, *Star Wars* has a similar structure to the traditional Arthurian legend in which a young man grows into a true hero through his battles against enemies. In doing so, this hero figure unites the country (Collins 1977). Just as King Arthur had a wizard

mentor, Merlin, who guided Arthur and became his right-hand man, Obi-Wan helps a hero in the movie, Luke Skywalker (ibid:2-3). Just as King Arthur discovered his identity (the son of the king) after pulling a sword from a stone, Luke also discovered the secret of his birth (a prince) and learned about his parents after Obi-Wan presented him with his father's ancient lightsaber (Henthorne 2004:78). Furthermore, researchers such as Collins and Henthorne point out that *Star Wars* also borrows themes from classic films of the western frontier tradition, *Wizard Of Oz*, and old World War I and World War II flying battles (Collins 1977:1-10; Henthorne 2004). George Lucas combines these popular old themes and creates a new modern myth (Collins 1977:2). As such, the *Star Wars* movies can be interpreted as a reinvented version of these early heroic stories in a pastiche style.

On the basis of these analyses, I conclude that young S, who shows an interest in the sword fighting of Jedi Knights, was attracted by the story of a hero, one which is widely accepted in the West. Indeed, young S was interested in the sword fighting in *Star Wars* as well as that in *The Three Musketeers* and the fighting culture of Sparta. Such narratives of practitioner S's become much clearer when compared to others such as practitioner B.S.

Practitioner B.S. was also a big fan of *Star Wars*. While the focus of practitioner S was the *cool* swordsmanship in the film, the focus of B.S. was on the mysterious aspect of otherness. B.S. was a 5th *dan* grade practitioner teaching at our *kendō dōjō* and *Nanseikan dōjō*. As a high school teacher in Melbourne he taught *kendō* as a selective subject. He also was taking a correspondence course in Asian Studies (at the University

of Adelaide), majoring in the history of Japanese swordsmanship. When he was in his early 20s, B.S. went to Kagoshima Prefecture, Japan, for six months to train in *kendō*. During my fieldwork period, he was training in a *koryū bujitsu* (an old style Japanese martial arts which includes swords, spear, and close quarter combat) at a different *dōjō* in a Melbourne suburb. One day B.S. and I had a chat in his car on our way back home. I casually mentioned that the other *dōjō* members and I recently had a nice chat about *Star Wars*, and I told him that some practitioners his age love to talk about the film. B.S. said to me that he was also inspired by *Star Wars*. He told me that he was particularly inspired by the idea of ‘force’ in the film and other Japanese motifs, like the swords and the costumes that resemble the *kimono*.

The idea of *force* is a key concept in the *Star Wars* universe. In the early episodes of the film, Luke lives in area near the desert with his stepparents. After they are killed, young Skywalker decides to fight against the Empire with the help of a mysterious desert hermit, Obi-Wan Kenobi, who is one of the few surviving Jedi Knights. After some adventures with Obi-Wan, Luke finally meets the legendary Jedi master, Yoda, in the wetlands of a distant planet where this old master has lived hidden as a hermit. As part of Yoda’s unconventional training, Luke is asked to concentrate only on his surroundings, and Yoda teaches him to sense the energy around him. The only way that Luke can stay connected with the energy that surrounds him is through the control of his inner mind. Luke finally masters the use of this supernatural Jedi power called the *force*.

The conversation with B.S. gave me a hint for my further examination of the case of

practitioner S. The narrative of B.S., which I rather expected, fit my notion that non-Japanese practitioners enjoy the mysterious idea of the *force* and connect it with the image of Japanese *samurai* culture. Unlike practitioner S, B.S. understood *kendō* in combination with the mysterious *force*, Japanese swords, and Japanese *kimono*. In other words, it can be said that *kendō* appealed to him as part of a package of images (swords, *kimono*, and the mysterious idea of the *force*) and that the supernatural power of the Jedi is associated with things Japanese. Though he was watching the heroic story of Jedi knights, he recognised aspects that he associated with the Japanese or what Basil Hall Chamberlain called things Japanese in the story. For B.S. it was *kendō* that fulfilled his curiosity. While practitioner B.S. sought out *kendō* and was interested in things Japanese, which sounds rather mysterious and exotic, practitioners like S, whose primary aim was not to learn *kendō*, were inspired by an Arthurian-style Jedi story to practise this Japanese martial art. In other words, *kendō* for S was accidentally Japanese.

In the genealogy of representation related to Japan (including the martial arts culture of Japan), things Japanese are always targeted by the eyes of Orientalists who have expected a Japan that is uniquely Japanese. Borrowing words from Said that ‘the Orient is thus *orientalized*’ (Said 1979:67), Orientalists’ views on things Japanese has *japanised* Japan, and they have established images as if there are some essences that define what Japan and the Japanese are, or what is called *Japaneseness*. However, what I learned from the narrative of S was a realisation that *kendō* practice does not inevitably stimulate the desire for things Japanese.

3. *Kendō* as an Accidentally Japanese Practice and as a Form of Contacting Newness

While analysing the narrative of R.B. (senior practitioner with multiple ethnic backgrounds) and P.S. (senior practitioner with Polish-German background), I gradually became convinced that the occurrence of such accidents relates to another important theme with regard to *kendō* practitioners. *Kendō* practice is framed as *a choice* among other activities.

R.B., who grew up in Ballarat, was a senior practitioner. According to R.B., he was not interested in *kendō* when he began. Explaining his life story in relation to *kendō*, he indicated that practicing *kendō* happened accidentally. In high school, he was a tennis player without any martial arts background. After graduating university, he was looking for a substitute activity for tennis, specifically an activity he had not done before; he had ‘decided to explore something different’. One thing that came to his mind was chess, and he went to see a chess club in a community centre in Ballarat. The club looked fine to him, and he joined. During the chess club meeting, however, he saw that some people next door were wearing something odd. They were in Gary Oliver’s *kendō* club. Answering my question as to whether *kendō* practice enhanced his interest in Japan and its culture, he told me that he has not been particularly interested in things Japanese even after starting *kendō*, though he enjoyed what he learned through *kendō* and its community. Laughing at himself, R.B. told me that he had not cooked any Japanese food, even sushi, though he is a professional chef. Then he added that ‘it would be a

good idea to cook *sushi* someday!’ His curiosity about new things eventually led him to *kendō* practice; *kendō* for R.B. was a choice among other activities.

Through the fieldwork, I often heard practitioners describe this accidentally Japanese practice the way R.B. described it—as something different. Mostly those practitioners explain that *kendō* practice enables them to connect with something additional that supplements their daily lifestyles. For example, senior practitioner S.P. (senior practitioner/Chinese-Singaporean background) expressed his attitude toward *kendō*, indicating that he expects *kendō*, as something new, to improve his physical well-being. S.P. told me that:

you know ... it looked cool ... and something that is new ... That’s kind of ingrained in my mind ... and I did not do *kendō* until the year 2000 ... I was looking for something ... too much work and too much television is not making me healthy ... I need something routinised ... yea it’s a routine to keep me healthy. I’m not disciplined, I can’t go to the gym myself to do weight-training, I’m not motivated to wake up at 6 o’clock in the morning to go for jog ... so you know, (something) along the line of martial arts seems to be all-right ... it’s a great sports and good exercise definitely ... more recently I’m beginning to recognise that it’s a self-improvement discipline.

S.P., who practises *kendō* for *exercise*, recognises the art as something that can replace jogging or weight-training.

In the case of practitioner P too, something different was mentioned to explain his reason for continuing *kendō* practice, and his case further suggests that something relates to his curiosity that extended beyond the practice itself to the benefits and accessories that can be received through becoming involved in the community. According to P, he is a very sporty person, and before he started *kendō*, P had played some other sports including squash and tennis and he first looked at taking up fencing rather than *kendō*. *Kendō* was introduced to him by his sister's friend at just the time he was looking for other activities in addition to fencing. The first time he visited *Kenshikan dōjō*, which he found through its website, his first impression was 'I like it!' The unique outfits of *kendō*, such as its armour and other gear, also attracted him very much. P was a senior practitioner, and most of the time I was in the *dōjō*, he instructed beginners instead of participating himself in training. He booked a restaurant for lunch at the China Town to promote friendship between beginners and seniors, and he planned other fun activities outside the *dōjō*. At first, he did not know anything about *kendō*, and he told me that he was not specifically interested in Japanese culture despite the number of years he spent practicing the art. His first impression of 'I like it!' turned into a love of organising the *kendō* community. As some of other practitioners told me, P committed his private time to maintaining the *kendō* community rather than practicing *kendō*.

When I had a conversation with P.S., I found that his accidental choice of *kendō*

practice is more complicated than other practitioners, and rather reflects his personal stance regarding Australian society. Similarly P.S. selected *kendō* practice among the many other activities and practices which are available in Australia, and in his case *kendō* practice was *picked up* because it formed part of his decision to be *different* from other Australians. P.S. is one of the *kendō* masters at *Kenshikan dōjō*, practicing the art over thirty years. He has a Polish-German background and runs his own real estate company. When I asked P.S. how he came to take up Japanese martial arts, he told me that, in his childhood, he ‘wanted to do something’ but was ‘never interested in football⁷⁰, cricket’ or in the sorts of things ‘which is normally what school boys could do’ in Australia. He commented: ‘I was always trying to do “something different” without realising it’. When in primary school, he had a Japanese friend who introduced him to aspects of Japanese martial art culture such as *jūdō*. P.S. then started exploring different Japanese martial arts including *karate*, *kyūdō*, and *kendō*. Responding to my question, ‘why did you pick up Japanese martial arts from among other martial arts?’ he offered this story:

When I think [of the reason] it’s really hard to explain ... I picked up martial arts when I was in school as a young boy or whatever ... well ... the reason probably was, like, everybody else picked up some forms of activities of fighting. It’s because that’s the sort of thing young boys do ... you know ... so you pick up boxing, you pick up whatever ... and I picked up martial arts. There was a lot of influence to do martial arts

like *karate* and *aikido* ... and I just thought ... through a friend, 'Oh yea I'll go and do *karate*!'

According to his narrative, it indicates that, as 'a young boy', P.S. was interested in fighting activities, and he was looking for something not normal⁷¹ compared to what the other boys did. Although P.S. casually mentioned his interest in Japanese martial arts in relation to his preference for not normal activities, his long-term involvement in Japanese martial arts suggests his strong intention to be a minority in this regard. According to practitioner S.F., who had joined our conversation, at that time in Melbourne, Asian martial arts including Japanese martial arts were not as popular as they are today. There were only a few martial arts practices and venues available. People like P.S. who were interested in Japanese martial arts and actually practised them were very unusual. As P.S. told me, to get involved in a Japanese martial arts' community instead of football (AFL) or cricket was 'a choice' that was different from the normal in Australian mainstream society. P.S. still does not take interest in the normal activities. He insists to me that he does not even watch those Australian sports. He has somehow distanced himself from what he thinks is the mainstream.

Remember P.S.'s attitude to the Olympics in Chapter One. He had a negative opinion of *judō*, which has become an Olympic event. P.S. asserted that *judō* as an Olympic game is now a 'sport' that has lost, borrowing S's word, 'depth'. P.S. is not interested in the sport aspect of the art. As he recognises AFL as the sport of 'normal Australians', *judō*, also recognised by him as a sport, is thus categorised as a normal

activity in Australia. In contrast to these sports, he finally picked up *kendō*. Although the distinctiveness of *kendō*, according to his previous narrative, is its philosophical teaching of a well-being that is not ‘ego-based’, his expression about ‘always trying to do something different’ in comparison with normal activities in Australia indicates that he is also attracted by the unusualness of *kendō* practice in Australia.

As discussed in this section, a practitioner attitude towards *kendō* practice does not necessarily indicate his curiosity towards *kendō* as a culture of the Other. P.S. pursued *kendō* practice to satisfy his desire to do something different or *not normal*, while R.B. and S.P. practised *kendō* in order to either provide a fulfilling a private activity or to maintain a healthy lifestyle. In the case of P, *kendō* was not merely a substitute sport to keep a healthy body and not merely a *Japanese* martial art; it provided something to satisfy his feeling of “I like it!” and for having fun with fellow practitioners. For all these cases above, one can say that *kendō* culture is adopted by some practitioners to add some *spice* to their daily lives. In other words, it is a choice made at an individual level about what to do to make a life fun and worthwhile.

4. Familiarity to Things Japanese and Their Childhood Memories

While I was interested in hearing practitioners’ interest in the newness that *kendō* offered to them, I also found diverse voices among other practitioners. For practitioners such as R (junior practitioner/English background) and S.F. (senior practitioner/Irish

background), the encounter with things Japanese was sometimes described as both a familiar entertainment and something sensational. As seen in their narratives below, this encounter with the sensational evokes good/happy memories of their childhood, and constructs their sense of being familiar with things Japanese including *kendō*. In this section, I examine the way the encounter with newness becomes a familiar part of practitioners' lives by referring to the Australian teen culture that they experienced during their own teenage years.

It was a very hot afternoon and we had just finished a tournament when someone started a conversation on this topic. The tournament was a local championship organised by a *kendō dōjō* in Berwick, and we had gone to have lunch at a pub in Berwick to celebrate our win. There were about 10 of us and we sat around a big table, chatting idly. Some were just standing with a cold glass of beer. As I was talking with a few members about how hot it was at the venue, I noticed that some other members just behind me had begun talking about Japanese classic films.

Practitioner R was talking to other practitioners about some DVDs he had lent to another member. I turned around and joined in their conversation. R began talking about *The Samurai*, the Japanese TV drama series about which we had been talking since the previous Wednesday when an episode was aired on *SBS*. *The Samurai* was first broadcast on Channel Nine in 1964. It was the first Japanese TV program ever shown in Australia and it aired until the late 1970s. The documentary showed how influential *The Samurai* had been for Australian teenagers at that time, to the point where school teachers banned students from bringing *Samurai*-themed items to their schools.

Along with his reasons for loving things Japanese (including the practice of *kendō*), R started to talk about his memories of *The Samurai*. Expressing how sensational the drama was, R recalled his early childhood. When he first watched the drama as a teenager, he did not know anything about Japan. It was the first time he had seen samurai, and the show was described as something sensational and something different, the likes of which had never been seen before. After watching it, he became fascinated by the battle between a samurai hero and a group of ninja. He especially enjoyed scenes of ninja jumping around a field in mysterious costumes. Practitioner S.F., who joined our conversation, too expressed his interest in Japanese culture through reflecting upon his experiences in his childhood, mentioning with particular enthusiasm some of the events that he had seen in the TV series (the battle scene between the samurai hero and the ninja, the ninja techniques of throwing shuriken, walking on water and jumping backwards up a tree). According to S.F., before *The Samurai*, there were only cowboy shows and Disney-style animations for teenagers to watch. Australian teens, said practitioner S.F., gradually became fed up with these shows—and then *The Samurai* suddenly appeared. In our conversation, they emphasised that, for Australian middle-aged people like them, *The Samurai* was very new and different from what they would usually watch, while at the same time it gave them an opportunity to interact with things related to Japan in their daily life. As for practitioner R and S.F., the series was the first encounter with Japanese things that they, along with many Australian children of the time, had seen, and the conversation with R and S.F. indicates that for some *kendō* practitioners the attraction to *kendō* practice deeply related to the culture of

predominantly male teenagers at that time in Australia.

According to the *SBS* documentary, the drama series was popular mostly among teenagers and pre-teen children, i.e. those who were born around the time of the baby boom (1946-1965)⁷² in Australia. School grounds became fighting fields for small samurai and ninja throwing at each other handmade star knives (*shuriken*) made of cardboard and jam jar lids. They also wore samurai pyjamas, wielded plastic samurai swords and collected the samurai cards that were sold at stores. Here, I introduce some comments from the documentary's audience, which will help us understand how *The Samurai* was received in the larger context of Australian society. These were posted on the *SBS* website after the documentary was broadcast.

05 Nov 2009 | 15:25 AEST

Paul: Canberra

Shintaro

Domo arigato! for making this and showing it. When I was a youngster, while most of the other kids played footy on the oval, my chums and I scurried through trees and around buildings, flicking foil milk bottle tops, slashing away with rulers, performing exaggerated acrobatics with the odd bit of ninja vogue. Pine trees were for jumping into backwards. Bridges were for hiding in ambush under. Handkerchiefs and balaclavas got a thorough work out. My only regrets about this doco are that: it didn't play the intro theme, some of

the voices seemed too dubbed? and alas I am no longer 10. But well done and once again thanks for the memories.

05 Nov 2009 | 09:51 AEST

Matthew: Coffs Harbour

I couldn't stop smiling

This brought back so many good memories - jumping around the backyard - swapping cards with school friends - going to see Shintaro at the Sydney stadium. The documentary had the right balance between being heartfelt and taking the piss: I felt it captured the whole thing so well. I sat and watched with my wife (a big Shintaro fan) and my 13 and 11yo boys - who now have an insight into what turned their dad on when he was a kid. What a joy! What a delight!

Agree (8 people agree)

Disagree (0 people disagree)

06 Nov 2009 | 11:18 AEST

Big Pete: Brisbane

Shintaro

A great documentary which bought back loads of memories as a kid in the 60s. I remember jumping off the shed roof and almost breaking my leg trying to be a Ninja. For more Samurai fun check out some of the

Baby Cart movies, it's a sort of Shintaro for grown-ups. SBS

sometimes has them on late at night. They're well worth a watch.

Agree (1 people agree)

Disagree (0 people disagree)

For some children at that time (including practitioner R and S.F.), the TV series was enjoyed and accepted as an inspiration for play on the school grounds. Although they clearly differentiate it from the things they usually saw and knew, such sensational newness that fascinated them was interwoven into their daily activities.

Dismayed by the fighting, however, some schools blamed *Channel Nine* and sent letters requesting them to stop showing the drama. The documentary showed an interview with one such school headmaster recalling scenes where students at his school had pretended to be samurai and were ninja fighting each other. Despite criticism from schools, the popularity of *The Samurai* only increased. In December 1965, a promoter brought the leading actor of *The Samurai*, Ose Koichi, and his troupe from Japan to Australia. Performances by Ose Koichi were held for 15 days both at Sydney Stadium and Melbourne Festival Hall. According to the *SBS* documentary, these events were very well attended; indeed, more people turned out to greet them at Essendon airport than had welcomed The Beatles when they visited in 1964.

05 Nov 2009 | 19:06 AEST

Michael :Wollongong

Lost and Found

I watched The Samurai in its weekday screenings while in Primary School in the mid to late Sixties, it was so different to everything else on offer from Rin Tin Tin to Wyatt Earp and F Troop to My Favourite Martian. I loved the show then forgot it. Until last night and then it all came flooding back. A world so different to mine, suburban Sixties Wollongong, that it made my headspin and changed my mind. I grew up into an adult that loves and embraces difference, the differences in people and the world and that is because of Shintaro and The Samurai. Thank you SBS for reminding me.

Agree (3 people agree)

Disagree (0 people disagree)

04 Nov 2009 | 23:49 AEST

Mike: Canberra

Shintaro

Loved the show. Brought back heaps of memories. Our family went to Essendon Airport to see Shintaro arrive and we weren't disappointed. My brothers and I used to "duplicate" the scenes as we watched in the loungeroom. We would position lounge chairs in the corners of the room and jump up onto them pretending to be Ninjas. When we were Shintaro, we knew the exact sword moves and would

slice up the bad guys and stand still with the sword held out and wait for the bad guys to drop. I am pretty sure that we all believed that Ninjas could do the backwards jumping into trees. The martial arts taught those skills, but in our suburb there was only Judo. I could never figure out why the Japanese didn't win the Olympic High Jump. For the guy that has Shintaro's wig—hang on to it, it is priceless. I believe it should eventually reside in the Museum of Australia. It is every bit Australian as Ned Kelly's helmet or Phar Lap's heart. Finally I really envy the people you had on the show. They have been able to turn childhood experiences into hobbies and careers. And wasn't Shintaro a really nice bloke?

Agree (8 people agree)

Disagree (0 people disagree)

The drama's samurai hero, Shintaro, became an icon as familiar as Australian national hero Ned Kelly and famous racehorse Phar Lap. As Mike from Canberra says: 'I believe it should eventually reside in the Museum of Australia', while Michael from Wollongong clearly observes its 'difference' from the things surrounding his local environment. The sensational drama was deified as a symbol representing *their time* as children and teenagers. Although some of the comments ('every bit as Australian') imply an Australian nationalism that praises *multicultural Australia*, here I instead focus on the feeling invoked by the commenter who wanted to live inside *The Samurai*. *The*

Samurai appears as a force for good in the memory of all middle-aged Australians who grew up with the TV series. Another comment (below) further links things Japanese with Australians, indicating that *The Samurai* was firmly a part of their childhood's popular culture.

04 Nov 2009 | 21:49 AEST

Angela: Canberra

Shintaro

Thanks for this fantastic doco. My husband and I were huge Samurai fans, right into the 70's. We even got our kids to watch it. Some of my 6 brothers, former little Ninjas all, watched it. My dad who went to the stadium with them when they all got lost with thousand of other kids in their home made happy coats and ninja head gear, or old waste paper baskets watched it ! It made a rarely expressed and important point about the influence of popular culture on general acculturation of Australia. It brought back wonderful memories of me, my brothers and my sister and even mum—who thought it was a fascinating show, which she tells me helped get her head around the 'jap' thing—all sitting around in the afternoon just having a good time. One of my brothers is now married to a Japanese girl. She thought it was really interesting that we all had this early fascination with her culture. But the thrill was universal. So I hope I can get a

copy or replay of this doco and send it to my brother in Japan.

Agree (3 people agree)

Disagree (0 people disagree)

For Angela from Canberra, *The Samurai* was a fascinating show in terms of its role in processes of ‘acculturation’. Describing this contact of acculturation as a ‘universal thrill’, she recognised the contact with things Japanese as a process of making Australian popular culture.

As such, *The Samurai* was recognised as something sensational while at the same time it became an important part of many Australians’ childhood memories. Practitioner R’s and S.F.’s narratives, both of which highlighted the newness of the drama, make it clear that, in this instance, Japanese culture was consumed as a thrilling entertainment while at the same time it is important to point out that *The Samurai*’s sensational quality was also consumed as part of ordinary child play which is experienced in their school grounds and in the backyards of their houses. Analysing the practitioners’ love of *kendō* practice, which came from their early experiences, *kendō* for some practitioners like R and S.F. is part of a continual process of playing with things Japanese, which began in their childhoods. The practitioners’ sentiments are supported as well by comments online (SBS) that were posted after the airing of *The Samurai*. From these comments it becomes clear that mentioned of *The Samurai* gives some Australian middle-aged people (including R and S.F.) a feeling of familiarity towards things Japanese while at the same time representing the Japanese as very foreign and sensational. In other words,

Australian teenage culture nourished practitioners' interest in the art and its community.

5. The Third Meaning, Global Culture, and *Kendō* Practitioners

One might question, however, what is the difference between Orientalists and *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne. Both interact with a non-Western culture, and they both enjoy *difference*. As I have discussed in Chapter Two, the Oriental Other has been conceived as separate from the Western Self, labelling the Other as pre-modern, exotic, inferior, and abnormal, and as a subject to be exhibited and observed at museums or in an anatomy lab. The non-Western Other has been deprived of *coevalness* and has been relegated to be observed within an Orientalist repository (Fabian 1983: 30-31, 143; Breckenridge 1989: 199). What those Orientalists enjoyed was the difference of non-coevalness through the process of labelling.

However, *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne do not consider *kendō* a cultural aspect of the Other that is merely meant to be labelled. Each *kendō* practitioner pursues his or her personal curiosity. Some enjoy the practice because they seek a real feeling of combativeness, and some others are involved in *kendō* because they seek a different life style. Their encounters with the art often come by accident, and *Japaneseness* which is so much part of the tradition of Oriental discourse is not inevitably a driving force for them in choosing to participate in this practice of the Other. It is also important to point out the way *kendō* practice for practitioners like R and S.F. is interwoven into childhood

memories, thus constructing oneself as a complete *kendō* practitioner.

Although each *kendō* practitioner interprets the practice differently, they commonly express *kendō* as something new. The practitioners' interpretation of something new indicates that they do not have a fixed meaning for *kendō* practice which is collectively shared among the *kendō* practitioners, but the practitioners only shared the recognition of this practice of the Other as something. Borrowing words from Roland Barthes, something new can be interpreted as the 'third meaning' that is not grasped by the system of meaning. Compared with the 'obvious meaning' that 'comes ahead...to seek me out', Barthes explains that the third, or obtuse, meaning is blurry and uncertain (Barthes 1977: 54, 61). Thus, one's reading is left suspended, and he/she slips away from the inside, an inside that captures one within the semantic determination of the struggle (ibid: 55, 64). In other words, the third meaning implies a struggle in how the interpreters term the thing in front of them. There is no fixed labelling of the Other:

the obtuse meaning appears to extend outside culture, knowledge, information; analytically, it has something derisory about it: opening out into the infinity of language, it can come through as limited in the eyes of analytic reason; it belongs to the family of pun, buffoonery, useless expenditure (Barthes 1977: 55).

In contrast to representations in Orientalist repositories wherein Orientalists perceive the Oriental Other with terms determined by cultural apparatuses which

produce the common knowledge of the Other (such as museums, literature, and taxonomy and anatomy), *kendō* practitioners' something new is flexible and individual. They do not necessarily label the Other, and what they imagine is the present of their being with the practice of the Other. The incorporation of a small aspect of an *Other* culture—something—by *kendō* practitioners without their fixing a full understanding of the cultural, historical, and environmental background implies that this incorporation is done without a holistic understanding of the culture or a desire to observe the Other. By involving themselves in the *kendō* practice and its community, practitioners recognise *kendō* as a thing to *add* to their everyday life. The practitioners structure their everyday life by appropriating a new phenomenon as an entertainment to make their life enjoyable.

In his work on cosmopolitanism, Ulf Hannerz describes cosmopolitan involvement with the Other as newness, and he suggests that cosmopolitans must engage with other cultures and Others through the way they reflect their own self-ness, absorbing a variety of elements from the other culture and then giving the elements meanings which are comfortable to the Self (Hannerz 1996:103). Hannerz defines cosmopolitanism as making 'one's way into other cultures ... a built-up skill in maneuvering more or less expertly with a particular system of meanings' (ibid:103). Thus, one of the distinctive characteristics of cosmopolitanism is an involvement (or an interest) in the Other and creations of meaning among newly confronted alien cultures. For Hannerz, cosmopolitanism is also a matter of selectivity. In the course of contact with the Other and other cultures, people adopt new cultural elements into themselves. In this process,

each individual, based on his or her personal perspective, chooses what to take in and what not to take into a personal repertoire. Since such adoption of alien cultures is encouraged by one's free choice, this selectivity implies 'personal autonomy' where the individual can make the decision regarding what cultural elements they want to carry or do not want to carry (ibid: 104).

By drawing on Hannerz' discussion, I am not trying to label all *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne as cosmopolitans, but would suggest that Hannerz's analysis can be a model to analyse the ways in which people approach cultural newness. Applying Hannerz's concept to the issue of representations, it can be suggested that a sense of newness among *kendō* practitioners is a process of selecting cultural elements they want to carry, and is indicative that they have a curiosity towards a new phenomenon without fully systematising a meaning of the Other. A sense of newness is derived from individual approaches to new encounters and experiences. In relation to the issue of stereotyping, categorising and labelling the Other, practitioners do not necessarily label *kendō* as a culture of the Other. By selecting what they like and what they do not like, practitioners recognise *kendō* as a thing to add to their everyday life. By subjectively becoming involved in the *kendō* practice and its community, practitioners incorporate *kendō* into their own cultural lives. In contrast to representations in Orientalist connoisseurship wherein Orientalists perceive the Oriental Other as something to separate from themselves in order to understand and justify colonisation, *kendō* practitioners do not necessarily lock the Japanese other into racial difference. Rather, they structure their everyday life by appropriating a new phenomenon as an activity to

make their life enjoyable and preferable, which means that a culture of the Other is experienced as an act of subjective creation by practitioners that is incorporated into the construction of their present lives. If *kendō* practitioners had an interest in practicing *kendō*, it is not an interest with objective eyes, but rather an interest for an everyday life that still has a sense of subjective involvement.

Furthermore, practitioners' flexible third meaning could also be considered in discussing the transnational flow of popular culture. As referred to in R's narratives on *The Samurai* TV series, things Japanese, including *kendō* practice, have enjoyed a place in Australian popular culture from its earliest memory. For practitioners like R, close contact with things Japanese is a key component of Australian middle-age identity, and establishes the solidarity of our generation among people who spent their childhood with *The Samurai*. The establishment of such solidarity with *kendō* practice also suggests the transnational flow of culture between Japan and Australia: the popularity of things Japanese in Australia shows an Oriental practice becoming a cosmopolitan culture, as well as contributing to a regional sense of we or Australian middle-age nationalism. As Martinez highlights by quoting Tobin globally exported cultures are often simultaneously domesticated by local concerns and homogenised by global concerns (Tobin 1992 quoted in Martinez 1998: 11). To avoid involvement in this global/local dichotomy, I suggest framing the cultural significance of *kendō* practitioners through a theory proposed by Condry. Condry suggests focusing on what he calls 'actual site', where the 'local language and key sites of performance' are produced and sees actual site as a passage for globalised cultures to build local networks

and to expand from one network to another (Condry 2001: 372; Condry 2009: 351). Although we have to be cautious that *kendō* practice in Melbourne might be homogenised by the unifying concept of our generation, *kendō* practice in Melbourne highlights an actual site of third meaning, where each practitioner creates a new sense of this martial art and expands its meaning from one practitioner to another.

In the following chapter, I turn my attention to a different topic that emerged during my fieldwork. In contrast to an Orientalist discourse that focuses on authentic otherness, I point out that *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne often practise the art in order to express an authentic self-ness.

Chapter Five: *Kendō* for the authentic Self but not for an authentic Otherness

One of the most popular places among *Kenshikan* members was a café called *Hot Poppy*. Locating on Errol Street in North Melbourne, the café is ten minutes walk from the *dōjō*. Almost every Sunday after the morning training, some of us would go to the café for drinks and lunch, sometimes sitting there for hours. Having lunch with them, I always took the opportunity to hold casual interviews. In particular, the café was a good place to talk to senior practitioners such as *sensei* P.S. and *sensei* Y. In the *dōjō*, it was sometimes difficult to catch these *sensei* who could be busy talking in the office or off limits in the male locker room.

For some senior practitioners, *Hot Poppy* functioned as an alternative place to talk about the upcoming schedule of *Kenshikan* and Victorian *Kendō* Renmei. By sitting beside the senior practitioners, some junior practitioners would learn the administrative aspects of the *dōjō*, while others would build friendships with other junior practitioners. Through this casual gathering, junior practitioners would gradually get involved in the community of *Kenshikan* with seniors practitioners⁷³, and the gatherings at the café provided them a sense of ‘I am a *Kenshikan* member’⁷⁴.

Community identity was also formed through participating in the competitions, and an awareness of *we* became most significant there. For example, in March 2010, the Australian *Kendō* Championship was held by the Australian *Kendō* Federation in Melbourne. The Australian *Kendō* Championship was held every year and it was the

biggest championship in Australia organised by the Australian *Kendō Renmei*⁷⁵. *Kendō* practitioners gathered from all around Australia to compete against each other.

Victoria was the team winner of the year, and individual awards were also given to each practitioner in the team. After the dinner party, Team Victoria went to a local pub to celebrate our win. At the pub, the practitioners were talking about the story of Victorian *kendō*. Inspired by the stories from the old *kendō* players at the party, some started talking about their own local story. The young members of Team Victoria, who were inspired by the old stories at the dinner party, sat down together with their glasses of beer and imagined how difficult the past practice was, sharing memories with the older generation and giving importance to the present day win. The process of passing on old memories showed not only that current Victorian *kendō* was built on narrated hardships of an earlier time, but also allowed for an historical continuity between the past and the present, giving to the younger generation a whole picture of how Australian *kendō* or Victorian *kendō* was established. Although I am not saying that all practitioners equally engage in the stories, it is also true to say that such story-telling gives a horizontal connection (a sense of collectivity) among those people. Indeed, at the pub the Victorian practitioners talked of the past members, saying ‘we’re so lucky’, ‘we’re proud of them’, ‘our commitment to training is nothing compared to them’, and ‘we need to develop Victorian *kendō* more’.

Such narratives of ‘we’ stood out to me since this was the first time I heard them during my fieldwork. Through participating in and observing this championship in which Melbourne practitioners uncharacteristically focused on the *we* in their stories, I

paradoxically became alerted to how they usually do not talk about a sense of *we*.

Rather, these practitioners were, in other contexts, more likely to speak about *kendō* as an individual practice, and some framed this in terms of an attention to the self. In this chapter, I focus on their attitude towards *kendō* in relation to their interest in themselves.

1. *Kendō* as a Practice for Self-Expressiveness

Readers might recall that a few of the members I have already introduced, such as P.S., L and S.P, are conscious of healthy and disciplined self-development through *kendō* practice. Interest in the self is commonly mentioned by many members of the *Kenshikan dōjō*. Here I examine this individuating consciousness of the self, by focusing on the narratives of practitioners, such as J.W. (senior practitioner/Anglo-Celtic Australian background), C.T. (junior practitioner/Thai background), R (junior practitioner/ English background) and K (junior practitioner/German-English background).

Practitioner J.W. was a young university student at Monash University majoring in archaeology. Having an Anglo-Celtic family background, he was interested in various martial art cultures. One day in our conversation, J.W. told me the reason he kept practicing *kendō*, and he explained that the *kendō* practice provides a space for ‘challenging the self’ in order to keep his body ‘fit’. According to him, *kendō* training is physically hard. In the summer, for example, one would fall on the floor with

dehydration if one did not maintain one's body. A careless mistake might also seriously injure someone. *Kendō* for him is a self-maintenance practice, and he said *kendō* is all about challenging how he controls his body and manages to deal with hardship. J.W. continued that he feels the real charm of the art is exploring his physical capacity as much as he can. In particular, he seems to be interested in the 'coordination' of the body, which he indicates makes his body balance well. As a *budō otakū* who practises other martial arts such as Brazilian *jiujitsu* at the same time, he sees martial arts in general as giving him perfect fitness and body maintenance:

I quite often notice people who are just starting are...not that coordinated or...you know. But as things go martial arts give you strength and balance...coordination you know. It gives you all these things. I believe it's up to how you train...anyone can sort of turn themselves round really if they fight themselves harder.... improvement kind of happens.

Such conversations with practitioners directed me to think about Melbourne practitioners' conscious on the self, and I gradually became aware that the practitioners practise *kendō* as a tool for supplementing *what they think they are missing out* and achieving *what they think they need*.

While the case of J.W. stimulated my attention to the concept of the self, this aspect of focussing on the self or the discourse of the self was further highlighted through

conversing with practitioner K. Practitioner K was a junior practitioner who grew up in Melbourne. Her family, traced back some generations, came originally from Germany and the U.K before migrating to Australia. In 2010, she finished a Masters course in creative writing at RMIT University. K, who was an amateur wrestler before starting *kendō*, was a very serious practitioner who came to regular training (three times a week) and special training for women (once a month). Her deep commitment to *kendō* was well known to the members of various *dōjō*. However, in common with the other practitioners who I introduced in the previous chapter, K did not often speak about Japan and its culture. Then I asked myself ‘what attracts K to *kendō* practice?’ One day before training started, K and I were in the changing room. We spoke casually about the reason why she loves practising *kendō*. K explained to me that *kendō* gives her space to ‘express’ herself intensively. According to K, in normal life it is hard to get a chance to feel ‘intensity’ which she believes that she originally has in herself by nature. K also told me that *kendō* makes her focus on herself, and the practice allows her to forget about everyday things. Practitioner R, a good friend of K, describes K’s desire for ‘intensity’ as ‘wild’ and ‘scary’ while sparring. R says that:

She is a *kendō* person. When they had a thing at Footscray [a competition], she was so wild. And [on other occasion] she found out there is a women’s special training and she cracked it ! You can see her...and suddenly she said ‘I wanna fuck’em! I wanna fuck’em!’ She has got one hell of a killer instinct...scary...she got a very very

good spirit!

Analysing K's deep attachment to expressing her intensity together with her focus on herself, *kendō* practice for her is interpreted as a place that gives her a moment of being a self: the self which is normally restricted from expressing its hidden emotions because of pressures to follow social norms. Additionally, in K's case (similarly seen in practitioners' narratives in the previous chapter), *Japaneseness* is not inevitably the core element that she seeks in *kendō* practice. In other words, for some *kendō* practitioners like K, the origin of *kendō* is not important. What is important is that *kendō* helps expose her unknown self that cannot be experienced in her daily life.

Among the practitioners above, practitioner R, who is a 4th generation British-Australian, is one who recognises *kendō* as a practice of focusing on the self in relation to its communal interaction. R is a junior practitioner who started *kendō* three years ago. During my fieldwork, R often explained to me how much he loves to practise *kendō* at *Kenshikan dōjō* by comparing it to other martial arts' communities. R has a son who practises *taekwondō*, and R found out from his son how a *taekwondō dōjō* is normally organised. R told me he is worried about being exploited by martial art instructors' commercial interests and asserts the importance of 'enjoyment' in practising martial arts. For him, martial arts should be a pure form of self-relaxed activity without having any pressure from others. According to R, what he could not accept was the system in which *taekwondō* instructors gain money from their students⁷⁶. He told me that *taekwondō* instructors make money out of sending their own students to grading,

and thus can buy luxurious cars and the like. If a student doesn't want to grade, R remarked, the instructors force them to take a grading. Though someone pointed out that this is because the *dōjō* is a private one, R kept saying that it is very sad that students cannot just enjoy their martial arts, and he regretted that such interaction with instructors is just the same as what he experienced in his busy daily life.

In Australia it is true that most *kendō dōjō* are run on a non-profit principle. In the case of *Kenshikan dōjō*, although fundraising events are sometimes held for the maintenance of the *dōjō*, instructors (*sensei*) do not get paid but train students voluntarily. In particular, R looked most amazed at the disciplined *sensei* who voluntarily committed to the *kendō* community in Melbourne over a long period. According to him, the *sensei* he met at the *Kenshikan dōjō* sacrificed private time and activities to develop *kendō* culture in Australia. R said that this would not be possible without disciplining the self. Insisting that he is interested in this self-discipline aspect of the *kendō* community and its volunteerism, R asserts that *kendō* practice gives him an opportunity to experience interaction with others without calculation: the interaction which he believes he does not get access to in his daily life.

R further explored his idea about interaction with others, namely that one who disciplines himself/herself well will be accepted by the other members. According to R, what he found unique in *kendō* practice is that the community members accepted each other through reciprocal interaction. After several years of long-term commitment to the *kendō* community, said R, one could become fully accepted by other members, such as senior practitioners, and would consequently be expected to 'sit on the big boy's table'

with the seniors. He then added that acceptance is built through serving fellow members. R worked hard to be accepted by the other members, and he committed to the *Kenshikan* community with renovation and repair work in the *dōjō*, supporting members with administrative jobs and participating in activities other than training. According to R, such acceptance does not depend on one's ability to perform the art well or one's occupation, one's educational background, or one's family background, but rather on how much and how long one 'commits to the community'. This is the moment, R explained, when a martial artist would experience his personal development and notice recognition from others. For practitioner R, *kendō* practice was part of achieving a disciplinary self, for receiving acceptance from others in the community. *Kendō* made a space for him to be accepted without pre-supposing who he was, where he came from, and what he did elsewhere.

Although their interests and preferences in *kendō* varied, there was a similar attitude towards *kendō* practice displayed amongst these practitioners: Melbourne practitioners practised *kendō* to cultivate the self in order to achieve *what they want to be*.

2. Authentic Individuality and *Kendō* Practice as a Retreat from Everyday Life

The tendency towards cultivating the self, however, is not a unique phenomenon seen only among Melbourne *kendō* practitioners. Similar cases exist around the world in which non-Western practices have become popular as practices to focus on the 'self'.

For example, Sarah Strauss conducted fieldwork in India, Europe, and other parts of the world. She argues that the worldwide interest in yoga, as a practice to develop ‘self-management’, manifests in people who are concerned with physical and mental wellness. Her analysis, based on her interviews with yoga practitioners from Germany, America, and India, reveals a belief that ‘the authentic Self’⁷⁷ is ‘healthy’ (Strauss 2005: 59) and that ‘[t]o be healthy means to be balanced, to have equal parts of physical, mental, spiritual, and social well-being’ (ibid: 71).

Without health, one lacks the basic equipment required for self-reliance; one can not make choices independent of the desires and abilities of others ... self-control is highly valued, since regulation of one’s own condition at every level—the avoidance of excess, the pursuit of moderation—is seen as conducive to achieving a good (that is, modern, independent, health, free) life (ibid: 71).

Through seeking a healthy self, Strauss’s yoga practitioners work hard on ‘a sense of continual self-making’ (ibid: 59), and her study suggests that, like *kendō* practitioners J.W., R and K, yoga practitioners are trying to discipline self, manage self, cultivate self and balance daily busy life.

Focusing on the New Age concepts of self-responsibility and conscious living in relation to yoga practitioners, Strauss further explains that the quest of Western health tourists to India is ‘not for authentic others, but for an authentic Self—a self which is at

ease, relaxed, able to express itself without being buffeted about by external pressures' (ibid: 58). Indeed, Western yoga practitioners show an interest in partly adapting yoga practice from India. Strauss points out that Western yoga practitioners coming to learn yoga in India do not learn the whole set of yoga practices which 'traditional yoga practice would require' (ibid: 58). Rather, their primary purpose is to 'develop a personal (and generally eclectic) routine of yoga practice that they could continue when they returned home' and 'to have the opportunity to learn yoga without the distractions of their everyday hectic lives' (ibid: 58).

Authenticity in this new kind of Self refers to an ongoing process of managing the various aspects of everyday life, from the most physical to the most philosophical, and trying to bring them into a dynamic balance (ibid:59).

Strauss's research shows that yoga practice in the contemporary globalised world has been removed from a particular historical place and time, and is reproduced by developing the original practice in various ways according to each practitioner's *everyday* needs. As such, each practitioner aims to manage themselves both physically and mentally.

Similarly, the *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne are like yoga practitioners in discovering and continuing *kendō* as a search for a personal cultivation that is sometimes disturbed by the demands of everyday life, and the practice enables them to

satisfy their individual needs. Their interest is in how they can improve, express, challenge, and discipline the self. Their focus is thus, as Strauss points out, on the self but not on otherness. In the case of K and R, these practitioners assumed that there is an ideal image of the self that they had not achieved - they had not embodied the image they wished for for themselves. *Something is missing out*. In other words, they practise *kendō* and are involved in its community as (to borrow Strauss' words) an 'ongoing process of managing the various aspects of everyday life' to seek the 'sense of being themselves' which is well-coordinated, well-expressed and well-accepted or to seek an 'authentic' individuality (ibid: 59).

In the case of Melbourne practitioners, however, I would emphasise a significant difference from Strauss' yoga practitioners. *Kendō* practice for practitioners positions them within a space that gives them some distance from everyday routine: *kendō* makes it possible to physically *retreat* from the place to which they usually belong for a short time. For example, practitioner, C.T., asserted that *kendō* practice gave her 'a release' from her stressful daily life. C.T. was a junior practitioner with a Thai background. During my research she was a PhD student at The University in Melbourne. I often heard C.T. say that she needed something for a 'break' that would provide an alternative time and space away from busy daily life. Another female practitioner Y.Y. asked why C.T. picked up *kendō*.

C.T.:I came to observe a class, and I thought yea ... it was pretty inspiring, and just joined the beginners class ... Just curious ... yea ...

Y.Y.: But why?

C.T.: I prefer *kendō*. It's very intense. Particularly cause before the last year I was more a musician ... I was playing piano ... so this is like an alternative release for me to de-stress.

According to C.T., after she moved out from her student college, she did not have access to the piano. Playing piano was her way to de-stress. Instead of piano, she has found *kendō* practice as an alternative time and space and way to have a break. Her expression 'alternative release' suggest that *kendō* practice for her is a part of self-management while the expression 'need a break' indicates her preference to temporarily distance herself from everyday busy life.

Such attitude of separating *kendō* practice from dailyness is seen much clearer in the narrative of practitioner K. For example, in the case of K, *kendō* practice and her involvement in the community seems to be recognised as a 'secret' practice. When I asked her about how she would feel if *kendō* became more popularised in the Western world, she answered with the following example from her family. According to K, 'normal' people, like her family members, who were born in and grew up in Australian mainstream culture, 'cannot understand what we do'. That is why she disagreed with those who wished to make *kendō* practice more popular, for example by making it an Olympic sport. At the end of our conversation, she added that '*kendō* has to be mystical!'. By this she does not mean that she is interested in an *esoteric* Eastern practice since her focus is to express herself; an objective for her to practise *kendō* is not

to learn Eastern, or Japanese, traditions. I would suggest that the secret-ness that she looks for relates to her positioning within society. Family, in this case, represents the mainstream society to K, and what is important to her is that *kendō* is hidden from it. In the case of practitioner K, *kendō* functions as a method of retreat from hectic everyday life as practitioner P.S. (in the previous chapter) similarly recognises the *dōjō* as a space for him to experience difference while distancing him from everyday life. Recall that *kendō* for P.S. was a way to be distanced from *normal Australian activities*. He was looking for an unusual thing to do and decided to get involved in this minority activity. His later interest in the healthy lifestyle of Zen also indicates that he is conscious about his way of being himself.

In the case of practitioner R, too, the *dōjō* provided him with a place to achieve self-development, separated from his everyday life. When R was asked by his son to practise *kendō* with him, he decided to join the *kenshikan* as part of his weekend family activity. Now he enjoys the friendship aspect of *kendō* practice. Even after his son stopped practicing the art, R stayed involved in the community. One reason for this is, he asserts, that achieving the acceptance of others at the *dōjō* gives him a space to establish an alternative network he could not have had in his everyday life.

In our *kendō* community, people are of various ethnic backgrounds and occupations; for example, a scientist at The university of Melbourne (Taiwanese background), an owner of estate agency (Polish-German background), a researcher who teaches architecture at RMIT University (German background), businessman for a big global enterprise (Japanese-Irish background), an IT professional (Egyptian background), an

engineer for the Australian Air Force (Taiwanese background) and an accountant (Irish background). R works as a storage man in a branch of an Australian supermarket, *IGA*. He feels that his job and his educational background are ranked low in Australian society and it is hard for a person like him to get to know others. According to him, the *kendō* community gives him a chance to break down social barriers.

What practitioner R tries to do is re-structure an alternative positioning he cannot establish in everyday life. He develops a self to achieve his goal of ‘sitting at the big boy’s table’. What he means by ‘developing self’ is exploring his potential in a different environment from that of his daily routine. For him, acceptance from the *kendō* community means having an alternative space for a sense of belonging. In other words, he uses the system of *kendō* to discover another self, and what he enjoys is a relaxing space that cannot be interrupted by everydayness. R enjoys being involved in the *kendō* community, which accepts him ‘just as a *kendō* player’ (or as described earlier ‘just as he is’), and he also enjoys being involved in the communal building of *kendō* practice. As described in the narrative of R, the *kendō* community gives him ‘a chance to break down social barriers’, and establish good friendships with a diverse community of people.

For these practitioners, the everyday routinised practice of maintaining self-management and self-release from their hectic daily lives is an important reason to keep practicing *kendō*. At the same time, I would emphasise that possessing a separate physical space for retreat is a necessary part of *kendō* practice. The attention that *kendō* practitioners pay to alternative spaces is not described in the yoga case as presented by

Strauss who has argued that, for Western yoga practitioners, the practice is to ‘develop a personal (and generally eclectic) routine of yoga practice that they could continue when they returned home’ (Strauss 2005: 58). Strauss explains that yoga practitioners try to ‘develop a discipline that they could take home with them, a strategy that would help them get through their stressful work weeks in a less frenetic way’ (ibid: 58). Even though Strauss briefly mentions that the ‘practice of yoga was a way to create a separate space, both temporally and emotionally, but not geographically’, her focus is on yoga practice as an everyday routine (ibid: 58).

Strauss’s perspective, which situates non-Western practice within a framework of Western daily life, is shared by some other researchers. For example, Cristina Rocha analyses the practice of Zen Buddhism in Brazil. She claims that the growing popularity of non-Western practices such as Zen is practised as a ‘social trend’ representing practitioners’ everydayness, and she found that there is an influence from the New Age movement and counter-culture (Rocha 2006: 114). According to Rocha, Zen practice that has spread across the world has to be understood as ‘modern Buddhism’⁷⁸. Modern Buddhism in Brazil is formed in the contact of Asian and Western middle-class elites (ibid: 114-115), becoming a fashion for people who seek a comfortable life in metropolises (ibid: 195). In the contemporary world, people love spaces like the Helmut Lang shop in New York that is decorated by a famous Finnish designer in a Tibetan Buddhist style; they recognise it as ‘pop’ and ‘fashionable’ (ibid: 143). As such, Rocha suggests that having an understanding of modern Buddhism means being ‘trendy’ and that gives one a certain social status (ibid: 143).

Furthermore Rocha describes the modernisation of Zen as it has become integrated within the daily life of Brazilian Zen practitioners. Rocha discusses interviews, collected in her fieldwork in Brazil, with people who practise modern Buddhism. The practitioners are interested in reflecting on what they experience in their daily life. They are interested in observing their inner selves through meditation. For them, Zen practice is different from other religious practices that separate them from daily life. Zen practice in Brazil is a daily practice of self-reflection that the practitioners can practise whenever and wherever they want. Below is a practitioner's narrative from Rocha's fieldwork.

What called my attention to Zen was mainly its simplicity. Zen is very much this *experience of meditation*, it's to *practice* and *observe* what happens in your daily life. Zen does not make this separation, as the majority of other religions do, between the religious place, where you practice (the temple, the church), and your normal, daily life. Zen puts these two things together. The practice is not only when you do *zazen*, but it is also something you'll practice in your daily life (ibid: 114-115).

Analysing the magazine *Casa Vogue* (1997), a Brazilian version of *Vogue Living*, Rocha further explores how modern Buddhism has become involved in everyday fashion as a popular practice among metropolitans. In *Casa Vogue*, twelve famous Brazilian professionals (including architects and interior decorators) were invited to

share their ideas of living fashionably through Buddhism (ibid: 127). Their definition of what Buddhism means as regards the fashionable life is expressed through the heading ‘Zen Style: More than a Decorating Style, It is a Life Style’. In other words, the magazine presents not only how to decorate one’s room with Buddhist items but also shows that *Zen* is a lifestyle with which to coordinate one’s everyday living.⁷⁹ Practicing Zen is a matter of life style in which practitioners control their hectic daily life in the same way as Strauss’s yoga practitioners. For such practitioners, practice has to take place in daily life, and practices such as Zen and yoga that were originally non-Western are no longer an exotic experience.

Two researchers’ (Strauss and Rocha) interpretations of non-Western practices within the framing of the ‘idea of the healthy self’ and ‘everydayness’ resonate with one another. Both reveal that non-Western practices become firmly integrated in individuals’ daily lifestyles and desires to seek a comfortable life in a metropolis and in trying to control and balance their everyday lives. However, for the case studies from my own work that I present here, *kendō* practitioners’ ideas vary somewhat from the cases presented for yoga and Zen. The narratives from K., R, J.W. and C.T. indicate that through their *kendō* practice they are trying to find things which cannot be achieved in daily life, and it is also true to say that they do not see *kendō* as a daily routine which is combined with everyday life. Rather, these *kendō* practitioners enjoy getting involved part-time in an activity that provides a space outside the mainstream society to which they belong.

3. Discussion on the authentic Self and authentic Otherness

Discovering the Melbourne practitioners' interest in gaining a sense of the self through *kendō* practice gave rise to one question. *What is the significant difference between the Melbourne practitioners' interest towards a practice of the Other and Orientalist interest towards things non-Western?* Both are similarly interested in things related to the Other, but one shows its interest as directed at oneself while the other shows its interest exclusively towards the Other. In order to examine the difference between the two, I will explore the concept of New Age philosophy, which relates to practitioners' interests in the self. Let me first provide a background for understanding what is meant by the New Age.

Concepts such as self-management and authentic Self, which Strauss found among yoga practitioners, are central to the narratives of New Agers (Strauss 2005:58, 109, 118-119, 133). New Age activities influenced by the non-West in which people search for an authentic-self or inner-self can be traced back to the work of the 19th Century Romantics (Heelas 1996:41-42). With Rousseau at the head of the list, the Romantics rejected orthodox religion, turning to Oriental esoteric or pagan themes. Friedrich von Schlegel (1772-1829) named it the *Oriental Renaissance* (Heelas 1996:42). The ideas from the Oriental Renaissance carried through to some extent to the 20th Century. For example, the School of Wisdom by Hermann von Keyserling, which was run from 1920 to 1927, introduced New Age themes (Heelas 1996:48). It is said that the School had an influence on the works of intellectuals such as Jung, Rudolf Otto, Tagore, and Erwin

Rousselle (Heelas 1996:48). New Age themes were also introduced by several organisations which were established in London, Los Angeles, and other parts of Europe (such as the Hubbard Dianetic research foundation in 1950). However, New Age activities had been practised by limited numbers of people. The popularisation of New Age themes and activities are most prominent with the emergence of the counter-culture movement in the 1960's. The contemporary popularisation of New Age is different from those earlier phenomena in terms of being combined with youth culture. The contemporary New Age movement that has its origins in the idea of the Oriental Renaissance in the 19th Century expanded along with this development of the counter-culture of the '60s and '70s⁸⁰ originating in Beat culture. Through the influence of Beat writers such as Allen Ginsberg,⁸¹ the younger generation learnt a sense of self-consciousness.

Heelas, an anthropologist who specialises on religion, describes New Agers as people who concentrate on the self and who assume that 'the Self itself is sacred' (Heelas 1996:2). Although it has also been described as 'an extraordinary mishmash of ideas, a positive ferment of beliefs having little obvious connection with each other' (Lemesurier 1990:185), Heelas finds a constant theme behind the heterogeneity of the New Age and states that 'one encounters the same (or very similar) *lingua franca* to do with the human (and planetary) condition' (Heelas 1996:2). 'Self-spirituality' is the *lingua franca*, and people find value in making 'contact with the spirituality which lies within the person' (ibid p.2). In other words, New Agers attempt to achieve a state of 'authentically human' or 'our authentic nature' (ibid p.18).

This authenticity is achieved when an individual is free from unnatural routines, or from a situation in which she/he is 'enslaved by unfulfillable desires and deep-seated insecurities; [...] dominated by anxiety-generating imperatives such as creating a good impression; and [...] locked into the conflictual demands of the ideal relationship' (ibid:18-19). A similar description is offered by the New Ager Arianna Stassinopoulos. She defines unnaturalness by means of the term 'self-limiting', saying that most people are captured by self-limiting images such as fear, anxiety, guilt, recrimination, and the burden of the past. Those images are beliefs which 'make us feel we are not terribly worthwhile' and give a 'sense of oneself as victim, as the passive recipient of life's circumstances' (Stassinopoulos' statement cited in Wallis 1984:32).

As such, New Agers have a strong tendency to be 'epistemological individualists' (Wallis 1984 :100). They often emphasise the need to be free from a certain doctrine and to stand by their own authority. Responding to a lecture by Sir George Trevelyan at the Festival for Mind, Body and Spirit, Michael Perry stated 'Only accept what rings true to your own Inner Self' (Perry 1992:147). As such, self-authority is an important issue for New Agers. Thus, New Agers often show their dislike of any authority that restricts their free choice or preferences. Just as Strauss's yoga practitioners seek an authentically healthy Self, New Agers also look for authenticity in self: a self which manages its own choices and preferences and is not ruled by an external authority but by nature.

In relation to the dislike of authority among hippies who are the New Agers⁸², Stuart Hall associates the 'hippy' counter-culture with words such as 'grooving', 'balling',

‘mind-blowing’, ‘turn on’, ‘drop out’, ‘love-in’, and ‘trip out’. Hall explains that ‘Hippies celebrate open expressiveness and the gratification of wishes and desires in the here and now’ (Hall 1968: 12). Since their expressiveness of ‘here and now’ rejects ‘the purposive, instrumental, goal-driven and emotionally-controlled way of managing the self and social relations’ and highlights a free-form style of ‘doing your own thing’, the hippies deny ‘historicity and the causality of human society’ (ibid:12). ‘Hippies are “drop-outs from history” (as Fiedler comments)—but, also, drop-outs from the long future’ (Hall 1968:12). In other words, ‘it is a protest against the over-managed, over-directed, over-routinised character of middle class life—a revolt against the model of the “organization man” and the “organized life” which is the archetype or paradigm of success in the square world’ (ibid: 17). Such anti-structural characteristics lead the hippies to self-cultivation or to ‘a voyage by the self into the self’ (ibid: 18)⁸³.

Furthermore Heelas describes such rejection of the ‘voices of authority associated with established orders’ among New Agers as ‘detraditionalized’ (Heelas 1996:22)⁸⁴. Introducing the shamanistic practices of New Ager, Kenneth Meadows, which states that ‘there is no set of beliefs to be accepted before progress can be made’, Heelas argues that the traditional dogmas and creeds of Western societies are believed by New Agers to obstruct the notion of the individual serving ‘as his or her own source of guidance’ (ibid: 23)⁸⁵. ‘The search for the self’ with elements taken from the ‘non-Western’ world, such as Zen Buddhism, Native American philosophy, Hindu meditation, Celtic rituals, Bohemian fashion, became highlighted by the younger generation living in the West in the process of resisting the Western established

orders⁸⁶.

Now, we have to be careful not to mix up the Melbourne and New Age cases. The Melbourne practitioners are not hippies dropping out from their society, reading Jack Kerouac, forming a community in the countryside, and searching for mysteriousness in a non-Western practice, such as Zen Buddhism, Native American philosophy, Hindu meditation, Celtic rituals, or Bohemian fashion. Rather they are searching for a ‘break’, as practitioners C.T., K, and R told me, by which to retreat temporarily from their busy everyday lives and are not seeking the Other. However, it is also true to say that the *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne and what we know of New Agers more generally share the idea of focusing on the self, believing that they are limited by the framework of everyday organised society. By seeking a space for expressing the self, the *kendō* practitioners search for ongoing self-management and a ‘personal autonomy’ that cannot be interrupted by everydayness. Through what Hall calls ‘voyaging by the self into the self’, *kendō* practitioners share the same sensitivity toward the independent self and self-cultivation and are curious about the authentic Self. Also, as the hippies reject historicity and focus on the moment of ‘here and now’, *kendō* practitioners show their preference to be temporarily separated from ‘historicity and the causality of human society’, focusing on individual free choice of ‘doing your own thing’ (Hall 1968:12). *Kendō*, for those people who seek the authentic Self, is the practice of the Other which provides a place and a moment for maintaining personal autonomy. Elaborating the words of Strauss, ‘not for authentic others, but for an authentic Self’, *kendō* practitioners seek *authentic time and space for the Self*.

4. Practitioners' authentic Self and Orientalists' View towards authentic Otherness

Orientalists' perspectives towards things non-Western derive from their interest in continuous historicity. Orientalists, in consciously *discovering* mysterious otherness in things non-Western, embrace the essentially different Other based on the long genealogy of the Western past. For example, in discussing the representation of the early 20th Century Primitive art movement as a part of an Orientalist interpretation of the non-Western Other, some theorists show us how Orientalists discovered the authentic Other by reflecting back on the origin of human history (Errington 1998; Foster 1993; Clifford 1988; Lindholm 2008).

According to Lindholm, the attitude, which has been a font of inspiration for many individual artists, such as Picasso, derives from the image of the authentic Other⁸⁷. For example, modernist artists, such as Picasso, were 'eager to become more authentic themselves', which is why they 'identified with the artist/savage' (Lindholm 2008:19). Lindholm explains that for Picasso, the search for primitiveness was 'the attempt to recapture lost authenticity through a retreat to origin, finding a truer reality in primitive cultic artifacts that presumably had their auras intact' (ibid). Picasso states that:

They were against everything—against unknown threatening spirits ...

I, too, I am against everything. I, too, believe that everything is unknown, that everything us an enemy! ... I understood what the Negroes used their sculptures for ... All fetishes ... were weapons. To

help people avoid coming under the influence of spirits again, to help them become independent. Spirits, the unconscious ... they are all the same thing ... *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* must have come to me that very day, but not at all because of the forms; because it was my first exorcism-painting (Picasso quoted in Andre Malraux 1976: 10-11).

Such aspirations as Picasso's toward the Other are often criticised. Researchers have critically argued that the primitive arts were an irrational superstition that gave Picasso the power of exorcism (Errington 1998). Highlighting the attitude in Picasso's superstitions about primitive arts, Shelly Errington states that 'it was there at its inception, when Picasso was inspired not—he insisted (at least in this quote)—by these objects' formal characteristics but by their magical power' (ibid:75). As such, Picasso's desire for primitive otherness was based on his presupposition about the non-Western Other as a mysterious pre-modern human entity. Indeed, the advocates of the *primitive* imagine a purely untouched pre-modern paradise, and they stereotype the non-Western other as the symbol of a *pure soul*. Other artists, for example, such as Paul Gauguin was also inspired by Tahitian culture, and maintained that 'you have to return to the original source, the childhood of mankind' (Gauguin 1985:15). Hal Foster disputes Gauguin's statement regarding the original source:

Against all evidence Gauguin persists in these stereotypes when he projects Tahiti as a place free of money and the Marquesas as a home

of cannibals. Indeed, it is there that he proceeds according to the primitivist equation of distance in space and in time. It is this space-time mapping that allows him to see the voyage *out* as a voyage *back*—to the beginnings of species, subject, and civilization alike (Foster 1993:73).

It is no surprise that individuals like Picasso and Gauguin who lived in the early 1900s found the Other in themselves. As Lancelot Law Whyte discusses in his *The Unconsciousness Before Freud*, the philosophy of Descartes⁸⁸ spread the idea throughout Europe that ‘conscious mentality should be separated from everything else’ (Whyte 1967:28). In the early 1900s, White continues, the Cartesian idea about the mind was promoted in the works of Freud (ibid:11, 60). In Freud’s psychoanalysis, Europeans succeeded in separating themselves as conscious subjects from their unconscious mentalities. Instead, the mentality of the non-Western Other, what Freud calls the ‘primitive mind’, was analysed in ‘neurotics’ and categorised as the irrational unconscious aspect of human mentality that Europe had succeeded in cutting itself off from (Freud 1999:1, 64, 89).

Thus the most profound aspect of Freud’s hold over many minds may have little to do with his scientific discoveries, with sex, or libido, or any special aspect of the unconscious, except as an opportunity for the conscious subject to escape his isolation, for individual to relax his

lonely self-awareness in a surrender to what is organic and universal. This deep appeal can be expressed in philosophical terms: by calling attention to the unconscious mental processes Freud gave the Western world an opportunity to improve the relations of the individual as subject to nature as object, in the daily life of ordinary people as well as in the thinking of the clinics and the academies (Whyte 1967:28).

Primitive men and neurotics, as we have seen, attach a high valuation – in our eyes an *over-valuation* – to psychical acts...As regards neurotics, we find that on the one hand a considerable part of this primitive attitude has survived in their constitution (Freud 1999:89).

As the Orientalist gaze over *the exotic Other* (outlined in Chapter Two) establishes the point of observation over the rest of the world, the work of Freud promotes another style of observation. This time, however, the point of observation is established within the mind of Europe, in which Europeans succeed in separating their conscious civilised subjectivities from the non-Western Other, the unconscious. What was constructed in this observation is the notion of a European consciousness observing *the unconscious primitive mind*. As such, the Other inside the Self became a common topic after the 1900s.

It is significant that Picasso's authentic self was based on the idea of 'becoming the Other'⁸⁹, the unconscious origin of the West, whereas the search for an authentic self

among *kendō* practitioners like K, R and P.S. is not based on the idea of becoming the Japanese Other. The longing of Picasso to become like the Other indicates the presupposition of the opposite side of *we, Europe*. By identifying himself with the *savage*, Picasso projects his ideally authentic existence onto the non-West.

Moreover, like Loti's Orientalist retrospective impressionism, the authentic self of Picasso as an Orientalist is related to the concept of *time*, providing a perspective on *how to locate* the Self/Other in history. As in the words of Foster, 'voyaging back to the beginning', the advocates of the primitive arts seek a positioning for their identity (authentic self) that traces back through Western history. As I have examined earlier, issues regarding the *Oriental Other* have been critically discussed in relation to the Western strategy of time-framing the Other. Within the time-frame, the Orient is retrospectively narrated and framed into a particular historical positioning within the universal Western time. By framing the Other in the Western past, the Orient is labelled as somewhere far from modern Europe, pre-modern, primitive, feudal, and inferior. In other words, the Orientalist representation of the Other is a strategy or idea that positions the non-Western Other in a particular time-frame: the Oriental Other is discussed around notion of a particular historically situated place or within a particular ethnicity.

Borrowing Walter Benjamin's notion of authenticity, such an authentic attitude is a preference toward a 'unique presence' in a particular history and a particular place; he calls such an attitude 'cult value' (Benjamin 1969: 225). He discusses that in the age of mosaic and fresco the authenticity of the work of art belonged to the original place

where the work of art was located. The work was authentic because of its unique presence in space and time. Benjamin notes that ‘even the most perfect reproduction of a work of art is lacking in one element: its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be’ (ibid: 220).

This unique existence of the work of art determined the history to which it was subject throughout the time of its existence. This includes the changes which it may have suffered in physical condition over the years as well as the various changes in its ownership (ibid: 220).

However, at the same time, Benjamin challenges such fixity of authenticity with another perspective. In contrast to cult value, Benjamin states that a work of art can be transmitted from the original to another. He claims that ‘its unique existence at the place where it happens to be’ has been lacking in the age of mechanical reproduction (ibid). With the emergence of mechanical reproduction such as photography and films, Benjamin says, the ‘aura’ of the work of art (authenticity) has been lost. Now ‘the singular particularity of the work of art’ which connects the work of art with a particular historical place and time is no longer the matter for the contemporary masses. In other words, it becomes possible to remove the work of art from the original place and time. The work of art becomes removable from the original, being reproduced repeatedly. This is what Benjamin calls ‘exhibition value’. Instead of cult value, which gives the

work of art the aura attached to a particular time and space, exhibition value becomes more independent from particularity. By the shift from cult value to exhibition value, the original is copied, and thus the work of art becomes portable, possible to possess, and possible to enjoy repeatedly.

With the emancipation of the various art practices from ritual go increasing opportunities for exhibition of their products. It is easier to exhibit a portrait bust that can be sent here and there than to exhibit the statues of divinity that has its fixed place in the interior of a temple (ibid: 225).

As I discussed in the previous sections, the pursuit of self, as seen in practitioners K R and P.S, is related to their sense of being separated from normal Australian society and expresses their independent existence of being here. Thus, their sense of authenticity is cut off from a particular historical place and time, and they focus on how to exhibit themselves without necessarily identifying themselves with the Other. Bearing in mind Hall's argument in the 1960s regarding hippies being New Agers, such sensitivity toward the self highlights a free-form style of 'doing your own thing', and thus it denies 'historicity and the causality of human society' since the self-expressiveness of 'here and now' rejects 'the purposive, instrumental, goal-driven and emotionally-controlled way of managing the self and social relations' (Hall 1968:12). Although *kendō* practitioners are not hippies, they share the same sensitivity

toward the self as New Agers do in terms of denying (temporarily) social relations, separating (temporarily) themselves from ordinariness, and expressing the self with a free-form style. What *kendō* practitioners K R and P.S. pursue is the unique positioning in time and space of the self, which enables them to distance themselves from socially constructed *normality*.

From this I now suggest a classification in which there are two categories of authenticity: 1) authenticity of the unique presence of a particular history (an Orientalist tradition of representing the Other) and 2) authenticity that is felt in the moment of the *here and now* through expressing the self (*kendō* practitioners in Melbourne). The difference between the two is seen in the attitudes toward time and space. In the case of the former, the verification of authenticity is preceded by stereotypical images of the non-Western Other attached to an object, such as primitive artefacts, a geographical place such as the Orient and a certain group of people and racial categories. As I explained, this image is produced in the long history of European exoticism toward the Oriental Other, Orientalism. The non-Western otherness has a strong connection with historical recognition. In contrast, the latter case suggest that people who are interested in *kendō* see significance in experiencing a sense of everydayness and a space for a temporal retreat from everydayness or bracketing off historicity while enjoying the moment of *here and now*.

Chapter Six: Exoticism, Fetishism and the Practitioners' Objective Perspective

By examining the subjective involvement of *kendō* practitioners in *kendō* practice, I have paradoxically noticed objective attitudes that they have directed toward themselves. *Kendō* practitioners observe themselves as culturally and historically *different* through this Japanese martial art and their interaction with Japanese practitioners. Their interaction is a mutually building process of identification vacillating on the borderline of the Self/Other. Through contact with the Japanese practitioners at the *Kenshikan dōjō*, Australian practitioners expand the possibilities of self-observation. Their identification of the self is not a one-way interpretation of the culture of the Other. In this chapter, I further examine the Self/Other relation of *kendō* practitioners and how they see such distinctions. In the second half of the chapter, I draw from theories on fetishism to help explain interactions with the culturally and historically different Other.

1. Japanese Practitioners in our *Dōjō*

Kenshikan dōjō is not only a place for non-Japanese practitioners, but is also a place for a few Japanese to gather (including me). Although in this thesis, I particularly focus on the non-Japanese practitioners due to my interest in the representation of the Japanese Other outside of Japan, the contribution of Japanese practitioners to the *Kenshikan* community should not be ignored. Before examining the self-observation of non-Japanese practitioners, I first introduce Japanese members who actively engaged

with non-Japanese practitioners as model practitioners and took central roles in the training of *Kenshikan* community.

In our *dōjō*, there were only a few Japanese practitioners who regularly came to training. *Sensei* Y was the only one who held a 7th *dan* grade in Australia (excepting short-term visiting *senseis*), and he was the most significant figure. Having the highest grade in the Australian *kendō* community, his presence was influential among many practitioners around Victoria and Australia. It is not an exaggeration to say that he symbolised the *Kenshikan* and Australian *kendō* community. Indeed, as non-Japanese practitioner Y told me (see later sections in this chapter), some practitioners joined our *dōjō* to train with *sensei* Y. Outside of the *dōjō*, he was a businessman who worked with a Japanese company in Melbourne. When the former *sensei* Nagae in our *dōjō* went back to Japan, *sensei* Y was asked to look after the *dōjō* in his place. He stayed in Australia after he graduated from a university in Sydney and has contributed his leisure time to Australian *kendō* for over thirty years.

Although Japanese practitioners were close⁹⁰ to each other, they also built good friendships with non-Japanese practitioners. Some of them visited each other's houses. For example, Japanese female practitioner K.D. loved to cook Japanese food and she enjoyed having both Japanese and non-Japanese practitioners at her house. One of my focus group interviews was conducted at her house. Her excellent cooking helped the practitioners to relax and talk. Practitioner K.D. was in her early 50s and was a long-term *kendō* practitioner. She started *kendō* when she was a high school student in Japan. She met her future husband (Australian) in Japan, moved to Melbourne with him

and had two children. Normally, she attended training on weekends, driving down from a remote suburb but, with menopause issues, she took a break from training. Instead, K.D. contributed home-grown lemons to the *kendō* community and cooked for practitioners at *Kenshikan* barbeque parties.

Other than the contribution of K.D., *sensei* S, (5th *dan*)⁹¹, supported *Kenshikan* with his energetic commitment to training and teaching. He was a middle-aged businessman from Japan who was transferred by his company to a branch in Melbourne. Together with *sensei* Y, *sensei* S committed himself to introducing *kendō* in Victoria. In particular, his teaching style, rich with feedback, was popular among *Kenshikan* members. A non-Japanese female practitioner told me that she preferred to have a sparring session with *sensei* S so that she could receive all the feedback he provided after each training session.

Practitioner H was in his early 40s (4th *dan*) and was also a popular person in our *dōjō*. A businessman working with an Australian company, H loved to talk to the *dōjō* members (both Japanese and non-Japanese). After training finished, he was almost always found discussing something related to *kendō* with one of the other practitioners. With the help of his social networking, he assisted with the administration of our *dōjō* as Vice President. On Tuesdays, the training day that *sensei* Y and S were not there, practitioner H occasionally took the role of *sensei* in their place along with *sensei* B.S.

Even though most practitioners in *Kenshikan* are predominantly non-Japanese, the presence of these Japanese practitioners is prominent in our *dōjō*. These Japanese practitioners are actively involved in the community, teaching *kendō* techniques to and

fighting against non-Japanese and Japanese fellow members. Japanese practitioners are in this sense *subjects* to be seen by non-Japanese practitioners, giving *Kenshikan* members awareness towards Japanese otherness. I often found that such awareness of difference often occurs through expressed recognition of bodily differences between the Japanese and non-Japanese practitioners during first-hand interactions with the Japanese (as the Other) in the *dōjō* space.

2. The Practitioners' Awareness of themselves as Different

Practitioners R (junior practitioner/English background), J.W. (senior practitioner/Caucasian-looking Australian) and K (junior practitioner/ German-English background), for example, recognise *kendō* as something that concentrates on the self but they are also aware of the foreignness of *kendō* practice. I noticed this awareness when I had a conversation after Sunday morning training. As we talked about the use of the body in *kendō*, practitioner D (junior practitioner/Israeli background) started talking about his perspective on the 'stamina-friendly'⁹² body techniques of *kendō*, which he thinks unique to the Japanese practitioners. D told us the story of his non-Japanese sensei and explained the difference in body use between his non-Japanese and Japanese sensei:

One of my sensei from the other martial arts that I do - he used to do

kendō, he was 4th *dan* in Japan ... he was a young commander (an military serviceman in Israel). He had ... you know muscles and stamina and everything ... and he used to do *shiai* against these 70 year-old 7th *dan* and 8th *dan* (Japanese sensei) ... and he was just like pushing and sweating ... but (the old Japanese sensei) were all standing relaxed ...

Then, practitioner R added to D's perspective by explaining how he has felt the difference between himself and the Japanese practitioners since he started *kendō* practice in *Kenshikan dōjō*. As described earlier, R enjoys *kendō* as something that gives him a self-disciplined lifestyle through interactions with fellow members. On the other hand, he understands that he is a non-Japanese practitioner. He first mentioned the difference in body size between the Japanese and non-Japanese practitioners by using the AFL (Australian Football League) as an example:

Quicker ... just because ... bigger and stronger you are, slower you are ... but smaller are quicker. The best example is AFL footy. You see big white men and you see little aboriginals. And little aboriginals race around the guys and just taking off.

R further explained how he found it hard as an Australian to practise this Japanese martial art, highlighting the differences in the way Japanese and non-Japanese use the

body. Using American baseball as an example, R said that small Japanese *kendō* practitioners use their body effectively by moving their whole body:

I played baseball years ago ... if you know American baseball ... many Japanese actually play in the Major league ... With Americans they just use their shoulders but if you see much shorter Japanese they use all that ... they use the body and they can hit the balls the same distance as a six-four bloke ... With American baseball they just use their chest. If you see Japanese who're playing American baseball ... the Yanks are like that ... the Japanese the whole body just swings straight through. So they get the exact same strength. They're using 'that' [the lower back] instead of just 'up there' [chest].

From his few years of *kendō* experience, R feels that the Japanese body has advantages for practicing *kendō*. R then repeatedly stated that *kendō* is 'basically foreign' to someone like him:

I've been doing a year and a half ... but still foreign ... still basically foreign to me to do, but I'm still glad to come here!

For practitioner J (junior practitioner/German background), the difference between the Japanese and non-Japanese practitioners is the reason why she comes to the

Kenshikan dōjō. In our conversation, she first explained that we are lucky to practise in the *Kenshikan dōjō* because of the facility and the opportunity to train with Japanese sensei (*Sensei Y*). She particularly emphasised that she selected the *Kenshikan* and found the *dōjō* good because of the Japanese sensei:

I selected based on that actually...and also credibility for me ... (it's from) the high ranking Japanese sensei that you can actually learn ... the original techniques that's been taught ...

Junior practitioner J, a German architect, is a long-term *aikido* practitioner who had just started *kendō*. She had been living in Japan for three years while studying at a university in Tokyo. She explained how her attitude to Japanese martial arts had been changed through recalling her experience in Japan. She explained that she became aware of the unique training style of Japanese *aikido* practitioners while training in Japan.

Practitioner K kept asking J why she specifically mentioned the 'Japanese sensei'.

Practitioner K: I was interested that J said 'Japanese sensei' before rather than just 'sensei'. Do you feel ...

Practitioner J: Yea, I think for me cultural background is super relevant ... I only practise *kendō* here ... but my background is in

aikido and I've practised *aikido* for 12 years and I started it in Germany and in the western way ... I always thought *aikido* was something similar to *Judō* ... but when I got to Japan ... I understood that the fundamental principle of ... where it actually comes from is fighting spirit or style that is taking body features into account, so it's designed for smaller people than stronger people because the Japanese ... are kind of smaller in comparison to European big guys. That's what I realised it is a huge difference training in Japan and abroad ... and especially in Western culture ... and the understanding of flexibility of the body and moving of the body is so much necessary to actually do the real way of fighting. It's not because of big muscles, because it's not about domination or anything ... it's more about whole techniques. This is where I think it comes from ... especially *aikido* ... also all sorts of fighting ... things that comes from Japan. Because they were designed by smaller people to defend themselves without physical strength and I think when you don't actually acknowledge that cultural background ... cannot understand why it's so effective.

This narrative of J indicates that her first-hand experience made her aware of the difference between practicing the art with Japanese and non-Japanese. She clearly believes that she needs to train in a Japanese way to practise *kendō* properly. Even though J did not mention her non-Japaneseness, her narrative indicates that she is very

aware of the Japanese/non-Japanese distinction. Her attitude to Japanese martial arts comes from her awareness of being a non-Japanese practitioner practicing the art outside Japan. Through practicing *kendō* with the Japanese practitioners, Melbourne practitioners like J and R have not only learnt body techniques and movements but have also become aware of their *foreignness* among Japanese practitioners.

However, J is not reluctant to be a foreigner. She has maintained a subjective involvement in the culture and community of *kendō* though feeling her foreignness. J also expressed the view that the art is open to anyone and adaptable to all practitioners:

Practitioner J: you adopt the Japanese system of repetition and flexibility ... through *suburi*⁹³ and all the training that we do is actually ... people ... can find an individual way of dealing with it.

Perceiving the differences between the physical abilities of the Japanese and non-Japanese practitioners, J.W. also mentioned that *kendō* does not depend on how big or how small one is. He then said that the body technique used for *kendō*, like for *karate*, allows any individual to adopt the art:

J.W.: there is a limit how all of us can move ... you know ... we can only move our arms at certain speed or certain strength. we are all like human ... it really depends on how you apply your *kendō* ... and ... really it doesn't matter how big or small you are. It's all down to the

training.

The practitioners further discussed *kendō*'s adaptability. They saw *kendō* as offering more of a possibility for non-Japanese like them to get involved than other martial arts:

J: but I think *kendō* has advantage of very little technique or very limited repertoire of things that we actually do and ... again in *aikidō* there're so many different variations of techniques that it's automatically appropriated and developed in different contexts and I think that's really good ... in *kendō* we stick to very limited ...

J.W.: just a handful of techniques we master in *kendō* whereas I'm doing Brazilian *jiu-jitsu* where there are thousands of things to learn ... I'm never gonna stop learning things to do ... It's very hard.

Overall, their conversation reveals a perception of difference between Japanese and non-Japanese practitioners. In particular, they are aware of the structure of their non-Japanese bodies, pointing out that *kendō*, as a Japanese martial art, is designed for smaller people like Japanese. However, this difference does not remain fixed between the Japanese and non-Japanese. Indeed, practitioners J.W. and J mentioned that the practice of *kendō* depends on individual training. The Japanese body, they suggested, is

something that one can alter through training. Paradoxically, what they tried to reveal in the conversation is an openness of *kendō* culture to non-Japanese practitioners despite their bodily difference.

Practitioner K concluded the conversation. Drawing on her educational background, she explained the curiosity that motivated her to contact the culturally and historically different Other. Realising the difficulty felt by those who are not Japanese in understanding *kendō*, K did not abandon her interaction with difference and said to me:

K: talking about the understanding of the context of origin, yeah...For example, I trained in classic studies in uni (ancient Greek and Roman) ... and I found that understanding a concept...for example democracy ... needs to know the context from which it came. Probably ... I have different perspective on it than people who haven't trained in classic studies ... its 'origin-ness', and possibly you get advantage from having a cultural background rather than ... like you know ... me non-Japanese and studying about its origins. But I think it's still opens to people from outside the culture to research ... probably we should try to understand where it came from... whether you can really understand from the outside perfectly I don't know.

Practitioner K is not only aware of *kendō* as a foreign practice but also clearly aware

of herself as a foreign subject within the culture of *kendō*. In explaining her attitude with words such as ‘its origin-ness’ and ‘outside the culture’, she clearly draws a borderline between the Japanese and non-Japanese practitioners. However, this borderline does not separate her from the culture of *kendō*. She states that she has a ‘different perspective on it than people who haven’t trained in classic studies’; other views are just different perspectives that she has not had. Then, at the end of the conversation, she adds that ‘it’s inevitable that people bring a new perspective on it ... you know’. The last narrative indicates that she believes that various perspectives on the art are legitimate and that she tries to be involved in the art subjectively and objectively at the same time.

3. The Eyes of the Japanese Practitioners on Non-Japanese Practitioners

Through having interacted with *dōjō* members during the fieldwork, I understood that they repeatedly reflected what *kendō* practice was for them. The practitioners constantly saw themselves as outsiders through experiencing the difference of body size, speed and the way of training. They had an objective perspective, not of the Other but rather of themselves. For some, their perception of *kendō* was not one-way.

Such objective perception of non-Japanese practitioners was further interwoven with the perspectives of the Japanese practitioners. Melbourne practitioners were highly aware of how they were *observed* and *narrated* by the Japanese, imagining the Japanese

practitioners' perception of non-Japanese practitioners. This objective perception was particularly notable when they interacted with visitors from Japan.

Other than Japanese practitioners in *Kenshikan dōjō*, non-Japanese practitioners had many opportunities to interact with Japanese who practise the art. For example, every year in Melbourne, we had visitors from *Nippon Sport Science University*⁹⁴. Between thirty to forty students came to Australia to perform *kendō* techniques. The performance was held in Albert Park (Melbourne Sports and Aquatic Centre). Students performed *judō*, *kyudō*, *kendō*, and *karate*, as well as other Japanese physical practices, such as dance. The university promoted Japanese martial arts to Australia, touring around cities such as Sydney and Melbourne. While they stayed in Melbourne, the *Kenshikan dōjō* took students and their teachers to joint sparring sessions. Those teachers who came with their students were also considered among the top *kendō* practitioners in Japan.

The joint practice in March 2010 was on a Sunday morning, and almost all the regular practitioners of the *Kenshikan dōjō* (including the members of the *dōjō*) came to training. The interaction between them became rather dynamic at the luncheon party that was organised by the members of *Kenshikan* administration. At a local restaurant, over twenty practitioners from our *dōjō* joined the party. It was an entertaining lunch, since the Japanese students only understood simple English and the *Kenshikan* practitioners had to mostly communicate with them by using gestures. Some practitioners in our *dōjō* clearly recognised this event as a contact between *Australian practitioners* and *Japanese practitioners*, giving the non-Japanese practitioners a way to observe themselves as foreigners in terms of being involved in a practice of the

Japanese Other despite their physical location *at home*.

The objective perception of non-Japanese practitioners could be clearly seen in senior practitioner R.B. (senior practitioner/multiple ethnic backgrounds). His self-reflection was critical. R.B. was a long-term practitioner, with a background in tennis and chess. He, like other practitioners, was not following a Japanese craze and was not into Japanese things even after starting *kendō*. As discussed in Chapter Four, his involvement with *kendō* practice was a choice among other activities to experience something different. One night, a week before the visiting of the university student in 2010, R.B. gave me a lift home after training. We were casually talking about these students. Having Japanese students to our *dōjō* would not have been new. R.B. had trained many times with those students. Suddenly, he asked me: ‘Do you think they might tease you?’ I responded: ‘What do you mean?’ Then R.B. explained that it might be odd for them to see me, a Japanese person, practicing *kendō* ‘among the Whites’, and he continued that he had always been interested to know how Japanese students think about him as an Australian practicing their martial art. Although he was joking with me, his question indicated that he had an objective perspective on Australian practitioners like himself. The joke revealed that he positioned non-Japanese practitioners against Japanese practitioners.

Practitioner S.C. (a senior practitioner of Irish-Japanese background) directly expressed his consciousness of how Japanese might view him, and he described his objectivity toward himself as a non-Japanese practitioner through the words ‘*henna gaijin*’. The Japanese *henna* means *strange*, and *gaijin* means *foreigner*. Those two

words are popularly known and used by the *Kenshikan* members. S.C. described himself as *henna gaijin*, mostly to the Japanese practitioners either temporarily visiting our *dōjō* or who had just joined our community. When I first talked to him, he introduced himself by saying, ‘I’m a *henna gaijin*’. Laughing at himself, S.C. assumed that I, a Japanese, might be surprised to see an Australian practicing a Japanese martial art. For S.C., a self-described outsider, it was a way to excuse himself before the Japanese practitioners, and he sees himself from the standpoint of the Japanese.

As such, the practitioners at *Kenshikan dōjō* are conscious of themselves and reflect upon themselves through their first-hand contact with Japanese practitioners. The *kendō* practitioners have been challenged by being constantly exposed to the presence of the Japanese Other. The contact between the two gives the Australian practitioners a multiple perspective on *kendō* practice through Australian eyes and also from the Japanese point of view. In other words, what they are experiencing in the *Kenshikan dōjō* is a mutual (or a two-way) interpretation of *kendō* and its culture.

As a result of exposing themselves to the Japanese Other in the *dōjō* space, they noticed some changes in their perspectives. Other conversations I have had with practitioners such as K and J.W. have revealed that the mutual communication between Australian practitioners and *kendō* as a culture of Japan have brought them new eyes with which to view their own *kendō* practices. As I have discussed, most of them are not following a Japanese craze; rather, they spoke about how they became aware of Japanese culture through *kendō* and its community. According to them, they gradually found that they could not totally ignore the cultural aspect of *kendō* even though they

did not always engage in that culture enthusiastically:

K: You can't say that I'm going to become culturally aware because it's just a really...it's something which has to happen by osmosis. I think it's a built up culture. I don't think you can go looking for cultural enlightenment because it's really wanky...so I think you definitely need to have the understanding but I think that comes with continued practice.

J.W.: With the culture when you do *kendō* I think you just open up more to Japan. Two years ago I probably would go through newspaper article about Japan I probably would flick straight past and not read it...Now, you see it and you go Oh! and obviously you read it...so you learn more and you take in more.

Their recognition of the art and its culture occurs each time without presupposing what the culture of *kendō* should be like. As J.W. states, 'You see it and you go Oh! and obviously you read it'; contact with the Japanese Other for them is not an everyday event. His feeling of 'Oh! there you are' exposes the relationship he has with the culture of Japan. In his daily life, things Japanese are 'Oh!'—no more and no less than that.

During the conversation, practitioner K told us of a change of mind. Before

getting involved in the *kendō* community, she had a negative image of Japan, but *kendō* practice and its community changed her mind completely:

K: A few years ago...I used to be in *Greenpeace* and I...spent a quite bit of time out front of the Japanese embassy...and got kicked out of the Japanese embassy...on the whaling campaign. Having done *kendō* now, I'm just like...the way they are going about the campaign is all wrong...like you know, it's just not like...it's changed...

Like practitioner K, their interaction with the Japanese has challenged the above practitioners to rethink themselves and the *dōjō* for them is a first-hand contact zone. Their identities as Australian *kendō* players are *constantly reinforced and changed at the same time*, or in other words, *interaction with the Japanese Other reinforces and changes the practitioners identification of themselves* at the same time.

In the next section, I further explore *kendō* practitioners' self-identification by examining the attitude towards the Japanese Other (difference). Referring to Homi Bhabha's version of fetishism to explain a way of identifying the Self/Other in relation to the Orientalist tradition of stereotyping non-Western cultures, I distinguish, theoretically, the way *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne build their identities with *kendō* culture from the way Orientalists build their identities with the exotic Other.

4. Recognising Difference in Fetishism and Identification

According to Homi Bhabha, the idea of fetishism is deeply related to the Orientalist tradition of stereotyping difference (Bhabha 1983). It is Bhabha's version of fetishism that applies the idea of fetish to the colonial context and helps to reinterpret the representation of the non-Western Other in a process of identification with difference. In particular, his work gives us a perspective on how *labelling and categorising the Other* supports the creation of one's self-definition process. Through this perspective, one does not only learn how to see the culturally and historically different Other, but also how to identify oneself by rejecting the Other.

The origin of the concept of *fetishism* derives from a medieval Portuguese word. Pietz analyses the early expansion of Portuguese gold trading during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries along the west coast of Africa (Pietz 1985). When the Portuguese explorers contacted the local Africans there, they observed an *odd* behaviour among the locals: the locals worshipped objects. Examining the early texts, such as *Accurate Description of the Coast of Guinea*, written by an Enlightenment intellectual, Willem Bosman, Pietz finds that the Portuguese started calling the worship of objects *fetiço* after the traditional Christian term for witchcraft or false idol worship (ibid). Pietz⁹⁵ concludes that the notion of *fetish* was invented by the interpretation of the outsider, and he points out that the interpretation occurs in 'a cross-cultural situation formed by the ongoing encounter of the value codes of radically different social orders' (ibid: 11). In other words, fetishes are produced through the process of one-sided interaction with the Other with

shared values in a society, and they help individuals determine the meaning of the world surrounding them.

Similarly the argument on the Orientalist representation of the Other in Chapter Two suggests that representing the Other involves the process of valuing surrounding things as *exotic*. The discussions on the long genealogy of Orientalist exoticism seen in the taxonomic, anatomic, natural scientific, ethnographic, and aesthetic categorisation of the non-Western Other is actually a process of fetishising the world. Indeed, the value of non-Western objects, beautiful or grotesque, was decided through forming a shared understanding of what Europe and the Orient are. The collections of things Japanese are also objects of Western fetishism that labeled the exotic Other. From the early Japanologists such as Chamberlain to the contemporary consumers of techno-Orientalism, Japan has been an object to be seen. The country, its culture and people are depicted within the framework of fairy, beautiful, delicate, feudal, old, pre-modern, samurai, and crazy computer junky. Things Japanese as an historical and cultural difference have been fixed into the European common imagination as fetish objects, and the value of Japan as the Other has one-sidedly been established from the outside, as were the customs of the local Africans as interpreted by the Portuguese.

Moreover, the one-sided interpretation of the Other in fetishism is not only the process of valuing the surrounding world including the Other, but it also stereotypes one's identification with the recognition/disavowal of racial difference. In the context of colonialism, Bhabha elaborates the idea of fetishism with Franz Fanon's statements in relation to the racial identification of White/Negro. According to Bhabha, fetishism is to

stereotype the Other, and it is a discourse as the reflection of the desire for the otherness (Bhabha 1983:30). He argues that ‘the fetish or stereotype gives access to an “identity” which is predicated as much on mastery and pleasure as it is on anxiety and defence, for it is a form of multiple and contradictory belief in its recognition of difference and disavowal of it’ (ibid: 27). Citing Fanon’s *Black Skins White Masks*, Bhabha argues the process of establishing White identity by disavowing the stereotypical image of blackness. Reinterpreting Freud’s theory on the anxiety of castration, he argues that the non-White colonised subject is *difference* which threatens the fantasy of Whiteness (Bhabha 1983). By stereotyping the fetish object (non-White and colonised) with words such as primitive, childish, uncivilised, the subject normalises (tames) difference, and the subject can have a sense of security that the difference which might harm Whiteness is no longer harmful because *they* are inferior to *us*. In this case, the image of non-Whiteness is objectified to make it possible to possess it in an ontological sense (in Bhabha’s words ‘stereotyping’ non-Whiteness), and the possession of the image creates the feeling that there is no difference that can harm the fantasy of Whiteness⁹⁶. In other words, the White subject one-sidedly damages the identification of the Other by stereotyping Fanon as *a Negro* while avoiding any change or damage to his or her own identity. Fetishism (stereotype) *protects* one’s identity while *destroying* that of the Other.

Thus, it could be interpreted that the discourse of Orientalism, which also stereotypes the non-Western Other, is an identification of the subject through the process of fetishising (stereotyping) the object. As the fetishism of Whiteness implies, I

would suggest that Orientalist stereotypes (not necessarily realised) is about a one-way self-define process of keeping oneself unchanged while tampering with the other. Indeed, while the fantasy of white fetishism remains unchanged, images opposing the fantasy of things Japanese is often rejected, as I explained with Chamberlain's narrative in Chapter Two, and the images are recognised as threats to the fantasy of the Orientalist imagination. In the process of the self-identification of Orientalist fetishism, there is no mutual interaction with the Other.

However, some *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne do not consider *kendō* a cultural aspect of the Other that is merely meant to be observed to protect one's racial identity. By exposing their presence to the Japanese, the practitioners build their identification of the Self/Other in an ongoing process of interaction. While seeing the *kendō* practice and its culture with their own eyes, the practitioners look back on their practice by imagining how the Japanese see them practicing the art. As seen in the narrative of practitioner K, the practitioners continuously change their attitudes to their *kendō* practice. Their engagement with difference shows their subjective/objective understanding of the surrounding world.

This could be compared to the Orientalist fetishism of the Other in terms of systematising the surroundings as observers who enjoy the positioning of mastery and pleasure. By subjectively/objectively becoming involved in *kendō* practice and its community, *kendō* practitioners vacillate in their identity. For them, *kendō* is a practice that reflects themselves. In contrast to representations in Orientalist repositories wherein Orientalists perceive the Oriental Other as something to separate from themselves in

order to understand and justify colonisation, *kendō* practitioners do not necessarily lock the Japanese other into racial difference. Rather, I would suggest that they *reset and re-structure* their image within cultural and historical difference, which means that a culture of the Other is experienced as a subjective/objective event by practitioners that is incorporated into the construction of their present lives. If *kendō* practitioners had a desire to practise *kendō*, it is not a fetish desire with objective eyes, but rather a desire for an everyday life that still has a sense of mutual communication.

I now conclude this section with some words from Victor Segalen (1878-1919). Segalen was a writer and French doctor who practised in the navy. As a naval doctor, he travelled around the world, to Tahiti, China, and Tibet. In contrast to Loti, who was good at depicting the Other in his retrospective impressionistic style, Segalen's style of writing and his attitude to cultural and racial differences has a sense of subjective involvement through the interaction with the Other. Segalen's identification of himself, which is different from the identification in Bhabha's fetishism, is continuously built through mutual interaction. In his case, like that of the *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne, the contact with the Other directly challenges his identity, and he explains that 'far from stifling it, the sensation of Exoticism enhances and enriches one's personality' (Segalen 2002: 40). He continues:

The capacity to discriminate is formed through the experience of diversity. Those who are capable of tasting it are strengthened, enhanced, and intensified by the experience. It crushes the others. If

it destroys their personality as well, it is because their personality was very weak or made of something other than the true capacity to experience exoticism (ibid: 40).

Exoticism is therefore not that kaleidoscopic vision of the tourist or of the mediocre spectator, but the forceful and curious reaction to a shock felt by someone of strong individuality in response to some object whose distance from oneself he alone can perceive and savor (ibid: 21)

For Segalen, the interaction with the Other is something for which one might be pressed to change one's personality. One is asked to handle a shock in the contact with the Other, otherwise one is destroyed. Through this contact, though, one could enrich one's personality. In other words, Segalen's identification is based on a *self-restructuring process at the same time [as a] self-destroying process* by diving into difference without thinking of preserving his identity. Similarly, the *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne try to *reset and restructure* their identities through the *kendō* community.

Segalen further examines the issue in his *Essay on Exoticism*. First, he discusses his disagreement with Loti:

not Loti, nor Saint-Pol-Roux, nor Claudel. Something else! Something different from what they have done!(ibid:14).

Instead, he argues that

Absolute subjectivism, however, is indisputably the only possible metaphysical stance to assume (ibid:15).

From there, move rapidly to the task of defining and laying out the sensation of Exoticism, which is nothing other than the notion of difference, the perception of Diversity, the knowledge that something is other than one's self; and Exoticism's power in nothing other than ability to conceive otherwise (ibid:19).

Then, he denies becoming like the Other, in contrast to Picasso and Gauguin:

While experiencing China profoundly, I have never had the desire to be Chinese. While I have felt the force of the Vedic dawn, I have never really regretted not being born three thousand years earlier and a herdsman (ibid:49).

He denies this because he believes that it is almost impossible to understand the Other:

Exoticism is therefore not an adaption to something; it is not the

perfect comprehension of something outside one's self that one has managed to embrace fully, but the keen and immediate perception of an eternal incomprehensibility (ibid:21).

The work of the Japanese scholar Ohira explains Segalen's exoticism further. He says that Segalen's exoticism recognises the Self as a process of change occurring throughout the experiences through which one contacts the Other; this change leads one to a different self that one has not known before (Ohira 2008: 206). In contrast to Loti, who simply *writes* what he sees in foreign countries while keeping the framework of his self, Segalen recognises the *I* as an existence that is continuously rewritten. He also recognises that the *I* is not a fixed unity. Rather, the *I* is a *moment* when *I* physically and ontologically feel a new *I* that is different from the moment before. Ohira states that, for Segalen, exoticism is 'a restructuring of himself from inside/outside himself rather than observing the Other and foreign countries' (ibid).

Kendō practitioners in Melbourne are similarly experiencing the contact with the Other as in the Segalen case above. They build their self-identification through questioning their involvement in *kendō* practice objectively and subjectively. As Segalen pointed out, the encounter with the Other is potentially a dangerous self-destructive process, and some practitioners like R.U. and S.C. are worried about their presence in this practice of the Other in terms of how they are perceived, while at the same time they enjoy the practice. Thus, their *I* as *kendō* practitioners, is a moment when they recognise themselves from inside and outside. Rather than standing from the

position of an observer who categorises the difference that surrounds their environment, their encounter with exoticism involves a process of continuously destructing/restructuring the Self.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

1. Orientalism and Occidentalism

My research has analysed ways in which some non-Japanese people living outside Japan represent Japan. My fieldwork in a small Melbourne community of non-Japanese practitioners of a Japanese martial art (*kendō*) focused on their understanding of their practice, of their community, and of Japan and Japanese culture.

As you have seen, the construction of Orientalism has been a central concern in my work. Orientalism describes a cross-cultural setting within a realm of exoticism; it is a perspective in which the culturally, historically and ethnically different Other is seen through the eyes of the Western Self. I was curious to investigate how this exoticism could be applied to the contemporary representation of Japan. In anthropological works, this Orientalist exoticism — as a practice of imagining fantasy — has been analysed in the context of colonialism in which a clear dichotomy of West and non-West is highlighted. This exoticisation distorts the reality of the non-West with unequal political power, and imagines the Other as not existing in the same present with the West but rather somewhere in the past or in a fantasy-like world (Fabian 1983: 30-31, 143). As Brett de Bary says about the *exotic* representation of Others, ‘the strategy of locating the object of one’s description in a different time has been a well-established strategy of representing cultural “others” ’ in modern Euro-centricity (de Bary 2006:62). As such, the representation of the Oriental Other is related to history, locating ‘other’ cultures ‘in

a universal time-frame' (Bhabha 1990: 208). With this time-frame strategy, the Oriental Other has been conceived as separate from the Western Self, and it is objectified as pre-modern, exotic, inferior, and abnormal, as a subject to exhibit and observe at Museums or in an anatomy lab.

Paying particular attention to the Orientalist strategy to narrate things Japanese, I unconsciously presupposed such Orientalist discourse among the *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne. When I began my fieldwork, I was eager to search for the stereotypes typically seen in Orientalist narratives. Indeed, there were some stereotypical representations of *kendō* among the practitioners which are similarly seen in the Orientalist representations of the non-Western Other. Some practitioners consciously linked *kendō* to a practice of old Japanese swordsmanship, though the art has been developed through its (contested) sporting character in modern Japan. Other practitioners asserted that to preserve this uniquely Japanese practice was to protect it from internationalisation, or to *salvage* the art.

However, I gradually realised how my presupposition was constructed by hearing from *kendō* practitioners who were influenced by Japanese practitioners who in turn stereotyped what *Japanese kendō* should be like. Thus, there was a spiral of stereotyping from outside and inside. This awareness eventually led me to a critique of Occidentalism, realising that I had seen the non-Japanese Other from my Occidentally essentialising eyes. In other words, my real fieldwork started at the moment when I noticed this. My purpose then changed to allow me to understand this exoticism in the context of a more complicated world.

2. Diversity of Interests in *Kendō* Practice and its Community

Seeing them without my Occidental eyes, I found that the *kendō* community and its people were more diverse than I originally expected them to be. Each individual had his or her own reasons for practising the art, and what these suggested is that practitioners in Melbourne were not necessarily interested in Japan and *kendō*, per se. Instead they were interested in searching for a new spice to add to their life through a cosmopolitan practice. Their interest in combativeness was a good starting point for me to examine the coincidence that got them involved in the art and the community. Even though some practitioners indicated an interest in swordsmanship and sought a fighting situation that was as real as mock sparring can get, what they meant by swordsmanship is not inevitably Japanese swordsmanship. Indeed, some practitioners indicated that they were inspired by the sword fights in *Star Wars* that they had watched as children (see Chapter Four). Those male practitioners interpreted *kendō* practice as an alternative to Arthurian-style knight fighting, and it was accidentally Japanese.

For other practitioners, involvement in *kendō* culture and its community was a *choice* among other activities (see Chapter Four). In searching for ways to make life enjoyable, they looked for an activity that suited their preferred lifestyles. Some practitioners decided to get involved in Japanese martial arts to stay physically and mentally healthy, while others learned of *kendō* while passing by a local community centre. Selecting what they liked and what they did not like, practitioners included an

Other cultural form in their everyday life without necessarily seeking to understand its full cultural and historical background.

Furthermore, *kendō* was a practice deeply interwoven with practitioners' childhood memories. Through the childhood experience of encountering things Japanese, *kendō*, as a practice originating in Japan, became imbedded in some practitioners' memories. Thus, as the conversations I had with some of them indicated (see Chapter Four), they did not consider practising *kendō* special. It was just an extension of schoolyard play in their childhood in which they pretended to be Shintaro, the *samurai* hero of a TV series. Interestingly, a comment on the *SBS* website which I analysed recommended exhibiting the belongings of Shintaro next to those of the national icon, Ned Kelly, in a museum. The narratives of the practitioners, together with the *SBS* comment, demonstrate how the daily lives of some middle-aged practitioners in Melbourne have been stimulated by encounters with the new.

One might think, however, that the narratives of those practitioners, reinforced by the *SBS* comment, are complicit in what Orientalists' stereotypes represent as the Other by categorising the non-Western Other in the past. Scholars might critique them as being part of the assimilating discourse of multicultural Australia, as if Australia can *possess* those differences (Hage 1998; Haggis 2004; Jupp 2004; Jakubowicz et al. 1984).

However, if one pays careful attention to the practitioners' expressions, one finds in them another perspective: the perspective linked with *a sense of familiarity* towards *kendō* practice. Compared to Orientalists, who are good at having a holistic

understanding by locating the non-Western Other within the project of theorising *what is West/non-West*, the understanding of *kendō* practice by practitioners in Melbourne is partial, as seen in my analysis (accidental, a spice to add, choice). The practitioners' interaction with *difference* has been constructed through their experiences in the past, or it could be interpreted that a sense of *things familiar* which they felt in their past leads *kendō* practitioners into contact with the Other in the present. As such, this process is not about *locating the Other in a certain time frame*, but rather about *locating oneself within the surrounding differences and building the present through the interaction with the Other*: it is not about assuming the position as a spectator but assuming the position in a spectacle. While Orientalist stereotypes provide a well-ordered and systematic understanding of the Other with one fixed view (the spectator's view), I would suggest that the way *kendō* practitioners interact with the Other is designed by a process of making *familiarity* rather than understanding it as Orientalist process of *possessing* the Other.

3. Subjective Involvement

Though each individual practitioner may have had a range of different reasons to take up *kendō* practice, the narratives of those practitioners indicate that there are two different ways of getting involved in the practice and its community. *Kendō* practitioners are subjectively/objectively involved in the culturally, historically and

ethnically different Other as participants. Throughout the analysis of my fieldwork, I suggested that representing the Other is not only a matter of stereotypes imagined by outsiders' objective view (as discussed in critiques of Orientalist representations). Instead, I explored the meaning of subjective involvement with a culture of the Other in the Melbourne community in which people desire to mingle with different *Others* and *cultures*.

The practitioners' subjective involvement is particularly prominent when they talk about their preference to focus on the self. They are people who are highly conscious about their lifestyle, health, and pleasure. By examining the practitioners' statements on *kendō* practice in which they explain the reasons for their continued involvement in the art, I drew out some characteristic narratives such as expressing the self, developing the self, challenging the self, and managing the self.

Concepts associated with the New Age provided me with a framework to examine this awareness of the self among practitioners in Melbourne. Although Melbourne *kendō* practitioners are not the same as New Agers (my *kendō* friends are not New Age practitioners who read Jack Kerouac, gather at a place in the countryside, drop out of school, and so on), I noticed that both share a sensitivity about being free to think and behave without being controlled by an other (thus controlling their own subjectivity). As Sarah Strauss (on yoga in the West) and Cristina Rocha (on Zen practice in Brazil) have similarly noted for the New Age concept of authentic Self in the popularity of non-Western practices in the West, I have suggested that the situation in Melbourne has to be understood within the contemporary trend of searching for selfhood. This has led

me to conclude that those *kendō* practitioners are ‘epistemologically individualists’ who are seriously committed to seeking an authentic Self (Wallis 1984 :100; Heelas 1996: 21). Important for the practitioners are their own experiences that are designed by individual preference, and what they are interested in is *not authentic otherness but the authentic Self*.

I further emphasise that for some *kendō* practitioners, the discourse of the self is also related to their dissatisfaction with being enveloped in what practitioner K calls *normal Australia*. They engage in *kendō* practice in order to protect their personal autonomy from the disruptions of hectic daily life. Those practitioners somehow see the *kendō* community as a special space in which they can temporarily retreat from *normal Australia*. In other words, the practitioners keep a distance from what they believe to be *mainstream Australian society*, establishing their alternative identities by belonging to this martial arts community. Such preference for temporary retreat clearly shows their attitude towards time and space. Applying the case in Melbourne to Stuart Hall’s argument on New Ager, *kendō* practitioners similarly show their dislike of being enveloped in ‘historicity and the causality of human society’, which sometimes denies the individual the free choice of ‘doing your own thing’ (Hall 1968:12). Practitioners focus on being in the present without being influenced by the continuity of historicity, and they express their self-autonomy by choosing the practice and its community.

In the discourse of Orientalism (as discussed in Chapter Two), the Orientalist understanding of time in relation to the non-Western Other is firmly related to the idea of the chronological order of the past, the present, and the future, and the order creates

the geographical recognition of centre/periphery such as *the modern civilisation where we live/the pre-modern place somewhere far away where they live*. Thus the Orientalists' stereotypes are *an invention of a historicity*, providing a perspective on *how to locate the Self/Other in the geo-chronological order*. Borrowing the idea from Walter Benjamin's notion of authenticity, the Orientalist geo-chronological order is a preference for 'the singular particularity of history' which connects the relationship between the Self/Other with a particular historical site and time (Benjamin 1969): such an authentic attitude is a preference for a *unique presence* in a continuous historicity and a particular place.

Kendō practitioners in Melbourne, however, see significance in experiencing a sense of separation (a space for a temporal retreat from everyday life or bracketing off historicity) while enjoying how to express themselves without necessarily identifying themselves with the long genealogy of a Western time frame. The practitioners' sense of authenticity is cut off from the particular historical place and time, and they focus on the moment of the *here and now* in which they can express the self as the free choice of *doing your own thing*.

4. Objective Involvement

Such attention to the self is further complicated by practitioners' awareness of themselves as foreigners. Even though they are involved in *kendō* practice and its

community subjectively, the practitioners found their foreignness through learning the techniques of body movement of *kendō*, which they believe to be *very Japanese*. As seen in the comment of a practitioner (in Chapter Six), the movement required in *kendō* is *still foreign to him*, while he has found alternative belongingness by practising the art.

Kendō practitioners are also conscious of the gaze of Japanese practitioners, and they imagine that the Japanese practitioners they encounter might see non-Japanese practitioners as outsiders. *Kenshikan dōjō*, which is the hub of the *kendō* community in Victoria, has some Japanese practitioners, including visitors from Japan. For some non-Japanese practitioners in Melbourne, the presence of those Japanese constantly challenges their position in this martial art. In other words, *kendō* practice gives the non-Japanese practitioners an opportunity to reflect upon themselves in the imagined eyes of Japanese. At these moments non-Japanese practitioners see themselves as *outsiders*, and this contributes to the process of building their *kendō* identities.

This process of *objectively* identifying oneself as *outside* is different from an Orientalist representation, which I examine in Chapter Two. In the discourse of Orientalism, the way Orientalists build their identity as observers is established through *one-way* interaction with the non-Western Other, and through the interaction they preserve (or confirm) their positioning of *we Europeans*. In other words, as Bhabha describes in his analysis of a Western fetish desire for stereotyping the non-Western Other (1983), Orientalist identification is one-way involvement with the Other in which one protects one's identity while destroying that of the Other, or it is the self-evident process of keeping oneself unchanged while tampering with the Other.

By contrast, the *kendō* practitioners' identification of themselves vacillates along the border between the Self and the Other. Their interaction with the Japanese Other is a *two-way* interaction in which non-Japanese practitioners struggle to establish their identities as *kendōka*⁹⁷ through an ongoing process of encountering the Other, exposing their presence to Japanese practitioners, realising their outsider-ness, and reframing their positioning. As seen in Victor Segalen's essay, in which his exoticism recognises the Self as being in an process of change in which one is constantly asked to transform into a different Self by stimulation through contact with the Other (Segalen 2002), those *kendō* practitioners experience the process of *reset and restructure* of their identities of the *I* by constantly reflecting upon themselves through an objective perspective. Thus for them, the *I* is a *moment* when *I* physically and ontologically feels to be a new *I*, and the encounter with the Other is a restructuring of oneself from inside/outside oneself rather than observing the Other in foreign countries (Ohira 2008:206).

The representation of *kendō* and things Japanese by non-Japanese *kendō* practitioners in Melbourne shows their various attitudes towards the Other, and their simultaneous essentialising and non-essentialising of *kendō* practice. *Kendō* as a practice of the Other promotes practitioners' subjective identification of the Self, whereas on different occasions these practitioners see their otherness in relation to the practice and through how they imagine themselves to be seen in the eyes of the Japanese Other.

5. The Current Discussions on Orientalism

Throughout my fieldwork I focused on a local situation in Melbourne, and my research on various narratives of *kendō* practitioners has, on the one hand, shown that various aspects bear comparison with the previous discussion on the long genealogy of representation of things Japanese (examined in Chapter Two). On the other hand, current discussions by some researchers also suggest new views on Orientalist representation that provide an interesting contrast to my work. At this final stage of the thesis, I reconsider the contemporary Melbourne *kendō* scene in the context of some current discussions on Orientalism in order to help consolidate my findings. I particularly focus on the work of Brett de Bary and Rey Chow⁹⁸. The researchers' arguments illustrate two distinguishing features (anti-Orientalist didacticism and the discourse of the 'already accomplished') of the contemporary representations of Japan as the Other, and they point to some dramatic changes in the Orientalist discourse from the late 20th Century (de Bary 2006: 64-65). Through a brief overview of these works, I critically point out that 1) the two distinguishing features continuously inherit the same structure of stereotyping the Other from the long genealogy of Orientalist representation, and therefore 2) Chow and de Bary's particular approaches to discourse change risk leaving a clear border between West /non-West without analysing the complex (subjective/objective) perceptions in people's identifications. Instead, I stress the importance to analyse the contemporary stereotypes of non-Western otherness with the *kendō* practitioners' intersubjective perspective that transcends the dichotomy of

past/present and inside/outside.

With Chow's discussion, the first distinctive feature becomes clear. According to Chow, anti-Orientalist didacticism debunks Orientalist stereotypes while at the same time it gives each member of an audience a sense of 'safeguarding his/her positioning as an anti-Orientalist' (Chow 1998: 74). By consuming this didactic play, people intoxicate themselves into thinking they are no longer accused of being Orientalists (ibid). Furthermore such 'stereotype-debunking' implies that people commit complicity with Orientalists by unconsciously justifying themselves, such as Christian Metz's cinematic disavowal: 'I know (this stereotype is not true), but.... ("I will enjoy it anyway")' (Metz 1983: 70, cited in de Bary 2006: 68).

For example, Chow finds such didacticism in David Henry Hwang's 1989 play *M. Butterfly*⁹⁹. Hwang rewrites the famous legend of *M. Butterfly*. In Hwang's version, a French male diplomat falls in love with a Chinese male spy disguised as a Chinese female opera singer, and the diplomat yields to despair after finding this out. According to Chow, the identity of white Western man is no longer guaranteed to be a definite identity, and it becomes instead an unstable positioning with the emergence of the Oriental Other who talks back to the white Western subject. While Chow speaks highly of Hwang's play, which destroys the Western male fantasy about Asia and women¹⁰⁰, she is not satisfied with Hwang's interpretation of the romance. What Hwang does with the French diplomat-Chinese opera singer relationship is, Chow critiques, merely to 'debunk' the idea that a 'fantastical relation to "the other"' is based upon 'a deep-rooted racist, sexist, and homophobic imperialism' (Chow 1998: 79). Chow warns

that it is too simple to only debunk anti-Oriental didacticism which camouflages old colonial stereotypes in the audiences who enjoy the play¹⁰¹.

Based on Chow's argument, Brett de Bary further elaborates such complicity of anti-Oriental didacticism, pointing out a second distinctive feature of contemporary Orientalism. De Bary finds it in William Gibson's novel *Idoru* (1996), and she terms this feature of the contemporary representation of Japan 'neo-Japonisme'. The novel is set in the Tokyo of the future, full of buildings constructed through nanotechnology. The story is presented to readers through the eyes of two Americans who visit Japan to investigate the mysterious romance between a Japanese female star, Rei Toei, and an internationally known male rock star, Rez. The most striking development in the novel is that the rock star, whose nationality is never mentioned, falls in love with a cyborg woman who is an idol of hyper-techno Japan.

In the eyes of de Bary, *Idoru* clearly shows racial stereotypes in words such as 'Jap twist'. The novel also describes the Japanese graduate student Yamazaki with feminising images; two American visitors say that Tokyo chapter meetings of Rez's fan club are laden with 'excruciatingly boring formality'; and they also describe their president as a person who presents himself 'robotically'. However, in a 2001 class discussion, de Bary was surprised to hear her students' comments on the novel (de Bary 2006: 80). They told her they had difficulty finding racial stereotypes in it. For some students, Gibson's text overcomes racial identification. In the discussion with her students, de Bary realised that unlike *M. Butterfly*, Gibson's *Idoru* somehow effaces the historicity, which is contextualised in colonialism, while the novel still embraces racial

stereotypes (de Bary 2006: 79).

De Bary highlights the writing style and language of Gibson's Japan, and she notes a unique aspect in describing otherness in *Idoru*. Quoting the analysis on technology and the sublime by William Tabbi, de Bary critically notes that Gibson's *Idoru* succeeds in showing readers that knowledge about the future is something 'already possessed'¹⁰². By using familiar words such as 'Egg' and 'Ono-Sendai' to explain technological knowledge, readers unconsciously enjoy the description of the future with the image of hyper-real Japan. De Bary quotes Tabbi:

What is perhaps most immediately striking about such a passage is Gibson's precise intuition of just how much abstract technology a modern audience would want to know. Nothing here would trouble even a school-age reader who is the traditional, though by no means exclusive, audience for science fiction. Not the computer jargon...not even the concretization of abstract information in a crystalline lattice, expressed with minimal explanation by the homely figure of 'ice'...Gibson's least turn of phrase heralds an unprecedented knowledge, not with technology itself but with its image. Case in cyber-space can take for granted a populist technology that earlier fictive heroes never had in such packaged and consumable forms. The merest mention of a 'Sense/Net', an 'Ono-Sendai', or a cyberpunk cowboy who 'flatlined on his EGG'---these things can call-up a

ready-made aesthetic and reinforce a popular intuition of technological abstraction that earlier novelists had to *create* in their audience (Tabbi 1995: 218 quoted by de Bary 2006: 89).

As Tabbi writes, technological knowledge is labelled with words people have already known and turned into *consumable forms*. Creating *a sense of consumable*, Gibson's text allows the audience to invalidate (or flatten) *otherness*, and the otherness is absorbed by them simply as *knowledge*, not to be questioned as *difference*. In other words, the readers possess an image of future through the process of reifying it with each word and in each sentence.

At the end of her essay, de Bary further examines the 'already possessed' with Gibson's *indifference* toward raciality. Quoting some lines from Gibson's novel, de Bary highlights Gibson's language, which gives readers an impression that the issue of historicity and the politics of racial identification have been wiped away, as if these issues were 'already accomplished'¹⁰³ in the distant past.

Laney sat there until dawn came edging in through the tall, arched windows, and Taiwanese stainless could be heard to rattle, but gently, from the darkened cave of the breakfast room. Immigrant voices, in some High Steppe dialect the Great Khans might well have understood. Echoes woke from the tiled floor, from the high beams surviving from an age that must have seen the advent of Laney's kind or predecessors,

their ecology of celebrity and the terrible and inviolable order of that food chain (Gibson 1996: 2).

M. Butterfly and *Idoru* show two different examples of ways in which otherness is described in the contemporary world. The examples highlight both the visibility and invisibility of racial stereotypes. Chow's critique suggests that anti-Orientalist didacticism which leads to stereotype debunking is a representation in which the racial Other is visibly highlighted to repent for the colonialist past, whereas de Bary highlights that the discourse of 'already accomplished' invisibly consumes raciality as if the issues of representing the Other were something already solved long ago. What the researchers have provided is a critical view towards the ways in which *ongoing* racial differences are narrated in these texts, and they suggest that contemporary Orientalism attempts to *digest* or *clean-up* the history of these Orientalist stereotypes which have continuously surrounded us since the colonial period. The two researchers critique *seeming reconciliation*¹⁰⁴ through the traumatic history of racial stereotypes. Borrowing ideas from Walter Benjamin¹⁰⁵, willingness for reconciliation is blamed for being a violent conclusion about traumatic history in terms of leading the history into a closed circuit which only takes us to an end (Benjamin 2003:166). Although the Orientalists' racial stereotypes of *Idoru* are much more invisible than *M. Butterfly*, both texts similarly consume non-Western otherness as a story that has *an ending*. The didacticism is an act of distancing oneself from Orientalist stereotypes, and it categorises Orientalists' stereotypes as *out-dated fashion*. In *Idoru* too, Gibson's language treats readers as if the

Orientalist tradition of representing the Other was something *already happily solved* in the past. Instead, the researchers suggest to leave the *traumatic wound of racial stereotypes* open without having a *happy ending* in order to remind us not to forget the sin of violating the Other (Jay 2003: 4, 11–24).

Their warning (Chow and de Bary) about the visibility/invisibility of Orientalist racial stereotypes clearly points up problems in the Orientalist discourse of postmodern society, and I understand why they try to keep remembering Orientalist stereotypes evident in a dominant discourse without any ultimate solution. However the anti-Orientalist didactic together with the discourse of ‘already accomplished’ share the same strategy with the time-framing of the Other in previous forms of Orientalism. Although de Bary points out the dramatic change in the current Orientalist discourse from the late 20th Century, the strategy of separating the non-Western Other from the Western present can be continuously seen in the two discourses. Indeed, *M. Butterfly*’s didacticism attempts to separate *ongoing racial stereotypes* from the presence of audiences by making a happy ending of a violent colonial history through stereotype debunking while *Idoru* concludes its story with celebrating words which narrate racial stereotypes as a remnant of the past. Such theorists’ framings, as I discovered when my Occidental eyes were turned toward the non-Japanese practitioners in Melbourne, sometime risk repeatedly confirming the dialectic spiral between Orientalists and Occidentalists. The stereotypes call up further stereotypes, reproducing the mutual essentialisation against each side.

Instead I suggest the importance of an intersubjective perspective when dealing with the discourse of Orientalism which helps us transcend the dichotomised categorisation of the Other (past/present or Oriental/Occidental). Intersubjectivity is ‘a view of the world arrived at through mutual confirmation and negotiation between different and independent perspectives’¹⁰⁶, and it adds to one’s subjectivity ‘a common evidence’ shared among others (Crossley 1996:3). With the intersubjective perspective, the visibility or invisibility of Orientalist stereotypes does not necessarily mean either didactic anti-Orientalism or things ‘already accomplished’.

Crossley reconceptualises intersubjectivity by drawing on Martin Buber’s ontology in *I and Thou* (Crossley 1996). Crossley reported Buber’s twofold conceptualisation of the world for human intersubjectivity and alterity. One of two ways is called I–Thou relations that represent ‘a mutual relationship’ which ‘is immediate and space is shared with the other’ (Crossley 1996: 11). In I–Thou relations, ‘a *subject who is in communication with us*’ recognises the presence of the Other as a whole, forming relations to others in the process of placing oneself in between (ibid: 11). The other way is called I–It relations, which objectify alterity; this way ‘constitutes the other as an object (an I) to be *experienced* and *used*’ (ibid:11). In I–It relations, the Other is constituted as parts ‘being located in space’: ‘the other is an *object of our experience*’ to be manipulated by one’s subjective intention (ibid: 11).

If Orientalism is interpreted as communication between subjects and alterity, a fundamental understanding of representing the Other can be explained with Crossley’s reconceptualisation on intersubjectivity. Based on Crossley’s idea, the discussion of

Chow and de Bary on intersubjectivity covers only one side, as they only focused on an aspect of human intersubjectivity based upon I–It relations. Thus, both researchers criticised the writing style of two texts where otherness, or ongoing racial stereotype, is experienced as if it has already accomplished and manipulated as an object to fulfill the subjects’ desire toward the Other. In Crossley’s words, this intentional subjective involvement into otherness would be termed an aspect of *egological subjectivity* (or I–It relations) found in intersubjective human interaction (ibid: 12, 15).

Meanwhile, Melbourne practitioners could be interpreted as those who find a relationship with the Other found in I–Thou relations. Although some practitioners are very keen to be subjectively involved in the practice of the Other, there are also those who place themselves *in communication with the Other*. In the former case, they are very keen to engage in something new(ness), and the otherness of the practice is embraced in their *subjective pleasure* in such a way as to negate cultural and historical difference. Furthermore, what they are interested in is temporarily retreating from the everyday scene, which limits practitioners’ satisfaction in controlling *their own subjectivity*, and diving into cultural differences as a place to seek the authentic Self. As such, some practitioners focus on the Self, and this action suggests the subjective intention of Melbourne practitioners towards the culture of the Other. Borrowing words from Crossley, Melbourne practitioners’ intention, or their subjective involvement, ‘is constituted by self’ and ‘is clearly not addressed as “thou”’: ‘the other qua object of experience’ (*kendō* practice) is ‘reduced to self, neither speaking for themselves nor relating with self’ (ibid: 15). Meanwhile, Melbourne practitioners are not necessarily

focused on subjective interaction with the Other, which fixes the relationship with the Japanese Other and its martial arts, but they are open to the relationship with the Other as third meaning (Chapter Three). They constantly learn the relationship with the culturally and historically different Other through reflecting upon themselves from an imagined perspective of the Japanese. Practitioners' subjective involvement in *kendō* does not imply that they ignore communication with the Other in practicing *kendō*. As seen in the narrative in Chapter Five, the practitioners' constant reflection about themselves as foreign indicates that they do not have a *happy end* in the interaction with the Other, but that instead their interaction with the Other is *an ongoing story of resetting and restructuring* of the *I*. Through this objective/subjective perspective, the practitioners notice a view from the Japanese Other, and they eventually escape from being trapped by the dialectic dichotomy, achieving an intersubjective perspective. With this vision, their encounters with the Other in the contemporary world involve multiple positionings to see *difference* around them.

The *dōjō* works as an alternative space to interact with the Other, which has a different cultural and historical background, without consciously noticing raciality, turning the practice of the Other into the practice of the Self. The practice of the Other is interwoven into the Melbourne practitioners' present. The contact with the Other creates the moment of *here and now*. The case of Melbourne suggests that the culturally and historically different Other is not fully explained with I–It relations; moreover, it shows that practitioners 'belong to the interworld which forms between them' and they turn attention 'towards an ontology of the "interval" or the "between"' (ibid: 12).

My ethnographic journey focusing on a small *kendō dōjō* in Melbourne opened a door to a new way to understand Orientalism in a mobile interactive social present. It has led me to emphasise the importance of approaching Orientalist representations, not from an ethical perspective that is accusing of Orientalist hypocrisy, but from an intersubjective perspective in order to keep our eyes open to the actual interactions that are daily explored between the Self/Other.

Epilogue

As I write this epilogue, I am back in Japan. My four-year journey to Australia started with an analysis of the 19th-Century representation of things Japanese, and now it is ending with the diverse voices of contemporary Melbourne practitioners echoing still in my ears. Unlike those early scholars and travel writers, who did not have a chance to communicate with their informants after returning home, my relationship with my non-Japanese practitioners continues through modern technology. It is a strange feeling when I log into e-mail and Facebook. The communications reveal to me the vivid daily lives of those Melbourne practitioners. I still ontologically feel close to them and they write that they feel close to me. Their time and my time synchronise through the internet, and I realise that their attitudes towards their practice have also been *reset and restructured* outside the Melbourne *kendō* community, through interacting with those practitioners like me who are staying outside Australia.

While I found that the Melbourne practitioners interacted with outsiders (in the community and on websites), I have noticed that Japanese practitioners (in my local *dōjō* in Japan) seem less involved with the outside world. In my local *kendō dōjō*, there are no practitioners who come from outside Japan. For most Japanese practitioners in my local area (Kobe), *kendō* culture outside Japan belongs to a different world. Unlike Melbourne practitioners, my local practitioners do not have a chance to interact with *kendō* practitioners who have diverse backgrounds, and thus they do not have a chance to reflect on how *kendō* has been represented and practised by non-Japanese

practitioners. For someone like me who can now see *kendō* culture from both inside and outside, there seems to be two parallel universes existing independently without fully intersecting. That is why my re-appearance and my four-year story may be seen as providing a *difference* for my Japanese friends, and I am now a person who came (back) from the outside world. Thanking me for the souvenirs I brought from Australia, practitioners asked me many questions, and they seemed very interested in knowing how *kendō* is practised in Australia and why Australians are practising the art. I then realised that my four-year experience in Melbourne gave me a unique positioning which belongs simultaneously to both sides and to neither.

Sitting at my familiar desk at home, I am now thinking of my ambiguous positioning, constructed through my interacting with Melbourne practitioners, and some lines in *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom* by T.E. Lawrence (or Lawrence of Arabia) came to mind. In the book, which I first read ten years ago, Lawrence expressed his loneliness as an intermediary who could see the Arabs through both English and Arab eyes. Though many (such as Said¹⁰⁷ and Arendt¹⁰⁸) have critiqued him as an Orientalist, it was Lawrence who first taught me the mystery (both good and bad) of involving oneself in a culture of the Other.

In particular, Lawrence tells us that one who is deeply involved in a culture of the Other sees ‘madness’. The madness deprives one of a place to belong, and it makes him/her feel isolated from one’s own world and the place where he/she travels. Lawrence, an English lieutenant colonel and an archaeologist, tried to understand the Arabs. Through the process of involvement with the Arabs, however, he reflected back

on the West with his new eyes, and he realised that he had lost a place to go back to and a place to remain. This is what he called ‘madness’.

In my case, the effort for these years to live in the dress of Arabs, and to imitate their mental foundation, quitted me of my English self, and let me look at the West and its conversations with new eyes: they destroyed it all for me. At the same time I could not sincerely take on the Arab skin: it was an affectation only. Easily was a man made an infidel, but hardly might he be converted to another faith. I had dropped one form and not taken on the other, and was become like Mohammed’s coffin in our legend, with a resultant feeling of intense loneliness in life, and a contempt, not for other men, but for all they do. Such detachment came at times to a man exhausted by prolonged physical effort and isolation...and then madness was very near, as I believe it would be near the man who could see things through the veils at once of two customs, two educations, two environments (T.E. Lawrence 1997: 14).

Throughout my four years in Melbourne, much like Lawrence in the Arabian desert, I tried hard to learn how non-Japanese *kendō* practitioners see the practice and things Japanese. My eyes gradually opened to the non-Japanese practitioners, and I found that my expectation towards non-Japanese practitioners in Melbourne was a

misinterpretation of the Other. Such experience, which finally destroyed my old view, does not, however, lead me to the same answer as Lawrence; instead, it made me realise the importance of someone like me who travels from one place to another. Two different worlds initially do not know each other, but through me, they can be bridged as a cross-cultural space. My eyes, tongue, and body are a removable cross-cultural spot. In contrast to Lawrence's regret that 'madness' was near 'the man who could see things through the veils at once of two customs' (ibid: 14), I would say rather that two different worlds, for the first time, are combined by my involvement, which provides me a chance to tell both sides what I have seen. In traversing and sometimes deconstructing the border between inside/outside (or the Self/Other), practitioners (including myself) develop a sense that *imagining the Other* is a continuously changing process of interaction.

Endnotes

¹ The term *culture* has been broadly and diversely defined and critiqued. I follow definitions by

² There are many definitions of the terms *ethnic* and *ethnicity* that are often used when an individual expresses his/her group identity (Barth 1969: 9-10; Eriksen 2001: 42-70). In this thesis I refer to the *ethnically different other* as someone who is not identified as being in the subject group sharing a common destiny of fundamental social condition of life. For further explanation, please refer to Barth 1969 and Hylland 2001:42-70.

³ In this thesis, I upper-case *the Other* to describe an individual or a group of people who are recognised as *cultural, ethnical and historical different*, and I lower-case *the other* when mentioning someone who is biologically and ontologically different from the presumed subject.

⁴ In this thesis, I upper-case the Self to describe an individual or a group of people who construct an awareness of themselves against *the cultural, ethnical and historical different Other*, and I lower-case *the self* when individuals are biologically and ontologically aware of themselves as separate from the next individual. Additionally, I follow the style of anthropologist Sarah Strauss when I mention authentic Self throughout this thesis. Strauss upper-cases authentic Self to denote the self who is free from stressful daily life or 'a self which is at ease, relaxed, able to express itself without being buffeted about by external pressures' (Strauss 2005: 58). For further explanation, please refer to my discussion in Chapter Five.

⁵ Similarly, Timothy Brennan argues, 'we have for some time now been witnessing a shift from a binary otherness to a single, internally rich and disparate plurality: a variety of levels within and sites between, rather than the lonely outputs on either side of belief's wall' (Brennan 1997: 2).

⁶ Hegelian dichotomy is a means of recognition in which two different existences recognise each side through negating the other. Thus, both sides paradoxically need each other, accepting the existence of the other side while at the same time confirming the *difference* of the other side. Please refer to Cynthia Willett 1998. Willett explains Hegel's master-slave dialectic that 'one cannot grant recognition to oneself. That is, one cannot simply assert or otherwise count oneself as a person and find any reality in this act of self-recognition. Such an act of self-recognition would constitute a total fraud, or worse, a psychological delusion...In particular, according to Hegel, one establishes that one is a person only in a contest that takes place before witnesses...The person can seek freedom only through the struggles that earn intersubjective recognition' (Willett 1998: 154).

⁷ According to James Carrier, Occidentalism is a mirror term for Edward Said's term Orientalism, with which Said critiqued the Western tendency towards othering—it is the counterpart of the concept of Orientalism (Carrier 1995). As Orientalists stereotype Orientals as strangers, at the same time they create their image of themselves (the Occidentals). In other words, Occidentalism is the dialectic self-definition process in which the Occidentals define what they are against the image of the orient. Carrier further points out a different sort of Occidentalism in which the image of the Occidentals is imagined by the Orientals, and the Orientals identify what they are through the perspective of the Occidentals.

⁸ Australian football league.

⁹ As this study focuses on the way in which the Western self sees the other, it excludes discussion of contemporary ethnographic museums where non-Western people are in control of their own identity politics and present and contextualise their own objects.

¹⁰ *judō* players.

¹¹ It is one of a number of Japanese martial arts which *bushi* (or *samurai*) practised. *Kendō*, which was formed along with Japanese modernisation, derived from *kenjyutsu*. Since the modernisation of Japan, *kenjyutsu*, a practice of *bushi*, gradually disappeared.

¹² Yamada (2001) analyses Herrigel's famous episode of the 'target in darkness' by comparing it with Komachiya's later rendition. In 1940, Komachiya wrote, 'After reading Herrigel's (1936) essay, I asked Awa about this incident one day. Awa laughed and said, "You know, sometimes really strange things happen. That was a coincidence"' (Komachiya 1982: 99). Komachiya reported the account of Anzawa, the most senior practitioner among Awa's students. Anzawa said, 'On that

occasion, I performed a ceremonial shot (*reisha*). The first arrow hit the target, and the second arrow made a “crack” sound as though it had struck something. Herrigel went to retrieve the arrows, but after a long time he did not return. I called out, “Eugen! Oh Eugen!” Then, I said, “What is it? How come you do not answer?” Then, well, there was Herrigel sitting down directly in front of the target. I went up to him like this (Awa imitated someone walking nonchalantly.) I said, “What is the matter?” Herrigel was speechless, sitting rooted to the spot. Then, without removing the arrows from the target, he brought them back...’ (Komachiya 1965 quoted in Yamada 2001: 18). However, in Herrigel’s account, this episode is written as if he encountered Awa’s superhuman performance, highlighting the mysteriousness of *kyudō* practice (Herrigel 1982: 47-48).

¹³ Please consider Donohue’s point that: ‘the similarity in these films is not only the result of the fact that modern audiences have acquired a taste for emotional catharsis through the vicarious experience of violence. The underlying thematic elements of these tales transcend mere violent action. What they point to is a concern with social relationship. They are also particularly obsessed with...the limits of individual action as opposed to group conformity, and questions concerning social connection’ (1994: 65).

¹⁴ This version is published by the Japanese publisher, Kenkyusya, in 1936.

¹⁵ Please refer to Rajyashree Pandey: ‘Nitobe’s book was reissued in 1905, appearing in bookshops just after Japan’s victory at Tsushima. It was widely read after the Russo-Japanese war by foreigners. American president Theodore Roosevelt, who had occasion to read the work not long after the outbreak of the war, professed to being deeply impressed by it. Nitobe’s interpretation of *bushidō* played a significant role in explaining to the West how a tiny country like Japan had succeeded in defeating a country such as Russia...in the 1930s, *bushidō* was even propagated as a tool for revitalising national ethics elsewhere, as Grant Goodman has show in the case of the Philippines’ (Pandey 1999:44).

¹⁶ *Kerekere* is a local economy that is based on reciprocal interaction amongst kin in Fiji (Thomas 1992a:213-232). However, before the 1860s, there is no record that *kerekere* was practised among the Fijians. The practice of *kerekere* appears in the process of colonisation, and it was the Western colonisers who first recognised the practice as a distinctive aspect of the local Fijian society. After a while, the colonial administration began prohibiting the practice of *kerekere* for the reason that the practice disturbed the development of the Fijian market economy. In their reflection on the prohibition, locals asserted the practice as uniquely Fijian, reifying it as a *tradition* of Fiji.

¹⁷ Thomas argues that ‘the question ... is not, How was tradition invented? But instead, *Against* what were traditions invented?’ (Thomas 1992a: 216).

¹⁸ Hobsbawm claims that traditions are often invented and that what people normally call ‘authentic traditions’ may be factitiously made (1983: 2). Traditions are invented, Hobsbawm argues, particularly when ‘rapid social changes’ (such as nation-building and nationalism) occur. Through this process of invention, societies renew social cohesion, reinforce membership of groups, and regain mass control (ibid: 4, 9). Hobsbawm defines an invented tradition as ‘a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past’ (ibid: 1). After the publication of Hobsbawm’s book, anthropologists such as Jolly took issue with Hobsbawm’s notion of the invention of tradition (Jolly 2000: 274-297). Claiming that Hobsbawm was essentialising traditions by distinguishing ‘genuine traditions’ from ‘invented traditions’, they further examined the issue of authenticity. For example, they claimed that Hobsbawm had produced the dichotomy between ‘authentic’ and ‘inauthentic’ traditions. Jolly, for example, points out that Hobsbawm presumes ‘authenticity’ when he says that ‘genuine traditions’ are constructed unself-consciously, while ‘invented’ traditions are consciously produced through contemporary nation-building, patriotism, and ethnonationalism (Jolly 2000: 274-297). Jolly claims that ‘unself-consciousness is associated with natural communities — self-consciousness with unnatural or “pseudo-communities (nations, countries)” ’ (ibid: 276). She continues: ‘According to Hobsbawm, the bonds of the former are specific and strongly binding (the canonical rituals being rites of passage); those of the latter are vague about the values inculcated, but compulsory in the rites of patriotism. Although Hobsbawm is careful not to essentialise and eternalise traditional societies,

he does draw a distinction between unself-conscious customs perpetuated by natural communities, such as villages, and self-conscious traditions invented by unnatural ones, namely nations and states' (Jolly 2000: 276).

¹⁹ In this thesis, I particularly draw on the work of non-Japanese authors (in the English speaking world) in order to concentrate on how Japan and Japanese martial arts (such as *kendō*) have been represented outside of Japan.

²⁰ Please also refer to the works by Japanese researchers such as Kousuke Nagaki and Kiyoshi Abe. Although these researchers are based within disciplines other than anthropology, their works are worthy of note. In particular, Nagaki conducted cross-cultural research on Australian and Japanese *judō* practitioners (Nagaki 1998). Abe's research focuses on Japanese nationalism in relation to martial arts such as *karate* and he analyses the representation of Japanese-ness by Japanese by strategically using the image of *karate* (2001).

²¹ In *The Zen Arts*, Cox examines the martial art *shorinji kempō* and *chadō* (the way of tea) as zen practices that are deeply related in Japan (2003). He investigates the relationship between individual practitioners' practice and Zen arts as a *national* culture of Japan, examining the balance between the arts as discourse and individual practice. Applying the concept of mimesis from Taussig, he discusses how each individual explores 'a variety of ways of being a practitioner, deconstructing the discourse of 'authentic' Japanese culture' (Cox 2003: 244-245).

²² For example, Chapman focuses on the relationship between personal identities, physical practice, and social structure within *kyūdō* and *karate* practice in Japan (2005: 99). He illustrates how an individual practitioner of these two martial arts communities communicates with fellow members within a framework of 'creative ambiguity'. The creative ambiguity is the fluidity of meaning in which individuals simultaneously define a meaning through interacting with their environment (ibid: 63). Chapman argues that individual practitioners practise each martial art as a 'shared activity' in order to have 'a sense of emotional significance' (ibid: 86). He examines the *dōjō* as a place to physically belong to, but also as a place to build meaning. Such intersubjective interaction, or what Chapman calls 'the atmosphere' (ibid: 86), integrates 'practitioners' personal spheres of interaction' with 'socially prescribed roles and rules' (ibid: 86). Through his ethnography in Japan, Chapman discusses martial arts 'as a site of agency' (ibid: 100).

²³ At this stage, I have only had the opportunity to examine this in the English-speaking world.

²⁴ Furthermore, the *Bushidō* code in martial arts culture has often been narrated as something that characterises the *national character* of Japan and Japanese identity. Lord Redesdale once commented that Japan was a nation-state where *Bushido* was 'the soul of the nation' (1906: 252). In *The Image of Japan*, Lehmann too points out that the values of martial arts have shaped Japan's social morality and become the most cherished aspect of identity in Japanese society (1978: 143-144). Alfred Stead, a news correspondent for *The Times*, explained the national formation of modern Japan in relation to the concept of *samurai* culture and *Bushido*. In his book he quotes the words of Inazō Nitobe, who first summarised the concept of *Bushido* in written form, to say that 'The transformation of modern Japan is itself the fruit of the teaching of *Bushidō*' (Stead 1905:57).

²⁵ The Japanese martial arts are widely recognised as practices related to Zen Buddhism among non-Japanese practitioners. In many introductory books for non-Japanese practitioners, such as C.W. Nicol's *Moving Zen*, Nathan J. Johnson's *Barefoot Zen*, Randall Hassell's *Zen Pen & Sword: The Karate Experience*, and Joe Hyams's *Zen in the Martial Arts* (McDermott and Arce 2004 :42), the arts are describes as 'moving Zen'. An introductory book by Donohue that introduces *kendō* to non-Western practitioners states, 'Only in actual practice of Kendo can you come to understand the commonality between the spiritual dimension of Kendo and some of what Zen seeks' (Donohue 1999:160) H continues to say, 'Whether it is through the seated meditation practised by Zen Buddhists or the "moving meditation" of Kendo, only by becoming one with the activity do we have the hope of achieving the integration that both promise' (ibid: 161).

²⁶ Otomo further analyses the complexity of the Mishima Affair within the Orientalist perspective. According to her, Mishima's novel 'is a genre through which Japanese writers have, since their torrential exposure to Western literature in the Meiji period, sought to create an indigenous subject endowed with an interior as "deep" as that of the Western subject. Mishima's novels in particular

were able to evoke a Westernised/modern space that was foreign and therefore seductive, set in the familiar landscape of Japan. Despite this, when Mishima is read in the West, he is often “Orientalised” and the modernity of his texts is ignored... In the same way, the Mishima Affair has become slotted into Western memory as something exclusively Oriental (and therefore pre-modern) ... Mishima successfully invoked a “pre-modern-scape” by performing suicide by *seppuku*’ (Otomo 2001: 31-32).

²⁷ Please refer to Otomo who explains that ‘Jim Jarmusch’s 1999 film *Ghost Dog: the Way of the Samurai* plays upon postmodern eclecticism; “almost all scenes have reference to the films in the past”. The “so-called” Mishima Affair of 1970, by contrast, has been defined by critics both within Janas and abroad as an occurrence confined to its socio-historical context. What links these two texts is the concept of *bushidō*’ (Otomo 2001: 31).

²⁸ Please see Oscar Wilde’s *The Decay of Lying*: ‘Now do you imagine that the Japanese people as they are presented to us in art, have any existence? The actual people who live in Japan are not unlike the general run of English people; that is to say, they are extremely commonplace, and have nothing curious or extraordinary about them. In fact the whole of Japan is a pure invention. There is no such country, there are no such people. One of our most charming painters went recently to the Land of the Chrysanthemum in the foolish hope of seeing the Japanese. All he saw... were a few lanterns and some fans... He did not know that the Japanese people are, as I have said, simply a mode of style, an exquisite fancy of art’ (Wilde 2004:22).

²⁹ All individuals as material are always already a subject of ideology (Althusser 1972 (1971): 164). Althusser states that ‘ideology has a material existence’; each individual is transformed into a subject of ideology by being materially categorised (Althusser 1972 (1971): 155). For example, a person is fixed in a certain social class without his/her will and he/she is gradually governed to act and behave like a person in that social class. This is what Althusser calls the concept of ‘hailing’ or ‘interpellation’ (Althusser 1972(1971):162). In terms of categorising each individual into a certain material existence, Althusser’s concept of ideology can be applied to the context of Orientalism in which the Oriental Other is categorised through being materially fixed as *Oriental*s by taxonomy, archaeology, ethnology and museum collecting.

³⁰ See also Shelton (2011).

³¹ Blumenbach states, ‘Finally, I am of the opinion that after all these numerous instances I have brought together of negroes of capacity, it would not be difficult to mention entire well-known provinces of Europe, from out of which you would not easily expect to obtain off-hand such good authors, poets, philosophers, and correspondents of the Paris Academy; and on the other hand, there is no so-called savage nation known under the sun which has so much distinguished itself by such examples of perfectibility and original capacity for scientific culture, and thereby attached itself so closely to the most civilized nations of the earth, as *the Negro*’ (Blumenbach 1865: 312).

³² Also available from Cornell University digital library. Accessed on 22nd of June 2012.

<<http://digital.library.cornell.edu/cgi/t/text/pageviewer-idx?c=mayantisavery;idno=18865311;view=image;seq=1>>

³³ In the field of anthropology, Boas’s salvage anthropology regarded non-Western cultures as ‘vanishing cultures’ and aimed to preserve such ‘primitive’ cultures (Erickson and Murphy 2008:95). Therefore North American anthropology in the early 20th Century was eager to document and collect non-Western cultures. As Boas himself worked for museum collections, those cultures became a subject for museum display. Criticising salvage ethnography in relation to the ‘ethnographic present’, Clifford pointed out that a ‘salvage ethnographer could claim to be the last to rescue “the real thing”’; ‘authenticity, as we shall see’, he continued, ‘is produced by removing objects and customs from their current historical situation’ (Clifford 1988:228).

³⁴ Famously, Claude Monet was a big collector of Japanese prints and plants. In his house at Giverny, Monet displayed over two hundred prints, and his garden was coloured by Japanese plum trees and willows. In his *La Japonaise* of 1876, Monet drew a picture of his wife wearing a gorgeous kimono, with many fancy Japanese fans on the wall behind her. Similarly, paintings by Van Gogh in which he drew Japanese flowers, fruit trees, bridges, and butterflies became a source of inspiration for European artists.

³⁵ Additional information: In France, the Exposition Universelle was held in 1867, and the Japanese Court attracted a large French audience. Japanese goods were rapidly available as 'the mass consumption of oriental items' in Europe and the United States (Lee 2010:25). Indeed, in 1868, the Goncourt brothers, who had discovered Japanese art much earlier, were surprised that 'we were the first to have this taste . . . it is now spreading to everything and everyone, even to idiots and middle-class women' (Ives 1974:12). By 1872, the term *Japonisme* was coined by a French collector and art critic, Phillippe Burty, to describe the influence of Japanese aesthetics on Western art culture (Walker 2009 (1999): 55).

³⁶ For additional information: The *Japonisme* movement was widely welcomed in European countries and soon gained universal popularity. By the early 1870s, the well-known Australian publication, the *Town and Country Journal*, had already introduced Japanese woodblock prints (Walker 2009 (1999):57). In 1879 in Sydney, the International Exhibition was held, and the Japanese Court saw many visitors. The *Sydney Morning Herald* on 8th September 1879 reported about the Exhibition that the Japanese Court was the most popular among all international displays (ibid: 61). Indeed, Walker mentions that 'Japanese exhibits featured prominently among the prize-winning entries: porcelain, china, cloisonné ware, earthenware, silk garments, fans and 'fancy articles' paper products and photography along with bronze, iron and copper castings all won first prizes' (ibid: 61). Australia's leading art critics, such as James Smith, expressed their enthusiasm about Japanese art objects. Smith comments in the *Argus* on 5th March 1887 that 'instead of being a mere cog or wheel in a vast and complicated piece of human mechanism . . . and feeling no interest whatever in his occupation . . . the Japanese artificer works in the spirit of the medieval artisan' (ibid).

³⁷ Julien Viaud is the French naval officer who wrote under the name of Pierre Loti.

³⁸ The story of *Madame Chrysanthemum* is based on Loti's experience in which he temporally married a Japanese woman in Japan. The temporal marriage between foreigners and Japanese women was common at the time in Japanese treaty ports. Young Japanese females were provided to visitors from the West for sexual services and housekeeping. Their marriage usually ended with the return of foreign husbands. Loti's first-hand account with exotic themes on this newly opened country tells Western readers about the details of marriage; Japanese customs and people are described through the eyes of this French naval officer.

³⁹ According to Daunais, those writers have to deal with tedious repetition to describe the place and people they see; therefore, 'effective travel writing, in this way, has to go beyond just observation'. Daunais continued, 'what the Orientalist does is *confirm* the Orient in his readers' (Daunais quoted in Turberfield 2008:112-113). In the case of Loti, he was good at writing about his emotional reactions 'that adds interest to what would otherwise risk becoming repetitive' (ibid:113).

⁴⁰ Loti's books were reprinted many times and translated into various European languages (Wilkinson 1983: 114).

⁴¹ Surprisingly, the romantic description of the *Butterfly legend* of Japan, so named by Brett de Bary, is still influential in the present day and widely attracts non-Japanese audiences. A hundred years after the publication of *Madame Butterfly*, the same pattern in the novel has been repeatedly reproduced, for example, in contemporary films such as *The Last Samurai* (A story set around the end of 19th Century, which is about the same time Loti first came to Japan). Indeed, the film depicts Japan as a country of old feudalism, noble *samurai*, old customs, and exotic women. The female Japanese heroine in the film, similar to the heroine in *Madame Butterfly*, obediently takes care of her foreign husband, and is represented as being devoted to being submissive to her Western lover (Tom Cruise), a military officer who escaped from the US to Japan, where he discovers the beauty of old Japan. The love/romance between them is designed by the erotic gestures of the heroine, and the image of the hyper-feminine Japanese woman is re-confirmed. The last scenes show the Japanese woman waiting for the officer's return, as does Puccini's *Madama Butterfly*.

⁴² Iwabuchi argues with Western intellectuals such as Chamberlain, Samson and Reischauer, suggesting that 'They were fascinated with some exotic parts of Japan, and lamented the loss of "authentic" Japanese tradition in the process of modernisation' (Iwabuchi 1994).

⁴³ In this thesis, I excluded an examination of the representation of Japan during the two World Wars since such a representation cannot be examined without a full understanding of politics of

European imperial expansion. Representation during the wars, in which Japan became the enemy of the Allies, has to be examined as a special case. Here, I introduce an example which shows the relationship between the Japanese military expansion and the European representation of Japan. Holmes and Ion have noted how Japan was seen in Britain from the early 1900s around the time of the Russo-Japanese War to the time of the Second World War (Holmes and Ion 1980). Examining the diary of Beatrice Webb, a member of the Fabian Society in Britain, they note that Webb's early account linked Japan to the image of samurai which she had learnt from books, representing Japan as the morally sophisticated country with the code of samurai (Webb 1904 cited in Holmes and Ion 1980:320). Webb was impressed by the image of noble samurai who are morally strict with themselves (ibid 321, 323). She had even described the Salvation Army officers as a samurai group (ibid 323). However, once the reality of Imperial Japan became more prominent, she began expressing her hatred towards Japan. She wrote that Japan is 'an evil influence in the world, intensely imperialist . . . Japan has "lost her head" and I think her soul' (Webb 1937 cited in Holmes and Ion 1980: 321).

⁴⁴ For additional information: In the case of Western countries like Australia, in which the economic and political connection with Asian regions, including Japan, has been promoted at the government level, there has been a dynamic reaction against Asia and Japan. After the Second World War, particularly with the administration of Whitlam, Fraser, Hawke and Keating, the Australian government gradually opens up the country to Asian migrants. Bob Hawke clearly describes that Australia has to find out our 'true place in Asia' (Milner 1997: 32). However, as Naomi Smith discusses, while the Keating government promotes Australia's stronger engagement with Asia, 'a majority of the Australian public did not share the views of the Keating government' (Smith 2004: 34). According to some news polls, many Australians did not support the government's big shift towards Asia (Milner 1996 cited in Smith: 34).

⁴⁵ According to the survey by Manday Thomas, those young Australian anime consumers who frequently go to manga clubs in Sydney are 'mostly male, tertiary educated and under the age of 30' (Thomas 2000: 205).

⁴⁶ Manday Thomas discusses cosmopolitan consumer culture in relation to Asian sub-culture in Australia, and she found that Asian cultural elements such as food, music, films, and anime were welcomed by some groups of Australians (Thomas 2000). Through observing prestigious restraint guides, such as the 'Good Living Guide' by the *Sydney Morning Herald*, Thomas found that an award of great street food in Sydney is usually given to a restaurant in which 'Asian cuisine is a predominant style, but only if it is among other elite cultural consumption practices (such as cafes which must serve the 'right' coffees)' (ibid: 204). She suggests a powerful link between Asian food and Australian national identity as a 'multicultural nation', suggesting 'the cosmopolitan connoisseurship of ethnic difference' in White Australian society (ibid: 204). In other words, the consumption of cultural difference is a 'strategic deployment to claim a superiority' to show one's tolerant understanding of racial difference and the ability of control over 'cosmopolitan capital' (Hage 1997: 126; Thomas 2000: 204-205). In the case of Japanese artefacts, Thomas also notices a similar connoisseurship. Describing the fans of Japanese music as 'consumers', she highlights their curiosity towards cultural difference as 'a style' in the narratives of a small group of young Australians who are crazy about Japanese punk (Thomas 2000: 205; Norris 2000: 225). She introduces her interview with one of them: 'None of my friends understand what I see in Japanese punk—but I find it highly creative and futuristic. It offers me something that others miss out on. One needs time to appreciate these things' (Thomas 2000: 205). As such, things Japanese are popular in Australia with the combination of sub-cultures as 'cosmo-multicultural capital' (ibid: 204), and the image of Japan which those younger generations have shared is different from that of the older generation (Norris 2000: 229).

⁴⁷ Along with the image of *techno-Japan*, the image of Japanese women has also changed. For example, the analysis of Japanese females by Craig Norris indicates the emergence of a new image of Japanese women, examining those heroines in cyberpunk stories (such as a female cyborg anti-hero Major Kusanagi in *Ghost in the Shell*) (Norris 2005). Being seen in the image of Major Kusanagi who is armed and powerful, Japanese women are no longer depicted as fancy, submissive

and delicate, as in the Madame Butterfly Legend. Referring to Norris, Thomas analyses the way those young Australians consume Japanese anime: 'As Craig Norris found, exported anime is radically different from that enjoyed in Japan. Operating here is a political economy of taste among overseas fans of these cultural products, which serves to fetishise Japan as being able to readily provide objects of belonging as well as images of a hyper-violent technoculture' (Thomas 2000: 205).

⁴⁸ It is a feudal regime which is established by a *shogun*. *Shogun* is the head of *samurai* class. The *shoguns* are nominated by the emperor and they had been the *de facto* rulers of Japan (or regents) until the end of *Edo* period.

⁴⁹ As some researchers discuss, the popularity of Asian martial arts became most prominent after World War II (Friman 1998:18, McNamara 2007). For example, in the case of the US, the military servicemen stationed in Japan during the occupation began to train in Japanese martial arts (Friman 1998:18). By the 1950s, Japanese martial arts were encouraged for the personnel by military officials such as General Curtis B. LeMay and General Thomas E. Power in Japan and the US. Japanese martial arts instructors were invited to train with the American personnel in the military bases in Japan and the US (Draeger 1996:49). The contact between the American servicemen and Korean martial arts during the Korean War was another key aspect of introducing Asian martial arts to the West (Friman 1998:18). As such, in the 1950s and 1960s, Asian martial arts were introduced in the US by military personnel and Japanese instructors. Then, the arts were incorporated into official trainings such as US Marine Corps training (Schmidt and Bristol 2005: 269-286). Further, training halls were opened across the country and American citizens enjoyed the practices. Amateur competitions were held in *judō* and *karate*.

⁵⁰ Some records show that Asian martial arts gradually spread across the world around the end of the 19th Century (Friman 1998; Hickok 1977; McNamara 2007). In the case of *judō*, President Grant of the US observed a *judō* demonstration while on a trip to Japan in 1879. However, *Judo* was not officially introduced to the US until 1902 (Friman 1998:18). An instructor of *Kodokan* (a school of *judo*) toured the US and demonstrated the art (Hickok 1977: 296). President Theodore Roosevelt too was well known to be enthusiastic about the art and was a *judo* practitioner (Suzuki 2005:15; McNamara 2007). As Rosenberg discusses, the popularity of *judō* is also related to the history of Japanese immigrants to the US and it gradually became popular after the 1920s (Rosenberg 1995: 19). Twenty years prior to the establishment of the International *Kendo* Federation, the International *Judo* Federation was founded in 1951. In September 2007, 199 countries officially participated in the IJF (All Japan Judo Federation), <http://www.judo.or.jp/article-reader/internal-1.0.php?id=438-2007IJFcongress>, accessed on 30th January 2012.

⁵¹ Please refer to <<http://www.budo.ac/kendo/salon/infomation/sugie070803/sugie070803.html>>

⁵² This early account of Japanese swordsmanship was recorded by Gary Oliver. Oliver provided useful information on the early development of *kendō* in Australia which was otherwise lacking (Oliver, G. 2007). There was only one written account prior to Oliver's work, and that was a personal essay written by John Butler, providing first-hand information on the early years of *kendō* practice in Melbourne. Oliver was involved in the development of a website for Victoria *Kendō Renmei*, and is writing the historical section of the website. Much of the history that Oliver collected on the official website was compiled from personal stories that he heard directly or indirectly from Butler and other early *kendō* practitioners (both non-Japanese and Japanese in Australia), and people closely associated with *kendō* practitioners. One of Oliver's interview subjects was *sensei* Sumitake Nagae. Although he returned to Japan a few years ago for health reasons, *sensei* Nagae committed his private time to the development of *kendō* at *Kenshikan dōjō* in Victoria. He provided a wealth of historical knowledge for Oliver, and also provided information regarding *kendō*'s origins. Other key persons whom Oliver mentioned included those who are still practising *kendō* at the *dōjō*, teaching the younger generation of students either as *sensei* or senior practitioners. As Oliver noted, the history he compiled was a collection of insight and recollections from past and present *kendō* practitioners in Victoria and the whole of Australia. Following Oliver's example, I garnered historical information largely through hearing the memories and personal experiences of fellow

members at the *dōjō*. As the development of *Kenshikan dōjō* was closely related to the development of *kendō* in Victoria, I was fortunate to have interacted with many key persons involved in the development and promotion of *kendō* in Victoria and Australia more broadly.

⁵³ Regarding the *kendō* uniform, the colour of the *dōgi* (or *kendōugi*) has to be either white or dark blue. The choice of the colour depends on personal preference, but not on the rank of grades.

⁵⁴ When *sensei* Nagae first came to Australia, he was living in Cobram in the central north of Victoria where Snow Brand had a joint venture project with the Murray Goulburn Co-op.

⁵⁵ *Kenshikan dōjō*, Programme, Opening Ceremony, 15 July 2009, 'Thank You' by Mrs Shizue Otsuka, translated by Mr Hiroshi Otsuka.

⁵⁶ The drum is beaten three or four times with a stick by whichever practitioner is nearest to the drum.

⁵⁷ The term *centre* is widely used by *kendō* practitioners. It means to keep body balance by focusing one's mind on the centre of body. Losing *centre* leads to lose unbalanced body posture and movement.

⁵⁸ In contrast to Australia, in Japan most *kyu* practitioners are children since Japanese who practise *kendō* mostly begin the art when they are young. Ranks from 6th to 3rd *kyu* are not officially recognised by the All Japan *Kendō* Federation. Instead, local *kendō* clubs are responsible for giving the lower *kyu* grades to schoolchildren.

⁵⁹ There is no concept of 'territory' among *dōjō*. As far as I know, *dōjō* do not compete with each other for practitioners. Each practitioner can register for his/her preferred *dōjō*, and they can change their membership from one to another if necessary.

⁶⁰ *Shinpan* are umpires who judge in a match. In Victorian *Kendō Renmei* as well as in Japan, those practitioners who are in high ranks are asked to attend the seminar. The practitioners are expected to be umpires in local and national matches.

⁶¹ Once a month, the females organise a special training for female practitioners. All female practitioners are encouraged to participate in this women's training. In each women's training, there are only six or seven participants, including practitioners from the other *dōjō*. The senior female practitioner, K.S., leads the training, which is held at *Kenshikan*. According to K.S., the purpose of the training is to strengthen the female body and the level of female *kendō* in Victoria both physically and technically. In particular, K.S. once told me that male practitioners train in a manner that is very different from the manner in which female practitioners do. Even though she does not consider female practitioners physically weaker than male practitioners, she insists that 'we women' need to develop and advance our own fighting style. According to her, 'power *kendō*', which Australian male practitioners tend to practise, is not suitable for female practitioners. In contrast, a woman's body is well suited for flexible movement which does not require as much power as men exert and adapts to various techniques with soft, light, and quick movements. K.S. also asserted that this flexible female *kendō* is very similar to the traditional old-style Japanese *kendō*, which has gradually disappeared with the emergence of the modern-style *kendō* in Japan. She is now conducting sociological research in Victoria University on female *kendō* culture in Japan and seeking methods by which women can develop their own fighting style. Although I do not suggest that every participant in the Women's Special Training share her view toward *kendō*, it is true that regular female practitioners, who join the Women's training, are those people who gather for this special training and are at least interested in strengthening their body and developing a female style for fighting and making the art enjoyable for women.

⁶² K.S., who is in her mid-30s and is an Australian of European origin, has trained to compete in the World *Kendō* Championship and has also trained in Shiga Prefecture, Japan, for a year. At present, she is in charge of coaching the female practitioners in Victoria, in particular, the female practitioners in the Australian National Team. Although she officially belongs to *Fudoshin dōjō*, her influence over *Kenshikan* female practitioners should not be ignored.

⁶³ Please refer to the website of All Japan *Kendō* Federation
< <http://www.kendo.or.jp/column/255.html> >

⁶⁴ Please refer to *Mutsusinpou* (a Japanese news paper)
< <http://www.mutusunpou.co.jp/news/2011/12/19159.html> >

⁶⁵ Please refer to the website of Oita-Press (a Japanese news paper)

< http://www.oita-press.co.jp/localSports/120731038943/2010_129237461889.html >

⁶⁶ For additional information, I included the case of practitioner K, whom I examine in detail in Chapter Five. *Kendō* allows female practitioners like K, who has a background in amateur wrestling, to feel the ‘intensity’. As her narrative explains in a later section, she feels that one of the best things about *kendō* practice is that it lets her express herself through shouting, fighting, and sparring, and she is fully committed to the training. Indeed, she always tells the other *dōjō* members how much she loves getting herself into situations in which she can display her fighting skills, which shows how strongly she feels about fighting. Her fighting spirit is quite remarkable. One day, a Japanese master, who was on a short visit to Melbourne, asked me, with a serious expression why she is so enthusiastic about fighting. He kept saying that every time he had a sparring training session with her, he would be taken aback by her aggressive stance. According to the master, K’s eyes are so fierce that it seems as if she is a real warrior for whom fighting becomes a matter of life and death. Most of our *dōjō* members also agree that she seems to turn into someone else when she starts sparring. So, it was no surprise when she won the Fighting Spirits Award at the Australian *Kendō* Championships.

⁶⁷ Regarding the ‘adrenalin thing’, we have to add here the case of practitioner K. Practitioner K sees *kendō* practice as a form of expressing her inner *intensity*, which has been suppressed in daily life. As shown in the study conducted by Elias, it is evident that the practitioner seeks bodily excitement through *kendō* practice and enjoys ‘a high adrenaline thing’ placing their bodies in a ‘mock’ combative situation.

⁶⁸ The word ‘edgework’ is a term coined by sociologist Stephen Lyng (2005:48)

⁶⁹ For additional information, please refer to Lindholm (2008). According to Lindholm, edgeworkers—who voluntarily indulge in high-risk activities such as white-water rafting, kayaking, bungee jumping, mountain climbing, and so on—are also categorised as people who seek personal authenticity. Lindholm explains that they are ‘seekers to escape from uncertainty about the authenticity of their experiences’ and ‘the stimulation of powerful bodily sensations’ gives them a sense of real experience ‘with deep feeling[s] of personal authenticity, communion, and faith that their ‘true’ selves control their action[s] in extreme situation[s]’ (Lindholm 2008: 48, 50). Quoting Thomas De Zengotita, Lindholm argues that, ‘in such circumstances, in the most majestically indifferent settings on earth, accident and necessity unite under the sign of mortal danger to yield the purest possible encounter with the real’ (De Zengotita 2005: 214 quoted in Lindholm 2008: 49).

⁷⁰ AFL (Australian Football League).

⁷¹ P.S. further explores his being *not normal* from a different perspective, focusing particularly on his *kendō* practice. According to him, his interest in *kendō* practice does not come from his interest in the cultural aspects of the art, which is, he believes, commonly seen among *kendō* beginners. Instead, he says that his interest in *kendō* stems from his long-term involvement in *budō* such as *karate* and *judō*. He said that: ‘Yea it’s a little bit “not normal” sort of thing. Usually people are sort of “Oh yea I saw this and that all cultural things”. Because I was already doing a form of *budō*, and have been doing *karate* for a quite long time. When I started *karate* I was 15 and *judo* when I was the age of 6 to 9 and then...*iaidō*, and many years of *kyūdō*!’ By the time he got involved in *kendō* practice, Japanese martial arts had become familiar.

⁷² Please refer to Natalie Jackson: ‘Australia’s post-war baby boom began in 1946 and ended in 1965’ (2006: 1).

⁷³ However, *kendō* practice is not open to anyone. *Kendō* is a difficult community to access. According to R’s son, the *dōjō* is very limited space for him in terms of being involved in the communal network, and he has said to R ‘they’re all snobs!’. R’s son had started *kendō* with R, but one day I heard from R that his son had told him that *dōjō* people were not friendly and that he felt that he might do something wrong. R’s son has complained to R that he feels isolated from other practitioners, especially from the senior members. Indeed, from my participant observation, I can see that it is very hard for someone who merely joins in the practice to be accepted as a member of the *dōjō*. As I have observed, 90% of beginners leave training after a few months. However, according to R, a good thing about *kendō* is that one gradually gets accepted by the members of the *dōjō*

through long-term commitment to training and participation in social activities. Through long-term participation one gains respect and comes to be seen as reliable as well as improving one's kendo skills. R told me that he became interested in taking care of the junior practitioners once he became good enough to instruct them. He called it 'sitting on the big boy's table'. As seen in R's words mentioned earlier, one needs time to be accepted and respected as a member. Long-term commitment to the community is very important.

⁷⁴ Community identity is also formed through participating in *kendō* competitions. In March 2010, the Australian *Kendō* Championship was held by the Australian *Kendō* Federation in Melbourne. *Kendō* practitioners gathered from all around Australia to compete against each other. Victoria was the team winner of the year, and individual awards were also given to each practitioner in the team. After the dinner party, Team Victoria went to a local pub to celebrate our win. At the pub, the practitioners were talking about the story of Victorian *kendō*. Inspired by the stories from the old *kendō* players at the party, some started talking about their own local story. The young members of Team Victoria, who were inspired by the old stories at the dinner party, sat down together with their glasses of beer and imagined how difficult the past practice was, sharing memories with the older generation and giving importance to the present day win. The process of passing on old memories showed not only that current Victorian *kendō* was built on narrated hardships of an earlier time, but also allowed for an historical continuity between the past and the present, giving to the younger generation a whole picture of how 'Australian *kendō* or Victorian *kendō*' was established. In this way *kendō* as an individual practice also becomes a collective practice. Although I am not saying that every practitioner takes the story seriously, it is also true to say that such story-telling gives a horizontal connection (a certain kind of collective sense) among those people who would otherwise see *kendō* purely as an individual activity. Indeed, at the pub the Victorian practitioners talked of the past members, saying 'we're so lucky', 'we're proud of them', 'our commitment to training is nothing compared to them', 'we need to develop Victorian *kendō* more' and 'we're' Such narratives of 'we' show that they find themselves sharing a situation that is built upon the same past. The practitioners' narratives of 'I'm practising *kendō* ... ' is replaced by words such as 'we are practising *kendō* in Victoria and Australia ... '.

⁷⁵ The championship is also a space for passing old memories to a younger generation. After the championship, those who participated were invited to a dinner party. This was the first time I saw several famous practitioners in Australia. Some of them were the officials who founded *kendō* in Australia. While dinner was being served, officials and other older practitioners gave speeches on the many difficulties that they had experienced in the early days. Even though they had practised in different states, those older practitioners were fellow members who had been involved in the Australian *kendō* Federation from the beginning of its establishment. Sharing the memories of hardship, some of those practitioners who gathered from different states shook hands and wiped tears from their eyes. Now they celebrate the fact that the Australian *Kendō* Federation is recognised as an umbrella organisation under the All Japan *Kendō* Federation and the International *Kendō* Federation. The dinner party soon became an old men's gathering, and they also told the younger generation sitting next to them about the early struggle to establish *kendō* in Australia. Listening to their narrations, I found that the championship not only functions as a competition but also keeps the memory of their struggle alive. The dinner party was not just a space for the Federation to show appreciation for the players who compete in the competition, but it was also a space to reproduce the communal history of people who have been involved Australian *kendō*.

⁷⁶ R's narrative on *taekwondō* is based on his understanding of the art, and it does not mean every *taekwondō* instructor runs their *dōjōs* for profit.

⁷⁷ I follow the style of anthropologist Sarah Strauss when I describe the authentic Self throughout this thesis. Strauss upper-cases authentic Self to denote the self who is free from stressful daily life or 'a self which is at ease, relaxed, able to express itself without being buffeted about by external pressures' (Strauss 2005: 58).

⁷⁸ According to Rocha, 'Significantly, these purportedly Buddhist features present in the counterculture as well as in New Age were part of modern Buddhism, constructed by the interaction of Asian and Western elites from the 19th Century onward as a way to counter the threat of

Westernization' (Rocha 2006: 114-115).

⁷⁹ The definitions by the twelve professionals are that: 'Zen has to do with culture, refinement, and it is contemporary; it reflects a particular mood; it is poetic because it incorporates all elements of life; it is quality above all; it seeks the essence; it has to do with visual simplicity; it is functional – it is here to be used; it is monastic but not poor; it is not decorative; Zen accessories are powerful because they carry memories and stories within themselves; Zen ambiances are monochromatic' (Rocha 2006: 127).

⁸⁰ Although counter-culture originates from the Beat movement, the Beat and counter-culture are not exactly the same. As Macfarlane discusses, the Beat movement was taken up by a particular group of intelligentsia such as Ginsberg, Kerouac and Burroughs who resisted established institutions such as the government. The Beats were 'cutting edge' (Macfarlane 2007 :15). On the other hand, the counter-culture of the '60s and '70s was not a single movement led by particular elites. Rather, it was a movement of people from various backgrounds who did not share the ideas of mainstream Anglo-American society. These people ranged from African Americans who sought black identity through the music of Jimi Hendrix, to civil-rights and anti-Vietnam protesters, hippies, homosexuals, feminists who were against traditional sex-roles, Zen meditation practitioners like the Beat writers, and people concerned with an ecologically sustainable lifestyle (Onkey 2002:206; MacFarlane 2007: 14-15; Heelas 1996: 1, 51).

⁸¹ Ginsberg explains his bohemian lifestyle that: 'We didn't have what you would call a philosophy. I would say there was an ethos, that there were ideas, themes, preoccupations...the primary things was a move towards spiritual liberation, not merely from Bourgeois, 50s quietism, or Silent Generation, but from the last centuries of mechanization and homogenization of cultures, the mechanical assault on human nature and all nature culminating in the bomb...the search for new consciousness...I don't think we had it clearly defined, but we were looking for something...as a kind of breakthrough from the sort of hyper-rationalistic, hyper-scientific, hyper-rationalizing of the post-war era' (cited in Oldmeadow 2004:258)

⁸² The ideas of New Agers have many aspects in common with counter-culture and a subgroup represented by the hippie movement. Please refer to MacFarlane 2007:10, Oldmeadow 2004: 258, Onkey 2002: 206, and Marty 1997: 125.

⁸³ For the voyage, the hippies tend to use mystic and exoteric practices. In particular, they pay attention to non-Western and pre-Christian religious practices as being seen among New Age practices (Hall 1968:8).

⁸⁴ The Beat culture also expresses opposition to authority and tradition. Societies in which Beat culture and counter-culture emerged had been unsettled by the Second World War, the war in Vietnam, and the cruelty and inhumanness of the American military deployment. MacFarlane describes the period from the 1960s through the 1970s in terms such as 'spiritual malaise' (MacFarlane 2007: 10). *Non-violence* became a key term, and the ideas of older generations – the so called *traditions* which led the country into the wars – were rejected. Instead, as seen in the works by iconic Beat writers such as Allen Ginsberg and Jack Kerouac, the younger generation supported a Bohemian lifestyle which praised cultures that break up mainstream tradition such as Jazz music, black musical idioms, Blake and Romantic poetry, European existentialism, Japanese Zen, and literature (MacFarlane 2007: 9, Oldmeadow 2004:245). In such Bohemian lifestyle people seek spiritual liberation from the mainstream social norm, and the slogan of a 'love and peace' driven by an attention to 'human nature' was highlighted.

⁸⁵ There is another aspect in the narrative of New Agers. Heelas examines the paradox of New Agers, calling them 'perennialists'. In place of Western traditions, New Agers are interested in shamanism, Buddhism, Native American teachings, and so on, seeing them as practices which are not authorised by an established authority. 'From the detraditionalized stance of the New Age what matters is the "arcane", the "esoteric", "the hidden wisdom", the "inner or secret tradition", the "ageless wisdom"' (Heelas 1996: 27).

⁸⁶ For self-cultivation, according to Hall, hippies tend to use mystic and exoteric practices (1986). Hall argues that the hippies show interest to non-Western and pre-Christian religious practices as

New Age practices (1968:8), and he further emphasises an Orientalist interest expressed among them. 'The sacred books of Eastern religion and mysticism, the erotic code-books, the figures of the Buddha and of Karma, fragments of eastern philosophy, the adoption of the kashdan, the simulated Orientalism of Leary's ritual LDS 'performances', the music of Ravi Shankar, the zitar, the looping and winding dances, the Buddhist chants of Allen Ginsberg - all these are elements in the eclectic Orientalism of Hippie life, representing a return to contemplation and mystical experience' (ibid:8).

⁸⁷ For additional information: Lindholm (2008) categorises the notion of authenticity in two categories, personal authenticity and collective authenticity. As an example of collective authenticity, Lindholm mentions identity-building which is related to nationalism such as the invention of 'real cuisine' in a country, traditional dance to establish a national identity, and so on (ibid). As an example of personal authenticity, Lindholm mentions the charisma of holy saints in mediaeval relics, edgeworkers who seek high-risk activities such as mountain climbing, and the contemporary artists like Picasso. Regarding the contemporary art, he explains that 'The high evaluation of the artist/corrector evolved until, as Charles Taylor writes by 1800 "the artist becomes in some way the paradigm case of the human being, as agent of original self-definition". For the artist, as for the modern individual, "self-truth and self-wholeness are seen more and more not as means to be moral, as independently defined, but as something valuable for their own sake"' (ibid:17). According to his argument, the artists like Picasso sought non-Western otherness and tried to trace back 'the origin of humankind' (ibid:19). By trying to identify himself with the non-Western Other, he 'discovered' the authentic Self and show his resistance to everyday organised Western society (ibid: 19). However, as I have discussed in my thesis, such identification of Picasso is rather derived from his desire towards 'becoming the Other'. Picasso's interest in himself presupposed the imagination of the Other, and it is different from the interest in the authentic Self seen among Melbourne *kendō* practitioners.

⁸⁸ Please refer to Whyte's discussion on Descartes' idea of mind: 'One part of his mind, impatient for logical clarity, thought: the soul is of a nature wholly independent of the body' (*Discourse*), and 'it is certain that I am really distinct from my body and can exist without it' (*Meditations*). But he was also a careful observer, and another part of his mind thought: 'The mind is so intimately dependent on the condition and relations of the organs of the body that if any means can ever be found to render men wiser and more ingenious than hitherto, I believe it is in Medicine they must be sought for' (*Discourse*)' (Whyte 1967: 27).

⁸⁹ Yoko Kurokawa (2004) in her PhD dissertation discusses 'becoming the Other' in relation to Orientalist exoticism towards the non-Western Other. She analyses Hawaiian hula practice in Japan, examining the narratives by Japanese hula practitioners. In the narratives, Kurokawa found that some practitioners represent Hawaii as 'romantic tropical island' and 'pristine nature', and they express desire 'to be a Hawaiian' (ibid:17, 400-402). She concludes that such desire (becoming the Other) for hula and Hawaii indicates that practitioners create the image of pre-modern Hawaiian life which 'the Japanese felt they had lost in the hurried process of postwar modernization' (ibid: 401).

⁹⁰ Japanese practitioners have close relationships with each other. For example, male practitioners often go out for a drink after weekday trainings. *Izakaya* (Japanese style pub) is their popular place to have Japanese beer. Those who have brought their families from Japan constantly exchange information. For them, *Kenshikan dōjō* is not only for training the art, but it is also a small *Japanese community*.

⁹¹ In *kendō* the teaching position is normally given to practitioners who hold 5th *dan* or above.

⁹² 'Stamina-friendly' are words which practitioner D coined in our conversation.

⁹³ *Suburi* is basic training and is part of warming up. Holding the *shinai* in both hands, the practitioner moves his/her arms up and down in order to learn the cutting movement. This warm-up also builds muscles.

⁹⁴ *Nippon* Sport Science University is famous for physical education, and many of the top high school athletes from different fields (from popular sports to martial arts) enter the university for further training.

⁹⁵ Pietz also defines the fetish using four consistent ideas: '(1) the untranscended materiality of the fetish: "matter", or material objects, is viewed as the locus of religious activity or psychic investment; (2) the radical historicity of the fetish's origin: arising in a singular event fixing

together otherwise heterogeneous elements, the identity and power of the fetish consists in its enduring capacity to repeat this singular process of fixation, along with the resultant effect; (3) the dependence of the fetish for its meaning and value on a particular order of social relations, which it in turn reinforces; and (4) the active relation of the fetish object to the living body of an individual: a kind of external controlling organ directed by powers outside the affected person's will, the fetish represents a subversion of the ideal of the autonomously determined self' (1987: 23).

⁹⁶ Anne McClintock similarly says that 'by displacing power onto the fetish, then manipulating the fetish, the individual gains symbolic control over what might otherwise be terrifying ambiguities' (McClintock 1995:184).

⁹⁷ A *kendō* practitioner (see Appendix 2).

⁹⁸ Their research targets popular literature and films. Although one might imagine that the focus of these researchers (literature and films) differs from that of an anthropological fieldwork such as mine, both focus on the *text* of what people talk about, as my field research does.

⁹⁹ *M. Butterfly* by David Henry Hwang was first staged in 1989. The Butterfly legend is one of the most enduring stories in which the Western imagination of romance between a Japanese woman and a Western man inspires Western readers' interest in the exotic East. In Hwang's *M. Butterfly*, however, the colonial fantasy towards an Oriental woman is disrupted by the heroine, a Chinese male spy disguised as a Chinese female opera singer, Song Liling. The film is a romance between Song Liling and a male French diplomat, René Gallimard, who works in China. When Gallimard first sees Song, she is on stage playing the role of Madame Butterfly. Gallimard falls in love with this opera singer, and he does not notice until the final scenes that the Chinese woman he loves is actually a man who is spying for the Chinese Communist Party.

¹⁰⁰ According to Hwang, he believes his play: '*M. Butterfly* has sometimes been regarded as an anti-American play, a diatribe against the stereotyping of the East by the West, of women by men. Quite to the contrary, I consider it a plea to all sides to cut through our respective layers of cultural and sexual misperception, to deal with one another truthfully for our mutual good, from the common and equal ground we share as human beings' (Hwang 1989: 100).

¹⁰¹ In comparison with Hwang's version of *M. Butterfly*, which tries to simply debunk the Butterfly stereotypes, Chow rather appreciates Cronenberg's version of *M. Butterfly*, which cynically tells us that there has been nothing behind the fantasy but the secret itself. In other words, Gallimard (a French diplomat) does not seek out the secret essence of romance with his Butterfly but instead seeks the form of the secret. What he tries to protect is Song's (an opera singer) 'perfect lie', but not true love with her. Cronenberg's film 'raises questions about the fundamental misrecognition inherent to processes of identification, which the encounter between an Oriental woman and a Western man magnifies and thus exemplifies' (Chow 1998: 79). 'Instead of entirely dispensing with the antiOrientalist didacticism, however, Cronenberg's film makes it part of its dramatization of the Gallimard-Song relationship. In this dramatization, the film no longer simply offers a diatribe against the stereotyping of the East by the West, or of women by men' (Chow 1998: 79).

¹⁰² In addition, de Bary discusses that 'Just as the bi-racial (Chinese/Irish) identity of the rock star Rez, who is infatuated with Rei Toei, never elicits commentary from other characters in *Idoru*, the knowledge of cultural and racial crossing on many levels is assumed to be *already possessed* by Gibson's reader' (de Bary 2006: 92).

¹⁰³ Please also consider de Bary's notion that 'Precisely because such seamless cultural fusion is assumed to have been "already accomplished", Gibson's novel even titillates readers by re-circulating blatantly racist stereotypes (or images that border on being such) which are, however, clearly designated as being from the "past"' (de Bary 2006).

¹⁰⁴ According to Martin Jay, Benjamin signals that willingness for reconciliation is often regarded as the most important thing in dominant discourse, and Benjamin believes that the consolation for trauma makes the 'happy ending' of a tragic history (Jay 2003: 4, 11–24). What Benjamin expresses here is rejection of consoling trauma; instead, he indicates that a 'happy ending' is a violent solution, as it neglects the traumatic message from death. Benjamin insists on leaving the traumatic wound open, and he suggests not seeking a 'happy end' and closing the wound. The only way the dead can approach living things is to present their existence as a corpse and remain grotesque to the eyes of

living things. Willingness for reconciliation is blamed for being a violent conclusion for a traumatic history in terms of leading that history into a closed space which only takes us to an end, and Benjamin signals the discourse of 'working through' grief and anger (Jay 2003: 4).

¹⁰⁵ For additional information: In his *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*, Benjamin states :
 'Everything about history that, from the very beginning, has been untimely, sorrowful, unsuccessful, is expressed in a face—or rather in a death's head. And although such a thing lacks all 'symbolic' freedom of expression, all classical proportion, all humanity —nevertheless, this is the form in which man's subjection to nature is most obvious and it significantly gives rise not only to the enigmatic question of the nature of human existence as such, but also of the biographical historicity of the individual. This is the heart of the allegorical way of seeing, of the baroque, secular explanation of history as the Passion of the world; its importance resides solely in the stations of its decline' (Benjamin 2003:166).

¹⁰⁶ Crossley explains that 'Husserl expresses concern regarding solipsism because, he claims, other perspectives on the world than my own are necessary if the objectivity of the world is to be established. Objectivity, in this sense, is intersubjectivity...It manifests in a form of interpersonal persuasion and decision-making which relies neither upon force nor upon deception but upon an appeal to common evidence and argument, and thus to a reciprocity of individual perspectives and an interchangeability of individual standpoints' (Crossley 1996:3).

¹⁰⁷ Said discusses that 'Out of such a coercive framework, by which a modern "colored" man is chained irrevocably to the general truths formulated about his prototypical linguistic, anthropological, and doctrinal forebears by a white European scholar, the work of the great twentieth century Oriental experts in England and France derived...They acted, they promised, they recommended public policy on the basis of such generalization; and, by a remarkable irony, they acquired the identity of White Orientals in their natal cultures — even as, in the instances of Doughty, Lawrence, Hogarth, and Bell, their professional involvement with the East (like Smith's) did not prevent them from despising it thoroughly. The main issue for them was preserving the Orient and Islam under the control of the White Man' (Said 1979: 237-238).

¹⁰⁸ Arendt suggests that T.E. Lawrence 'was seduced into becoming a secret agent in Arabia because of his strong desire to leave the world of dull respectability whose continuity had become simply meaningless, because of his disgust with the world as well as with himself. What attracted him most in Arab civilization was its "gospel of bareness ... [which] involves apparently a sort of moral bareness too", which "has refined itself clear of household gods" ' (Arendt 1976: 218). Arendt further discusses Lawrence in relation to totalitarianism: 'Lying under anybody's nose were many of the elements which gathered together could create a totalitarian government on the basis of racism' (ibid: 221).

References

- Abe, Kiyoshi. 2001. *Samayoeru nashonarizumu* [Wandering Nationalism]. Tokyo: Sekai Shishousya.
- Alcock, Sir Rutherford. 1878. *Art and Art Industries in Japan*. London: Virtue and Co., limited.
- Alter, Joseph. 1992. *The Wrestler's Body: identity and ideology in North India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Althusser, Louis. 1972(1971). *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
- Alexander, Garth. 1991. Japanese 'ants' take the fight to the foreigners. *Sunday Times* June 23. London, England.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London•New York: Verso (revised edition).
- Aoki, Tamotsu. 2007(1999). *Nihonbunkaron no henyō* [The changes of theories on Japanese culture]. Tokyo: Chuoukouronsya.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. *Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1998 (1958). *The Human Condition*. Second edition with an introduction by Margeret Canovan. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
1976. *The Origin of Totalitarianism*. New York: A Harvest Book•Harcourt, Inc.
- Ashcroft, Bill and Pal Ahluwalia. 2000(1999). *Edward Said: The paradox of identity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Barth, Fredrik. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Barthes, Roland. 1977. *Image Music Text*. essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath. London: Fontana Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1991(1989). *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
1993. Postmodernity, or Living with ambivalence. In Joseph Natoli and Linda Hutcheon (eds.) *A Postmodern Reader*, pp1-24. New York: State University of New York Press.

- Benjamin, Walter. 1969. *Illuminations*. Edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt. New York: Schocken Books.
2003. *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*. Introduced by Geroge Steiner and translated by John Osborne. London • New York: Verso.
- Bennett, Alexander. 2006. The FJ Norman Saga—The Final Chapter? *Kendo World* 3 (3): 8-15.
2004. A Brief Synopsis of The History of Modern Kendo. *Kendo World* 3 (1): 6-15.
- Bhabha, Homi. 1983. The Other Question . . . Homi K. Bhabha Reconsiders the Stereotype and Colonial Discourse. *Screen* 24 (6): 18-36.
1990. The Third Space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In Jonathan Rutherford (ed) *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, pp.207-221. London: Lawrence&Wishart.
- Blackshaw, Tony. 2005. *Zygmunt Bauman*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Blumenbach, Johann Friedrich. 1865. Natural Variety of Mankind. In Thomas Bendyshe (ed) *Anthropological Treatise of Johann Friedrich Blumenbach*. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Robert & Green.
- Boulnois, Luce. 2005. *Silk Road: Monks, Warriors & Merchants*. Hong Kong: Odessey Books & Guides.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977(1972). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. translated by R. Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bousiou, Pola. 2008. *The nomads of Mykonos: performing liminalities in a 'queer' space*. Berghahn Books.
- Braga, J.M. 1942. The Panegyric of Alexander Valignano, S.J. *Monumenta Nipponica* 5 (2): 523-535.
- Brennan, Timothy. 1997. *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Breckenridge, Carol. A and Peter van der Veer. 1993. *Orientalism and Postcolonial Predicament*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Breckenridge, Carol. A. 1989. The Aesthetics and Politics of Colonial Collecting: India at World Fairs. *Comparative Study of Society and History* 31.
- Broderick, Jeff. 2004. *Kendo: The essential guide to mastering the art*. London: New

Holland Publishers.

Budden, Paul. 2000. *Looking at a far mountain: a study of kendo kata*. Boston: Tuttle publishing.

Burke, Kenneth. 1969 (1945). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Butler, John. (year unknown). *A Personal History of the Melbourne Kendo Club* (unpublished essay by Butler).

Carlyle, Thomas. 1853. *Occasional discourse on the Nigger question*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Library (Samuel J. May Anti-Slavery Collection).

Carrier, James. G. 1995. *Occidentalism: Images of the West*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chamberlain, Basil Hall. 2009 (1905). *Things Japanese: being notes on various subjects connected with Japan for the use of travellers and others*. Middlesex: Wildhern Press.

Chandler, James. 1999. *England in 1819: The Politics of Literary Culture and the Case of Romantic Historism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chapman, Kristopher Paul. 2004. Ossu! Sporting masculinities in a Japanese karate dōjō. *Japan Forum*. 16 (2): 315-335.

----- 2005. Inside the Dojō: participation and performance in the Japanese martial arts. PhD Thesis, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Chapman, William. 1985. Arranging Ethnology: A.H.L.F Pitt Rivers and the Typological Tradition. In George Stocking (ed.) *History of Anthropology. Vol.3. Objects and Others*, pp15-48. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Chow, Rey. 1998. *Ethics after Idealism: Theory-Culture-Ethnicity-Reading*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press.

Clarke, John James. 1997. *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter between Asian and Western Thought*. London and New York: Routledge.

Clifford, James and George E. Marcus (eds). 1986. *Writing Culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clifford, James. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Condry, Ian. 2009. *Hip-Hop Japan: Rap and the Path of Cultural Globalization* (Japanese version). Tokyo: NTT Press.
- 2001. Japanese Hip-Hop and the Globalization of Popular Culture. In George Gmelch and Walter Zenner (eds.) *Urban Life: Readings in the Anthropology of the City*, pp357-387. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Corbey, Raymond. 1993. Ethnographic Showcases, 1870-1930. *Cultural Anthropology* 8 (3): 338-369.
- Collins, Robert G. 1977. Star Wars: The Pastiche of Myth and the Yearning for a Past Future. *The Journal of Popular Culture* 11 (1): 1-10.
- Cox, Rupert. 2003. *The Zen Arts: An Anthropological Study of the Culture of Aesthetic Form in Japan*. London: Routledge Curzon.
- 2010. Shorinji Kempo, In Thomas A. Green and Joseph R. Svinth (eds.) *Martial arts of the World*, pp172-174. California: ABC-CLIO LLC.
- Critchley, G.R., S. Mannion, and C. Meredith, 1999. Injury rates in Shotokan karate. *British journal of sports medicine* 33 (3): 174-177.
- Crook, Paul. 1999. Historical Monkey Business: The Myth of a Darwinized British Imperial Discourse. *History* 84 (276): 633-657.
- Crossley, Nick. 1996. *Intersubjectivity: The Fabric of Social Becoming*. London: Sage Publications.
- Dabashi, Hamid. 2008. *Post-Orientalism: Knowledge and Power in Time of Terror*. New Jersey: Transaction publishers.
- Daston, Lorraine. and Katharine Park, 1998. *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150–1750*. New York: Zone Books.
- De Bary, Brett. 2006. Orientalism in the Inter-Cultural Imaginary: The Butterfly Ledeng in D. Cronenberg and William Gibson. In Tomiyama Ichiro (ed) Japanese translation in *Kioku ga karatihajimeru*, pp.59-97. Tokyo University Press.
- Debord, Guy. 1995. *The Society of the Spectacle*. Massachusetts: Zone Books.
- De Gruchy, John Walter. 2003. *Orienting Arthur Waley: Japonism, Orientalism, and the Creation of Japanese Literature in English*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- De Zengotita, Thomas. 2005. *Mmediated: How the Media Shapes Your World and the Way you Live in It*. New York: Bloomsbury.

- Deleuze, Gilles and Paul Patton. 2004. *Difference and repetition*. New York: Continuum.
- Donohue, John. 1994. *Warrior Dream: The Martial Arts and American Imagination*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- 1998. *Herding the Ox: The Martial Arts as Moral Metaphor*. Hartford, CT: Turtle Press.
- 1999. *Complete Kendo*. Massachusetts: Tuttle Publishing.
- Draeger, Donn F. 1996. *Modern Bujutsu & Budo: Volume three of the Martial arts and ways of Japan*. New York: Weatherhill.
- Erickson, Paul A and Liam D. Murphy, 2008. *A History of Anthropological Theory*. High Education University of Toronto Press.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2001. Ethnic identity, national identity and intergroup conflict: The significance of personal experiences. In Ashmore, Jussim, Wilder (eds.) *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction*, pp 42-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Errington, Shelly. 1998. *The death of authentic primitive art and other tales of progress*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ervin, Alexander MacKay. 2005(2000). *Applied Anthropology: tools and perspectives for contemporary practice*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Evans, Robert John Weston and Alexander Marr. 2006. *Curiosity and Wonder from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*. Ashgate Publication Co.
- Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How anthropology makes its object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 1991. *Time and the Work of Anthropology: Critical Essay 1971-1991*. Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- 1996. *Remembering the Present: Painting and Popular History in Zaire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.
- Fara, Patricia. 1997. The appliance of science: the Georgian British Museum, a cabinet of curiosities or a medium for enlightening the general public? *History Today* 47(8) August.
- Feest, Christian. 1984. From North America, In William Rubin (ed.) *"Primitivism" in Twentieth Century Art*, pp.85-95. New York: Museum of Modern Art.

- Fellows, James. 1989. Containing Japan. *Atlantic Monthly* 263 (5): 40-55.
- Foster, Hal. 1993. "Primitive" Scenes. *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1): 69-102.
- Foucault, Michael. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Frankenberg, Ruth (ed). 1997. *Displacing Whiteness*. Duke University Press.
- Fredrickson, George M. 2002. *Racism: A Short History*. Princeton University Press.
- Friman, H. Richard. 1998. The Art of Regulation: Martial Arts as threats to Social Order. *Journal of Asian Martial Arts* Vol.7 November 3.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1999. *Totem and Taboo*. London: Routledge.
- Funabiki, Takeo. 2010. *Nihonjinron saikou* [Reconsidering theories on the Japanese]. Tokyo: Koudansya Gakujyutsu Bunko.
- Gair, Christopher. 2007. *The American Counterculture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gambordella, Grandmaster Ted. 2008. *Oriental Philosophy: Martial arts and Oriental Philosophy*. CreateSpace.
- Gauguin, Paul. 1985. *The Intimate Journals of Paul Gauguin*. London: KPI (Pacific Basin books).
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *Interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic.
- Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press.
- Gibson, William. 1996. *Idoru*. New York: Putman.
- Gould, Stephen. Jay. 1981, *The Mismeasure of Man*, New York/London: W.W.Norton and Company.
- Grassmuck, Volker. 1991. Otaku: Japanese kids colonize the realm of information and media. *Mediamanic* 5 (4) Winter.
- Green, Thomas and Joseph R. Svinth, 2003. *Martial Arts in the Modern World*. Westport CT: Praeger Publishing.
- Guarné, Blai. 2008. On Monkeys and Japanese: Mimicry and Anastrophe in Orientalist Representation. *Journal of the UOC's Humanities Department and Language and Cultures Department* Issue 10:26-36.
- Guttmann, Allen and Lee Austin. Thompson, 2001. *Japanese sports: a history*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Hackett, Rosalind. 1922. New Age Trend in Nigeria: Ancestral and/or Alien Religion? In James Lewis and J. Gordon Melton (eds.) *Perspectives on the New Age*,

- pp215-231. Albany: State University of New York.
- Hage, Ghassan. 1998. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. Australia: Pluto Press.
- Haggis, Jane. 2004. Beyond race and whiteness? Reflections on the new abolitionists and an Australian critical whiteness studies. *borderlands* (e-journal) 3 (2).
- Haggis, J., Susanne Schech, and G. Fitzgerald. 1999. Narrating Lives, Narrating Whiteness: A Research Note. *Journal of Australian Studies* (March).
- Hall, Stuart. 1968. The Hippies :An American 'Moment'. In *Centre For Contemporary Cultural Studies - Sub & Popular Culture Series* No.16. Birmingham: The University of Birmingham.
- 1980. Encoding/decoding. In S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, and P. Willis, (eds) *Culture, media and language*, pp128-138. London: Hutchinson.
- 1997. *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational Connections*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hansen, Paul. 2004. Filming Bushidō: Religion, History and The Last Samurai. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 6 (3).
- Hardt, Miicheal and Antonio. Negri, 2000. *Empire*. Harvard University Press.
- Hayes, Nicole. 2001. *Insiders and Outsiders: Boundary Maintenance and the Construction of Identity Among Youth Travellers in Whistler, British Columbia*. Master Thesis, Dep of Anthropology, McMaster University.
- Heelas, Paul. 1996. *The New Age Movement – The celebration of the Self and the Sacralization of Modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hendry, Joy. 2006. Anthropology in Japan: A Model for Good Practice in a Global Arena? In Joy Hendry and Heung Wah Wong (eds.) *Dismantling the East—West Dichotomy*, pp1-10. New York: Routledge.
- Henthorne, Tom. 2004. Boys to Men: Medievalism and Masculinity in Star Wars and E.T: The Extra-terrestrial. In Martha W. Driver and Sid Ray (eds.) *The Medieval Hero on Screen: Representations from Beowulf to Buffy*. North Carolina: McFarland and Company Inc Publishers.
- Herman, Edward S. and Robert W. McChesney, 1997. *The Global Media: The New Missionaries of Corporate Capitalism*. London and Washington: Cassell.

- Herrigel, Eugen. 1953. *Zen in the Art of Archery*. Translated by Richard F. C. Hull. New York: Pantheon Books.
- 1982 (1941). *Nihon no Kyūjutsu* [Archery of Japan]. Translated by Shibata Jisaburō with an essay (1940) by Komachiya Sōzō. Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko.
- Hetherington, Kevin. 2000. *New Age Travellers: Vanloads of Uproarious Humanity*. London and New York: Cassell.
- Hickok, Ralph. 1977. *New Encyclopedia of sports*. New York: MacGraw Hill.
- Hirsch, Eric Donald. 1993. *The Dictionary of Cultural Literary*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Hobsbawm, Eric and Trence. Ranger, (eds). 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hollinsworth, David. 1992 Discourses on Aboriginality and the Politics of Identity in Urban Australia. *Oceania* 63 (2): 137-155.
- Holmes, Colin and A. Hamish. Ion. 1980. Bushido and Samurai: Image in British Public Opinion 1894-1914. *Modern Asian Studies* 14 (2): 309-329.
- Holmes, R.M. 1971 Counter culture: some anthropological implications. *Lambda Alpha Journal of Man* 3 (2): 20-33.
- Hunt, James. 1867. On the Doctrine of Continuity Applied to Anthropology. *Anthropological Review* 5 (16): 110-120.
- Hwang, David. 1989. *M. Butterfly: With an afterword by the playwright*. New York: Plume.
- Hyams, Joe. 1979. *Zen in the martial arts*. Los Angeles: J.P.Tarcher.
- Ives, Costa Fella. 1974. *The Great Wave: The Influence of Japanese Woodcuts on French Prints*. New York.
- Iwabuchi, Koichi. 1994. Complicit exoticism: Japan and its other. *Continuum: The Australian Journal of Media & Culture*. Vol. 8 No 2.
- 2002. Soft Nationalism and Narcissism: Japanese Popular Culture goes Global. *Asian Studies Review* (Asian Studies Association in Australia) 26 (4) December.
- Jackson, Natalie. 2006. When is a baby boom not a baby boom? Nine points of caution when interpreting fertility trends. *People and Place* 14 (4).
- Jackson, Peter. 1998. Marco Polo and his 'Travels' . *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 61 (1): 82-101.
- Jakubowicz et al.1984. *Ethnicity, Class, Social Policy in Australia*. Kensington, NSW: Social

Welfare research Centre, University of New South Wales.

Jameson, Fredric. 1998. *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern 1983-1998*. London•New York: Verso.

Jay, Martin. 2003. *Refraction of Violence*. New York&London: Routledge.

Jerry, Gafio Watts. 2001. *Amiri Baraka: the politics and art of a Black intellectual*. NYU Press.

Jolly, Margaret. 2000. Specters of Inauthenticity, In David L Hanlon and Geoffrey Miles White (eds.) *Voyaging through the contemporary Pacific*, pp. 274-298. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Jones, David. E. 2002. *Combat, Ritual, and Performance: Anthropology of the Martial Arts*. Westport, Conn: Praeger.

Jupp, James. 2004. *The English in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, Thomas. W. 2006. Being Modern: The circulation of Oriental Objects. *American Quarterly* 58 (2): 379-406.

Kiyota, Minoru 1995. *Kendo: Its Philosophy, History and Means to Personal Growth*. London: Kegan Paul International.

Kluckhohn, Clyde. 1949. *Mirror for man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kohn, Tamara. 2001. Don't Talk – Blend. In Joy Hendry and C.W. Watson (eds.) *An Anthropology of Indirect Communication*, pp163-178. London: Routledge.

----- 2003. The Aikido Body: Expressions of Group Identities and Self-discover in Martial arts Training. In Noel Dyck and Eduardo P. Archetti, (eds.) *Sport, dance, and embodied identities*, pp.139-155. New York: Berg.

----- 2007. Bowing onto the Mat: Discourses of Change through Martial arts Practice. In Simon Coleman and Tamara Kohn (eds.) *The discipline of leisure: embodying cultures of 'recreation'*, pp.171-186. New York: Berghahn Books.

----- 2008. Creatively sculpting the self through the discipline of martial arts training. In Dyck, N (ed.) *Exploring Regimes of Discipline: The Dynamics of Restraint*, pp.99-112. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

----- 2011. Appropriating an Authentic Bodily Practice from Japan: on 'being there', 'having been there' and 'virtually being there'. In Strang, V. and M. Busse (eds.) *Ownership and Appropriation*, pp. 65-86. Oxford: Berg.

Kondo, Dorinne K. 1990. *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in*

- Japanese Workplace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Koshy, Susan. 2004. *Sexual naturalization: Asian Americans and miscegenation*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Krueger, Richard A. 2001. Focus Groups. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, (eds.) *The American tradition in qualitative research* Vol.3. London: Sage Publications.
- Kurokawa, Yoko. 2004. Yearning for a Distant Music; consumption of Hawaiian music and dance in Japan. PhD thesis, University of Hawai'i. Honolulu.
- Lammer, Donald. 1990. Taking Japan seriously: Some Western literary portrayals of the Japanese during the climax of their national self-assertion, c. 1905-1945. In Winks, Robin W. and James R. Rush (eds.) *Asia in Western Fiction*, pp195-214. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Latham, Ronald. 1958. *The Travels of Marco Polo*. translated and with an introduction by Ronald Latham. London: Penguin Books.
- Lawrence, Thomas. Edward. 1997. *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Lee, Josephine. 2010. *The Japan of pure invention: Gilbert and Sullivan's The Mikado*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Lehmann, Jean-Pierre. 1978. *The image of Japan: From feudal isolation to world power, 1850-1905*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Lemesurier, Peter. 1990. *This New Age Business – The Story of the Ancient and Continuing Quest to Bring Down Heaven on Earth*. Forres: The Findhorn Press.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1966 (1962). *The Savage Mind*. University of Chicago Press.
 ----- 1976. *Structural Anthropology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (reprinted by Basic Books).
- Lindholm, Charles. 2008. *Culture and Authenticity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lishka, Dennis. 1978. Zen and the Creative Process: The “Kendō-Zen” Thought of the Rinzan Master Takuan. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 5/2-3, June-September.
- Littlewood, Ian. 1996. *The Idea of Japan: Western images, Western myths*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
- Logan, Peter Melville. 2009. *Victorian Fetishism: Intellectuals and Primitives*. New York:

- State University of New York Press.
- Lyng, Stephen. 2005. *Sociology at the Edge: Social Theory and Voluntary Risk-Taking*. In Stephen Lyng (ed.) *Edgework: The Sociology of Risk-Taking*. London: Routledge.
- MacFarlane, Scott. 2007. *The Hippie Narrative*. North Carolina and London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Malraux, Andre. 1976. *Picasso's Mask*. Translated by June and Jacques Guicharnaud. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Mandy, Thomas. 2000. *Fantasia: transnational flows and Asian popular culture in Australia*. In Ien Ang (eds.) *Alter/Asians: Asian-Australian identities in art, media and popular culture*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- Martinez, Dolores P. 1998. *Gender, Shifting Boundaries and Global Culture*. In Dolores P. Martinez (ed.) *The World of Japanese Popular Culture*, pp1-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marty, Myron A. 1997. *Daily life in the United States 1960-1990*. Westport, CT: The Greenwood Press.
- Mason, Peter. 1990. *Deconstructing America: Representations of the Other*. London: Routledge.
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the colonial contest*. New York: Routledge.
- McDermott, Patrick and Ferol Arce. 2004. *Karate's Supreme Ultimate: The Taikyoku Kata in Five Rings*. Lincoln: iUniverse, Inc.
- McLatchie, G. R. and E. W. Morris, 1977. Prevention of karate injuries-a progress report. *British journal of sports medicine* 11 (2): 78-82.
- McNamara, Joseph D. 2007. The effect of Modern Marketing on Martial Arts and Traditional Martial Arts Culture. *The Sport Journal* 10(1) (Quarterly refereed sports journal, published by the United States Sports Academy).
- Meadows, Kenneth. 1991. *Shamanic Experience – A Practical Guide to Contemporary Sharmanism*. Shaftesbury: Element.
- Meech, Julia and Gabriel P Weisberg, 1990. *Japonisme Comes to America: The Japanese Impact on the Graphic Arts 1876-1925*. New York: Harry N Abrams.
- Milner, Anthony. 1997. The Rhetoric of Asia. In James Cotton and John Ravenhill (eds.)

- Seeking Asian engagement: Australia in world affairs 1991-1995*. Oxford University Press Australia, South Melbourne.
- Milner, Anthony and Quilty, Mary. 1996. *Communities of thought*. Oxford University Press Australia, South Melbourne.
- Miner, Richard H. 1980. Orientalism and the Study of Japan. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 39 (3): 507-517.
- Mishima, Yukio. 1976. *Mishima Yukio Zenshu vol.34* [The complete works of Mishima Yukio vol. 34]. Ishikawa Jun (ed). Tokyo: Shinchosya.
- 2006. *Bunka Boueiron* [Theories of protecting culture]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobou.
- Mitford, Redesdale. 1871. *Tales of Old Japan*. London: R Clay, Sons, and Taylor, Printers.
- Moran, J.F. 1993. *The Japanese and the Jesuits*. London: Routledge.
- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. 2000. *Talkin 'up to the white women: Aboriginal women and feminism*. St Lucia, Qld: University of Queensland Press.
- 2003. 'I still call Australia home': Indigenous Belonging and Place in a White Postcolonizing Society. In S. Ahmed, C.a Cantaneda, A.M. Fortier and M. Sheller, (eds.) *Uprootings/Regroundings Questions of Home and Migration*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- 2004. *Whitening Race: essay in social and cultural criticism*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Morley, David and Kevin Robins. 1992. Techno-Orientalism: Futures, Foreigners and Phobias. *New Formations* (16) Spring: 136-156.
- Nagaki, Kousuke. 1998. A comparison of Australian and Japanese judo practitioner's values and attitudes towards sport. In Hardman, K. and Standeven, J (eds) *Cultural Diversity and Congruence in Physical Education and Sport*, Chapter 10.
- Nitobe, Inazo. 1936. *Bushido: The Soul of Japan*. Tokyo: Kenkyusya.
- Norman, F.J. 1905. *The Fighting Man of Japan*. London: Archibald Consfable & Co Ltd.
- Norris, Craig. 2000. Australian fandom of Japanese anime. In Ien Ang (ed.) *Alter/Asians: Asian-Australian identities in art, media, and popular culture*, pp218-231. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- 2005. Cyborg girls and shape-shifters: The discovery of difference by Anime

- and Manga Fans in Australia. *Refractory: a Journal of Entertainment Media*.
<http://refractory.unimelb.edu.au/2005/10/14/cyborg-girls-and-shape-shifters-the-discovery-of-difference-by-anime-and-manga-fans-in-australia-craig-norris/>
 (accessed on 23th October 2011)
- Ohira, Tomohiko. 2008. Reading the World through the Culture—cultural Basics for Tourism Creation. *The Journal of International Media, Communication, and Tourism Studies* 7 (3-21): 3-21.
- Oldmeadow, Harry. 2004. *Journeys East: 20th century Western encounters with Eastern religious tradition*. Bloomington: World Wisdom Books.
- Oliver, Gary. 2007. The history of the Victorian Kendo Renmei. *Victoria Kendo Renmei*.
<http://www.kendovictoria.asn.au/history/start.html>
 (accessed on 20th of September 2011)
- Oliver, Pam. 2004. Allies, Enemies and Trading Partners: Records on Australia and the Japanese. *National Archives of Australia*. Canberra: Publications Manager, National Archives of Australia.
- Onkey, L. 2002. Voodoo Child: Jimi Hendrix and the Politics of Race in the Sixties. In Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle, (eds.) *Imagine Nation: the American counter culture of the 1960s and '70s*. New York: Routledge.
- Ono, Setsuko. 1972. *A Western Image of Japan: What did the West see through the eyes of Loti and Hearn?* Geneve: Impr du Courrier.
- Ota, Yoriyasu & Hiroshi. Kamakura, 2008. A study on the International Spread of Kendo From the Development of World Kendo Championship (WKC) and the Europe Kendo Championship (EKC). *Osaka Kyouikudaigaku Kiyoku IV*. pp 55-75.
- Otomo, Ryoko. 2001. 'The Way of the Samurai': Ghost Dog, Mishima, and Modernity's Other. *Japanese Studies* 21 (1): 31-43.
- Pandey, Rayyashree. 1999. Traditions of War Literature in Medieval Japan: a Study of the Heike Monogatari. In David Wells and Sandra Wilson (eds.) *The Russo-Japanese War in Cultural Perspective, 1904-05*, pp.41-59. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pawle, Reginald. 2007. Zen Bukkyou to transupasonaru sinrigaku. *Japanese Journal of Transpersonal Psychology/Psychiatry* 7 (1) : 7-10.
- Perkins, Morgan and Howard Morphy. 2006. *The Anthropology of Art*. Wiley Blackwell.

- Perry, Michael. 1992. *Gods Within*. London: SPCK.
- Pietz, William. 1985. The Problem of the Fetish I. *Anthropology and Aesthetics* 9 (Spring): 5-17.
- 1987. The problem of the Fetish II: The Origin of the Fetish. *Anthropology and Aesthetics* 13 (Spring): 23-45.
- 1988. The Problem of the Fetish IIIa: Bosman's Guinea and the Enlightenment Theory of Fetishism. *Anthropology and Aesthetics* 16 (Autumn): 105-124.
- Poewe, Karla. 1996. Writing culture and writing fieldwork. *Ethos* 3 (4) : 77-206.
- Polo, Marco. 1959. *The Travels of Marco Polo*. by arrangement with Giulio Einaudi Editore - Torino. London: André Deutsch Limited.
- Pomian, Krzysztof. 1990(1987). *Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Policy Press.
- Priest, G. and D. Young. 2010. *Martial Arts and Philosophy*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Redesdale, Lord. 1906. *The Garter Mission to Japan*. London: Macmillan and CO., Limited.
- Repington, Charles a Court. 1905. *The War in The Far East 1904-1905*. London: John Murray.
- Rij, Jan. Van. 2001. *Madame Butterfly: Japonisme, Puccini, and the search for the real Cho-Cho San*. Berkeley: Stone Bridge Press.
- Roach, Joseph. R. 2007. Postcolonial Studies. In Janelle G. Reinelt and Joseph R. Roach (eds.) *Critical Theory and Performance*, pp.67-70. University of Michigan Press.
- Rocha, Cristina. 2006. *Zen in Brazil: the quest for cosmopolitan modernity*. United States of America: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Rogers, James. Allen. 1972. Darwinism and Social Darwinism. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (2) April-Jun: 265-280.
- Rosen, Steven. L. 2000. Japan as Other: Orientalism and cultural conflict. *Journal of International Communication* 4.
- Rosenberg, D. 1995. Paradox and dilemma: The national arts and American violence. *Journal of Asian Martial Arts* 4 (2): 10-33.
- Rubin, William. 2006. Modernist Primitivism: An Introduction. In Morgan Perkins and Howard Morphy (eds.) *The Anthropology of Art*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

- Said, Edward. W. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc.
- Sakai, Naoki. 2000. "You Asians": On the Historical Role of the West and Asia Binary. *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 99 (4): 789-817.
- Sax, William S. 1998. The Hall of Mirrors: Orientalism, Anthropology, and the Other. *American Anthropologist* (New Series) 100 (2): 292-301.
- Schaaffausen, Hermann. 1868. Darwinism and Anthropology. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London* 6: cviii-cxviii.
- Schetter, R. 1998. Wellness in Leukerbad. Diplomarbeit (Master Thesis), Universitaet St. Gallen, Switzerland.
- Schmidt, R and G.R. Bristol. 2005. The influence of the Japanese Martial Disciplines on the Development of the United States Marine Corps Martial Arts program. In Alexander Bennett (ed.) *Budo Perspectives*, pp.269-286. Auckland New Zealand: Kendo World Publications Ltd.
- Scholtz, Amelia. 2007. 'Almond-Eyed artisans'/'Dishonouring the national policy': The Japanese Village exhibition in Victorian London. *Japanese Studies* 27 (1) May.
- Schulz, Eva. 1994. Notes on the History of Collection and of Museum. In Susan M. Pearce (ed.) *Interpreting Objects and Collections*, pp.175-187. London • New York: Routledge.
- Segalen, Victor. 2002. *Essay on Exoticism: An Aesthetics of Diversity*. Translated and Edited by Yael Rachel Schlick. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Shelton, Anthony Alan. 1994. Cabinets of Transgression: Renaissance Collections and the Incorporation of the New World. In John Elsner and Roger Cardinal (eds.) *The Cultures of Collecting*, pp.177-203. London: Reaktion Books.
- 2011. Museums and Anthropologies: Practices and Narratives. In Sharon Macdonald (ed) *Companion to museum studies*, pp 64-80. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Shiozaki, Satoshi. 2004. Books on Japan and Japanese Culture read in the U.S. During the Russo-Japanese War. *Keiai University International Studies* 14: 93-107.
- Silva, Michael and Bertil Sjögren, 1990. *Europe 1992 and the new world power game*. New York: John Wiley.
- Shimizu, Akitoshi. 2006. West/Japan Dichotomy in the Context of Multiple Dichotomise.

- In Joy Hendry and Heung Wah Wong (eds.) *Dismantling the East—West Dichotomy*, pp17-21. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Naomi. 2004. Consuming 'Asianness' in Australia: Identity, Capital and Class. Master Thesis, School of Anthropology, Geography and Environmental Science, The University of Melbourne.
- Spinoza, Baruch. 1992. *Ethics: Treaties on The Emendation of the Intellect and Selected Letters*. Translated by Samuel Shirley. USA: Hackett Pub Co Inc.
- Stagl, Justin, 1995. *A history of curiosity: the theory of travel, 1550-1800*. London: Tayler & Francis.
- Stead, Alfred. 1905. *Great Japan*. London: John Lane, the Bodley Head.
- Stocking, George. W. 1982. *Race, Culture, and Evolution* (Phoenix Series). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Strauss, Sarah. 2005. *Positioning yoga: balancing acts across cultures*. New York: Berg.
- Sugie, Masatoshi. 2005. Considering on the Japanese Traditional Sports in Modern Times. Paper presented at *Japanese Society of Physical Education, Health and Sport Sciences*.
<http://www.budo.ac/kendo/salon/infomation/sugie070803/sugie070803.html>
(accessed 9th July 2011)
- Sutcliffe, Steven. 2003. *Children of the New Age: a history of spiritual practice*. London: Routledge.
- Suzuki, Sadami. 2005. Twentieth Century Budō and Mystic Experience. (Translated by Alexander Bennett). In Alexander Bennett (ed.) *Budo Perspectives*, pp15-44. Auckland New Zealand: Kendo World Publications Ltd.
- Tabbi, William. 1995. *The Post-Modern Sublime*. Thaca: Cornell University Press.
- Takezawa, Yasuko. 2005. *Jinshugainen wo tou* [Questioning the concept of race]. Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin.
- Terada, Takeshi. 2000. The Australia-Japan Partnership in the Asia-Pacific: From Economic Diplomacy to Security Co-operation? *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 22 (1): 175-198.
- Tessone, Natasha. 2002. Displaying Ireland: Sydney Owenson and the politics of spectacular antiquarianism. *Eire* (Journal of Irish Studies) Fall-Winter: 169-186.

- Thomas, Nicolas. 1992a. The Inversion of Tradition. *American Ethnologist* 19: 213-232.
- 1992b. Substantivization and Anthropological Discourse: The transformation of Practices into Institutions in Neotraditional Pacific Societies. In James G Carrier (ed.) *History and Tradition in Melanesian Anthropology*, pp64-85. Berkeley: The University of California Press.
- Tobin, Joseph Jay. 1989. Visual Anthropology and Multivocal Ethnography: A Dialogical Approach to Japanese Preschool Class Size. *Dialectical Anthropology* 13: 173-187.
- Tokeshi, Jinichi. 2003. *Kendo: elements, rules, and philosophy*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Turberfield, Peter James. 2008. *Pierre Loti and the theatricality of desire*. Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V.
- van Wolferen, Karl. G. 1990. The Japan Problem Revisited. *Foreign Affairs* 69 (4) Fall.
- Vogel, E.F., 1979. *Japan as number one: Lesson for America*. Cambridge: Harverd University Press.
- Wacquant, L. 1995. Pugs and Work: Bodily Capital and Bodily Labour among Professional Boxers. *Body and Society* 1(1): 65-93.
- Walker, David. 2009 (1999). *Anxious nation: Australia and the rise of Asia, 1850-1939*. St Lucia, Old: University of Queensland Press.
- Wallis, Roy. 1984. *The Elementary Forms of the New Age Religious Life*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Watanabe, Toshio. 1991. *High Victorian Japonisme*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Whyte, Lancelot Law. 1967. *The Unconscious before Freud*. London: Bradford & Dickens Limited.
- Wilber, Ken. 1985. *No Boundary – Eastern and Western Approaches to Personal Growth*. London: Shambhala.
- Wilde, Oscar. 2004. *The Decay of Lying*. USA: Kessinger Publishing.
- Wilkinson, Endymion. 1983. *Japan Versus Europe: a history of misunderstanding*. London: Penguin Books.
- Willett, Cynthia. 1998. The Master-Slave Dialectic: Hegel vs. Douglass. In Tommy L. Lott (ed.) *Subjugation and bondage: critical essays on slavery and social philosophy*, pp151-170. Oxford: Rowman&Littlefield Publishers.

- Williams, Elizabeth. 1985. Art and Artifact at the Trocadéro. In George Stocking (ed.) *History of Anthropology 3 Objects and Others*, pp145-166. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Weisberg, Gabriel P. 2001. Philippe Burty and a critical assessment of early “Japonism”. In The society for the study of Japonisme (ed.) *Japonisme in Art: An international symposium*. Tokyo: Kodansha International LTD.
- Wolfgang, Michel. 1991. Japan’s Image in Europe. *Kyushu University Public Lectures*. 23: 27-55.
- 2007. 17th Century Japan as Seen by European Eyes. In Aoki Toshiyuki (ed.) *Foreign Intercourse and Western Studies in Ogi*. Saga University, Center for Regional Culture and History Studies October: 41-46.
- Yamada, Shoji. 2001. The Myth of Zen in the Art of Archery. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 28/1-2.
- Yaya, Isabel. 2008. Wonders of America: The curiosity cabinet as a site of representation and knowledge. *Journal of the History of Collections* 2 (2): 173-188.
- Yoshimoto, Mitsuhiro. 1989. The Postmodern and Mass Images in Japan. *Public Culture*. 1 (2).
- Yoshioka, Masanori. 2005. *Han posutocokoniaru jinruigaku* [Anti-postcolonial anthropology]. Tokyo: Fukyousya.
- Young, Michael. W. 2000. The Careless Collector: Malinowski and the Antiquarians. In M. O’Hanlon and R.L.Welsch, (eds.) *Hunting the Gatherers. Ethnographic Collectors, Agents and Agency, 1870s-1930s*, pp181-202. Oxford & New York: Berghahn.

Appendix 1: *Kendō* practitioners in *Kenshikan dōjō*

All the practitioners in this thesis are known by their initials, because of the regulations of the University of Melbourne's ethics committee. Their personal data, which I discuss here, was collected during my fieldwork and thus some of these descriptors are possibly out of date when you read them. I describe practitioners' personal characters including their looks, in order to provide readers with a better sense of who the *Kenshikan* practitioners were.

Practitioner B.S.

B.S. was a slender man with hard muscle (According to P, B.S. has a Scottish background). He was one of the masters who held the rank of 5th *dan* grade. He was a calm man who trained hard without uttering any complaints. Once I heard that Japanese senior practitioner described him as 'a real bushi' (Japanese swordsman or samurai). Teaching at *Kenshikan dōjō* as a Tuesday trainer (he came to *Kenshikan* on Tuesday to help at the *Kenshikan dōjō*), he mainly trained at *Nanseikan dōjō* as the principal master. When he was twenty-one years old, he stayed in Kagoshima Prefecture (Japan) for half a year. In Kagoshima, he took the rank of 2nd *dan* grade. B.S. was in his mid forties when I met him. Outside the *dōjō* he was a high school teacher and taught *kendō* as an elective subject.

Practitioner C

C, in his early fifties and from a Greek background, was as tall as S and was ranked 4th *dan*. He was an office worker who worked in a factory producing goods for Japanese restaurants (*Saizeriya Australia Pty. Ltd*). *Kendō* was introduced to C by a Japanese colleague. Together with his close friend S, C was a member of the *Kenshikan* administration. Along with *kendō* practice, C practises *iaidō* (or *iai*). *Iaidō* is another Japanese art which focuses on the drawing and control of a sword.

Practitioner C.T.

C.T. was a short woman in her late twenties with short hair (3rd *kyu* in 2012). She was of Thai background and had studied in Australia since high school while her family remained in Thailand. When I met her she was enrolled in The University of Melbourne as a PhD student of Education. She joined the *Kenshikan* beginners' course after K and R had started.

C.T. and K loved to talk in front of the *dōjō* and in the locker room. Compared to other practitioners, C.T.'s participation in *kendō* training was rather minimal.

Practitioner D

D, in his late-twenties, was a short man who shaved his head. He came from Israel to study engineering at The University of Melbourne. D started *kendō* practice at *Kenshikan dōjō* after I started my fieldwork in the community. Before starting *kendō*, he was interested in martial arts, and he had been practised a Chinese martial arts since he was in Israel. He held the rank of 5th *kyu* grade in *kendō*.

Practitioner E.L.

E.L. was a short man who migrated from Taiwan. He held 3rd *dan* grade and took an instructor position for the beginners' course with other senior practitioners. Although he was not as talkative as other practitioners, his commitment to *Kenshikan* community was significant. He worked with the Australian government as an engineer.

Practitioner J

J was a quiet women in her mid-thirties, and she was 4th *kyu* grade in *kendō*. Coming from Germany, she had graduated from Tokyo University and was teaching architecture at RMIT University. She was a long-term *aikidō* practitioner who had started the practice when she was in Germany. J started *kendō* in *Kenshikan dōjō* after I started my fieldwork there.

Practitioner J.L.

J.L. is a cousin of E.L. In her early thirties, she was a short woman with long black hair and round eyes. She migrated from Taiwan to Australia with her family when she was a child. She held the rank of 1st *dan* grade. She used to teach math at a high school and at the time I was training at *Kenshikan* she was working at The University of Melbourne as a researcher. J.L. had an older brother who practised *kendō* and was working in Japan as a dealer for a *kendō* armour company.

Practitioner J.W.

J.W., a person of few words, was a tall and skinny white Australian man in his

mid-twenties. He held the rank of 1st *dan* grade. Along with *kendō* practice, he also practised Brazilian *jiujitsu*. He was a student at Monash University studying archaeology.

Practitioner K

K, in her late twenties, was a well-trained muscular woman who used to practise amateur wrestling and was an ‘energetic and powerful’ person. She had brown curly hair and round eyes and came from a German-English-Scottish background. K started a beginners’ course with R and they were the only two who keep practicing *kendō* after it ended. When I first met K she had just started *kendō* and was 6th *kyu* grade, but by the time I left she held 1st *dan* grade. Along with normal training, K was a regular practitioner in the Women’s special training sessions. When I had nearly finished my fieldwork, she graduated from a Masters course at RMIT University in creative writing.

Practitioner K.D.

K.D. was a middle aged Japanese housewife who had practised *kendō* since she was high school student. She held 4th *dan* grade. She was married to an Australian man and had two children.

Practitioner K.S.

K.S. was a middle-sized woman with a strong build. A blonde with blue eyes, K was in her mid-thirties and originally came from New Zealand. K.S. was very well known in the *kendō* community in Australia. She was also well regarded for her strong leadership and strict training method. Holding 4th *dan* grade, she was a member of the Australian National Team and represented Australia at three World *Kendō* Championships. Her local *dōjō* was *Fudoshin dōjō* which is approximately 20 minutes away from *Kenshikan dōjō*. She also trained at two other *dōjō* as a coach (Victoria University *Kendō* Club and Monash University *Kendō* Club). As a coach, K.S. was also in charge of the women’s special training that is held at *Kenshikan dōjō*. When I was at *Kenshikan*, she was a PhD student at Victoria University. Her research focused on female *kendō* culture.

Practitioner L

L, in his early thirties, was a short man with a strong build. He had an Indonesian

background, had migrated with his sister, and had received permanent residency (PR) in Australia. L started *kendō* just before I joined *Kenshikan dōjō*, and was 1st *kyu* grade (promoted to 2nd *dan* in 2012). Although L was a junior practitioner, he progressed quickly and was well involved in the *Kenshikan* community. During my fieldwork, he was nominated as an organiser for the Winter Camp.

Practitioner P

P was a middle-aged Egyptian man. He had practised *kendō* for more than ten years and held a 2nd *dan* grade. He was a very talkative person who loved to joke and paid much attention to juniors, beginners and visitors who needed help. However, he repeatedly injured his knees during my fieldwork. Therefore I often saw him teaching beginners who did not wear *kendō* armour rather than practicing with those of us who were fully armed. He was also a member of the *Kenshikan* administration.

Practitioner P.S.

Growing up in Melbourne as an Australian with a Polish-German background, he was one of the principal masters (*sensei*) in *Kenshikan dōjō*, had practised *kendō* for over 30 years, and held the rank of 6th *dan*. He was in his mid-fifties, tall and brawny with gray hair and a moustache. In the *dōjō*, P.S. was an earnest practitioner who was strict with both himself and his students while at the same time he loved to relax and talk to junior practitioners like me over a cup of tea at a café. He also visited Japan several times to train with Japanese practitioners, and had close relationships with some *kendō* masters in the Nippon Sport Science University and the Tokyo Metropolitan Police Department.

Practitioner R

R, in his mid fifties, was a cheerful, plump and friendly man. He was 4th generation English. He started *kendō* a year after I joined the *Kenshikan* community, and held 6th *kyu* (4th *kyu* in 2012). Although R did not take an administrative role, he was a very helpful person who occasionally offered support to the *Kenshikan* administrative members. *Kendō* was introduced to him by his son, practitioner A. A was interested in *kendō* through watching Japanese animation. Together with his son, R joined the *Kenshikan* beginners' course. R worked at an Australian supermarket (*IGA*).

Practitioner R.B.

R.B. was a short and slender man with long brown curly hair, in his early thirties. He held a 3rd *dan* grade. R traced his family background to French, French-Jewish, Sri Lankan, German, Dutch, and Australian roots. R worked as a chef at a restaurant.

Practitioner R.L.

R.L., in her late twenties, was the younger sister of J.L. During the course of my fieldwork, her rank in *kendō* was 1st *dan* (she achieved 2nd *dan* in 2012). She received her PhD from The University of Melbourne in 2011 in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. R.L. was a member of the *Kenshikan* administration, where she worked hard to help the *dōjō* while at the same time finalising her PhD thesis. She was looking for a job as a researcher. The L family (including E.L.) was close and they always came to training together.

Practitioner S

S was a very tall and slender man with short hair and glasses. He worked as an IT consultant, and was a friendly person with a great sense of humour. In his early fifties, S held the rank of 3th *dan* and was one of the early practitioners in Melbourne who trained together with young P.S. They held important administrative roles within the Victorian and Australian *kendō* federations. S had a Greek background, and when he was a child, his family lived in Brazil before migrating to Australia. He had a child (boy) who also practised *kendō*. S and his wife lived in Japan for a while and he was one of the few practitioners in our *dōjō* who could speak (basic) Japanese.

Practitioner S.C.

S.C., in his mid-thirties, had a slender muscular body with a shaved head and was regarded as ‘reliable’ among seniors and juniors. He was the older brother of T.C. who first introduced *kendō* to his brother. During my fieldwork he held 2nd *dan* grade and was promoted to 3rd *dan* in 2012. He worked with the Melbourne branch of a Japanese trading company (*Mitsui & Co*). During my fieldwork, he worked as a secretary for the *Kenshikan dōjō*, and was a good player who received prizes in Victoria.

Practitioner S.F.

S.F. was a talkative middle-aged man of Irish background who held a 2nd *dan* grade. He was an accountant outside of the *dōjō*. His daughter used to work in Japan as an English teacher. S.F. was interested in *kendō* practice because of his daughter, and the two of them joined the *Kenshikan* at the same time.

Practitioner S. L.

S.L., a 3rd *dan* grade holder, was a woman with short black hair and a well-trained muscular body. She had a Chinese background and grew up in New Zealand where she started her study of *kendō*. She was officially a member of the *Fudoshin dōjō*. S.L. was a valiant practitioner who did not shirk from training with big male practitioners, and she was also a frank person who was sometimes described as ‘curt’ by other female practitioners. She was a postgraduate student specialising in Chinese language when I met her.

Practitioner S.P.

S.P. was a slender and middle height Asian with glasses. He grew up in Singapore, had a Chinese background, and a job in Australia. He had practised *kendō* for about ten years and was ranked at 1st *dan* grade.

Practitioner T.C.

T.C., a self-proclaimed *budō otaku*, was the president of the administrative side of *Kenshikan dōjō* and held a 2nd *dan* grade. He was in his early thirties and worked as a telephone operator. He started *kendō* practice with his older brother S.C a few years before I met him. He was an Australian with an Irish-Japanese background, and his brothers were educated in Singapore and Australia. Their mother language was English, and they did not speak Japanese.

Practitioner V

V, who had a Malaysian background, was in his mid-thirties. He was a 3rd *dan* in *kendō*.

Practitioner Y.Y.

Y.Y., in her mid-twenties, was a short, talkative and cheerful woman. She was a junior

practitioner who started *kendō* after I started my fieldwork. Coming from China, Y.Y. worked with an Australian company that sold baby clothes while at the same time she studied fashion design. She was 5th *kyu* grade.

Appendix 2: Glossary of Japanese Terms

Bōgu: A set of *kendō* armour or protective gear. *Bōgu* consists of a face mask (*men*), a pair of gloves (*kote*), a chest protector (*dou*), and a hip and waist protector (*tare*).

Budō: Martial arts.

Dan grade: All the ranks are divided in two categories: *kyu* grades and *dan* grades. The International *Kendō* Federation (IKF), which follows the regulation of the All Japan *Kendō* Federation, establishes guidelines for the requirements for each grading. *Dan* grades have eight ranks, which begin with the First *dan* and finish with the Eighth *dan*.

Dōjō: A training hall for Japanese martial arts. In the case of martial arts such as *kendō* and *iaidō*, the *dōjō* has a board floor. In the case of *aikidō* and *judo*, that floor that is covered by *tatami* (straw mats). Moreover, as *Kenshikan dōjō* follows the Japanese style, it also features a *shinto* altar (*shinto* is the Japanese native religion), which can be found in most *dōjō* in Japan.

Dou: There are two meanings for this term. One is a chest protector, and the other is a technique of *kendō* in which practitioners cut their opponents' chest protector. Practitioners shout 'dou' when cutting with their bamboo swords.

Dōugi: The uniform for Japanese martial arts worn on the top part of the body. In *kendō* practice, the colour of *dōugi* has to be either white or dark blue. The choice of the colour depends on personal preference, not on the rank of grades. *Dōugi* is worn under *bōgu*.

Hakama: The uniform for Japanese martial arts worn on the lower half of the body. In the case of *kendō*, there are two choices of colour, white or dark blue. As with the *dougi*, the choice of colour depends on personal preference.

Iai (or *iaidō*): *Iai* is a Japanese martial art that uses Japanese swords. Experienced senior practitioners are allowed to use *shinken* (real swords). In training, practitioners learn how to

draw the swords, the movement of swords when cutting, and the most effective ways of cutting the human body. Unlike *kendō*, iai practitioners do not spar but practise a set of movements called '*kata*' (forms).

Jiujitsu: The history of *jiujitsu* can be traced back a few hundred years. *Judō* and *aikidō* have developed from *jiujitsu*. Brazilian *jiujitsu* was developed by a Japanese *judō* practitioner who had migrated to Brazil.

Judōka: *Judō* players

Kakarite: Almost every *kendō* technique is practised with a partner. The person who starts moving is called the *kakarite* while the receiver is called the *motodachi*.

Kamidana: A *shinto* altar in which a household amulet (*ofuda*) is placed. In *shinto* ritual practice, each household purchases amulets at shrines, and they worship them as representations of *shinto* deities at home.

Keiko: Training.

Kendōka: *Kendō* player or practitioner.

Kenjyutsu: One of the Japanese martial arts that *bushi* (or *samurai*) practised. *Kendō*, which was formed along with Japanese modernisation, derived from *kenjyutsu*. Since the modernisation of Japan, *kenjyutsu*, a practice of the *bushi*, has gradually become outdated.

Kiai: A big shout showing spirit. In *kendō*, practitioners are taught to train each other with big shouts in order to show 1) their opponent the correct time to move and 2) to focus one's concentration on the self.

Kirikaeshi: In Japanese, this means 'continuous cuts'. The practice of *kirikaeshi* is usually the first technique that is taught when a sparring session begins, and it contains all the basic movements of *kendō*. It involves training with a partner.

Kote: There are two meanings for this term. One is a pair of gloves, and the other is a technique of *kendō* in which practitioners cut their opponents' gloves. Practitioners shout 'kote' when cutting each other's gloves with their bamboo swords.

Kotemen: A name of a *kendō* technique in which practitioners cut *men* (face mask) right after he/she cuts the *kote* (glove). It is a continuous movement which contains two techniques.

kotemendou: A *kendō* technique in which practitioners first cut their opponents' gloves (*kote*), then their face masks (*men*) and then their chest protectors (*dou*).

Kouhai: Persons who joined a community or a group (such as school, company or army) later than you.

Kyu grade: There are six ranks in the *kyu* grades. *Kyu* grades are lower than *dan* grades. Within the *kyu* hierarchy, the lowest rank is Sixth *kyu* and the highest is the First *kyu*. The International *Kendō* Federation (IKF) also takes charge of establishing guidelines for *kyu* grading.

Kyujutsu: Together with *kenjyutsu*, this is one of Japanese martial arts that *bushi* (or *samurai*) practised. *Kyudō*, a modern form of *kyujyutsu*, is derived from *kyujyutsu*.

Men: There are two meanings for this term. One is a face mask, and the other is a technique of *kendō* in which practitioners cut their opponents' face masks. Practitioners shout 'men' when cutting the mask with their bamboo swords.

Menhikidou: A *kendō* technique in which practitioners first cut the opponent's face mask (*men*), and after that they cut the opponent's chest protector (*dou*) while moving backwards.

Menhikigote: A *kendō* technique in which practitioners first cut the opponent's face mask (*men*), and after that they cut the opponent's glove (*kote*) while moving backwards.

Menhikimen: A *kendō* technique in which practitioners first cut the opponent's face mask (*men*), and after that they once again cut the face mask while moving backwards.

Menmen: A *kendō* technique in which practitioners attack (or 'cut') the opponent's face mask (*men*) twice with their *shinai*s.

Motodachi: Almost every *kendō* technique is practised with a partner. The receiver is called the *motodachi*, and the person who starts moving is called the *kakarite*.

Naginata: A Japanese weapon with long blade and shaft. It is also a name of Japanese martial art which uses this weapon.

Otaku: *Otaku* is a Japanese word to indicate people who are nerds. They are typically involved in information technology, video games, animation, and so on. Originally, the word was invented to describe Japanese youth.

Renmei: 'Federation' in English. In Australia, the federation of Australian *kendō*, which is associated with The International *Kendō* Federation (IKF) and All Japan *Kendō* Federation, is described as Australian *Kendō Renmei*.

Seiza: A Japanese style of sitting down. One sits down on floor with one's legs under one.

Senpai: A person who joined a community or a group (such as school, company or army) earlier than you.

Shiai: A *kendō* match.

Shinai: A sword for *kendō* training. The *shinai* is made of bamboo, and it represents the real Japanese sword of *samurai*. Practitioners buy reasonably priced *shinai* (A\$ 35–45) for training, and they change these *shinai* every few months. Senior practitioners usually buy expensive *shinai* for the use of championships.

Shogunate: A feudal regime which is established by a *shogun*. *Shogun* is the head of a *samurai* class. The *shoguns* are nominated by the emperor and had been the *de facto* rulers of Japan until the end of *Edo* period (1603-1868).