

異文化コミュニケーション

NEWSLETTER: Intercultural Communication

No. 25 June 1996

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION INSTITUTE
KANDA UNIVERSITY OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
1-4-1 Wakaba, Mihama-ku, Chiba, 261 JAPAN

〒261 千葉市美浜区若葉1-4-1
神田外語大学・異文化コミュニケーション研究所
(Phone) 043-273-2324 (Fax) 043-273-2324

第6回 夏期セミナーに向けて Preview of the Forthcoming Summer Seminar

久米 昭元 (Teruyuki Kume)

当研究所（異文研）は、今年度も8月29日から3日間「異文化コミュニケーションの教育と研究—多文化共生社会に向けて—」をテーマに、British Hills（福島県）で夏期セミナーを開催する。東京神田にあった異文研が、千葉市・幕張新都心の神田外語大学設立と同時に大学の付属研究所として再スタートしてから早や10年。夏期セミナーは今年度が第6回目ということになるが、本セミナーの意義についてこれまでの経緯を簡単に振り返りつつ、述べてみたい。

異文化コミュニケーション研究は、世界が急速にグローバル化し、一地域で起きた出来事が他の諸地域に直接的、間接的に影響を及ぼさざるを得なくなった今日、その緊急性と重要性が改めて認識されるようになってきている。そのような認識を反映してか、1980年代の後半から90年代にかけて大学の改革・改組、カリキュラム一新の気運が著しく高まった。全国の各大学で人文、社会両科学あるいは語学の中の新科目に「比較文化論」や「コミュニケーション論」、「異文化コミュニケーション論」等が次々と登場するようになり、それまで関係がないと思いついていた多くの教員を巻き込み、教授法を含めて改めて学習する必要に迫られた。

1989年に南山大学で行われた「日本コミュニケーション研究者会議」でも日本の大学におけるコミュニケーション関連の授業科目を把握する必要性が指摘され、それを受けて、異文研は1990年に「日本の大学におけるコミュニケーション教育の実態調査」を実施した。その結果、大学での異文化コミュニケーション関連の授業をどのようにすればよいか悩んでいるという声が多々聞かれ、それらのニーズ分析に基づいて1991年、「異文化コミュニケーションの教育と方法」というテーマで初めての夏期セミナーを開催することになったのである。

幸いなことに、毎年、文化とコミュニケーションに関連した授業の科目を担当されている方々に、ワークショップ担当講師となり、コース・シラバス、ガイド

ライン、使用テキストを初め、授業内容の一端を詳しく披露してもらい、全体として参加者との活発な意見交換が飛び交う、自由な雰囲気が出たものとなっている。

1994年からは教育に加えて研究面をも加味することとなり、各講師が自分の研究しているテーマを扱うワークショップが中心となった。さらに若手研究者による研究発表のセッションを設けたところ、極めて好評で、一人当たり45分の時間を最大限に使って、活発な討論がなされている。

昨年度は第5周年記念で、会場を千葉市幕張から初めてBritish Hillsに移して行った。東京からかなりの距離があるので若干の心配をしていたにも拘らず、これまでで最も多くの参加者(70名以上)があり、大変涼しく、研修環境としては理想的で非常に有意義な時を持つことができた。

今年も再びBritish Hillsで行うこととなり、多彩な講師陣よりそれぞれ長年に亘る研究の一端を披露して頂くほかに、マルチポイントを結ぶTV会議等もあり、実に楽しみである。第1日目は摂南大学経営情報学部教授の木下富雄氏（元京大教授）が、基調講演として「共生時代のリスク・コミュニケーション」と題して話される予定である。我々はえてして自分達に都合の良い情報を得ようとするが、都合の悪い情報に対しても、それを取り込んで未来に対処するリスク・コミュニケーションの考え方は、これから大変重要になると思われる。

第2日目の午前と午後と亘って繰り広げられる6つのワークショップには、コミュニケーション、異文化間教育、社会心理学、文化人類学等、各分野の第一線で活躍されている方々を講師にお招きし、それぞれ共生社会との関わりでユニークなセッションを展開して頂く。例年、講師と参加者が役割交代をしつつ、お互いに切磋琢磨して学び合うという姿勢が貫かれており、これからもこのような雰囲気を大切にしたい。

また、今回多くの方々の要望に応じて、夏期セミナーの前日（8月28日）に、オプション・プログラムを用意した。「アメリカ黒人の日本人観」を初め、コミュニケーション授業のコースデザインからシミュレーションを含めたワークショップも開かれ、当プログラムも参加者中心型のユニークなものとして今後の発展が期待される。関心のある方々の積極的な参加と支援をお願いする次第である。（異文研 副所長）

MUTUAL EMPATHY: THE KEY TO IMPROVING JAPAN-U.S. RELATIONSHIPS

Tom Bruneau

日米間のコミュニケーションは摩擦や誤解のコミュニケーションといえるほどの様相を呈している。日米間における最大のテーマの一つは、このような現実の問題をいかに大局的に解決するかということである。しかし、我々は日米の文化的相違をクローズアップしすぎたために、両国間の接点を探ることをなおざりにしてきた。当エッセイではこの点をまず指摘し、その後で「文化を超えた共感」というコンセプトを研究テーマとして取り入れるべきことを提言したい。

At present, tensions and negative thoughts and feelings between Japan and the U.S. have escalated. The anniversary of the end of the great war for military control of the Pacific has brought up bitter memories and buried emotions on both fronts. The economic arguments centering about fairness in trade and trade sanctions as well as fierce competition in the matters of technological advance and superiority have added to these tensions. The continual battle of the dollar and yen, particularly in their on-going fluctuations against the growing backdrop of a more dynamic and very changeful world economy, is another factor giving rise to even more tension. The strain of economic problems in both countries: wages, rising costs of living, unemployment, etc. has added fuel to the larger economic fires. Mutual America-bashing and Japan-bashing are seemingly on the rise.

These tensions are, of course, compounded and complicated by the common belief that *none* of us Americans can possibly understand the Japanese (a myth or mytheme) and that the Japanese are totally lost in America (another exaggeration of convenience). Some perpetuate unnecessary conflict by such attitudes--even though it is the case that differences in tradition, values, language and the like loom very large and often are very real. All of these tensions, however, appear to be only surface symptoms of deeper, more pervasive problems which are often elusively hidden from view or even very awkward to discuss openly. It is difficult to talk openly about bigotry, prejudice, hatred, anger, fear, mistrust, and other underlying negativities. It is inherently Japanese not to do so publicly--but these negativities are there in silent, private, and personal ways. We

would rather avoid (make empty) these unresolved sources of tension and conflict--like the crazy ostrich we bury our heads in the sand, not wanting to look openly and fully at the dark horizons and dark, cloudy uncertainties ahead.

While many of these tensions seem to concern our mutual ignorances, they seem to highly involve dysfunctional competition and feelings of superiority-inferiority by both cultural/national entities. There appear to be many problems of common mistrust and fear. We tend to down-play or dismiss such ideas. We want to paint a rosy picture and dream of peace, oblivious of the problems clawing at our throats like an angry hawk. In the case of many of the elderly Japanese and American people who remember the terrible war and the killing and sacrifices, in the case of conservative and hardened pro-military people, and in the case of dogmatic, polarized people, there seems to be a hatred, a very deep animosity. This is difficult to discuss openly and frankly. Defusing this complex of tensions, these underlying negativities, and this potentially explosive climate may take years to resolve. But any complete resolution seems too idealistically hopeful. Any new negative incidents, however, could be easily blown out of proportion with this ugly climate of conflict and oppositionalities. Both countries are now really locked into so many umbilical, interdependent needs, programs, and common interests. However, on the whole, Japan-U.S. relationships seem to be now deteriorating rapidly. This could lead to many long-term detrimental futures for both countries. We actually need to be friendly much more often. This could work!

It is with a sense of urgency, then, that intercultural affairs and relations scholars in Japan and the U.S. begin to address this climate head-on as advocates of peace-making, as mediation specialists, and as proponents of mutual understandings of mutual matters of the heart. While we who study intercultural communication often profess how important these matters are, giving us a sense of purpose and direction, few of us actually deal directly with the underlying problems, the nasty and difficult causes of the dysfunctional conflicts. We often do not see the powerful forces of large numbers, of millions-upon-millions of people, whose negativities influence national policy and politics and international relations.

We intercultural people seem to become too fond in pointing to our differences as very, very interesting and as sources of joyful puzzlement, or as curious intellectual exercises. But, we seldom see bigger solutions to those unique differences. Our position here is that the concepts, and especially the processes, of empathy can help us much better than our intellectualizing and comparing our differences. Intercultural peace-making *is* possible; a focus on differences seems to exasperate the problematics, creates opposition-alism, and seems to actually produce feelings of ineffectualness in trying to cope with one another. Peace-making with empathic strategies seems credible--if we take a new definition of communication: communication is transcending or lifting above conflicts and differences with empathic caring and concern.

I have previously written at length about empathy, reviewing the concepts, attempting to describe its complex processes, relating it to careful and concerned interpersonal relations, to mental processes, to communication theory-building, and intercultural communication.⁽¹⁾ My purpose here is not to rehash this work. Here, I would simply wish to informally apply, in summary, a few of my previous ideas to the special case study problematics of Japan-U.S. relationships. In brief, empathy concerns the ability to take the biological, perceptual, psychological, emotional, and social-cognitive (social cognition) viewpoints of another or others so as to attempt to simulate or experience, vicariously, their realities, their world views, *as if we were the other(s)*. This approach is naturally an emic rather than etic or outsider view of others.

Mutual empathy or sharing empathic communication together, each having positive regard for the other, simultaneously, develops out of the initial *struggles* to practice empathy. To make matters worse, each culture seems to have different empathic systems and traditions! Attuning empathic processes leads to mutual empathy, and trust for one another appears to often follow or develop after empathic communication, concomitantly. Mutual empathy implies a greater intimacy than the distancing and objectifying involved in the differential classifying, categorizing, or concluding negatively or narrowly, all growing out of misplaced Aristotelian oppositionalism. Such logical mathematical division and its brother, sub-

traction, does little for the necessity of addition and multiplication of "otherness" in ourselves. Categorical approaches may actually prevent otherness because they may act as screens or defenses or barriers to interpersonal interpenetrations of empathic insight.

We already know of our big differences! We keep repeating and monotonously being redundant about them. Texts or article-after-article belabor these highly interesting comparisons. They are attractive. "Gee," we say, "those other people sure are weird!" The focus on these differences appears to have some intercultural educational purposes in the sense that they warn us and heighten our sensitivity to strangeness and may indeed make us more cautious, more *careful*. But, what about the transcending of these differences. We say usually little about this except for platitudes, or we speak about intercultural competence (which seems to be a theoretical-research approach developed by people who think they can actually measure poetry or Spring). What may be initially important in developing a new focus is the "common ground bases of empathy." This approach focuses on how our basic values *are* similar, how many of our beliefs *are* similar, and how our attitudes, our problems, and our hopes *are* similar.

The common ground bases of empathy emphasizes the humane aspects of everyday living which all humans everywhere experience. This kind of empathy is important in conflictual atmospheres of mutual distrust and distancing. It is the kind of empathy necessary to develop initial trust levels to help us sustain our relational contacts, to renew these contacts more often, leading to the development of friendships. Common ground approaches to empathy seem to develop a sense of immediacy with the other, we experience the other as ourselves, as experientially near, close. This has been called "the oneness of youness" by Martin Buber or "I-as-the-other" by Jean Paul Sartre, two prominent western philosophers who looked at loving relationships and problems of self-other and mutual identity constructions. Two brief examples here might illustrate what we are discussing. I hope they create some interest and a little controversy.

What were the Japan-American relationships about the Kobe earthquake? Do I dare disturb the world by bringing up this sensitive issue? This disaster had excellent daily news

coverage in the American media. It was on all the TV national networks (which are viewed in many countries of the world) and regional networks. We Americans were right there with all of you Japanese people--we were reading and seeing at the same time you were. It was immediate to us Americans, with our abilities of the instantaneity of global communication technologies. We could feel the tragedy and identify with the common ground bases of the terrible suffering and unbelievable fear and tormenting trauma--while it was occurring. We could see behind the "stiffer" formal masks and the gallant suppression of tears and the courage "to bear up." It made many Americans start to see that, while the outside appearances and behaviors are different, the feelings beneath would be quite similar for all of us in these bad situations. Very few Americans could say, "I'm happy they are suffering." I think that even the most hardened bigots and racists and Japan-bashers who were watching may have initially begun to see beyond the faces of the Japanese character and into the humanistic hearts of the regular, everyday people damaged at poor, dear Kobe.

Our government called for aid; our President went on national TV saying that we would give any and every kind of immediate help to the Japanese. Students at our university started to collect food and medical supplies. The whole country, I believe, wanted to give, to support, to show care and concern in real ways. But, what happened? We Americans have been extending massive efforts of humanitarian aid to many countries for many years. We have the infrastructure to deliver fresh water, food, emergency shelter, medical supplies, and doctors, in the case of massive disasters. We offered our help, but it seemed to many Americans that our chance to show common ground empathy was denied or refused. I *do not* know the full story from the Japanese perspective, but we Americans in many circles or groups thought this was a distancing of relations, an opportunity for sharing which was denied. Some of us felt distanced as people who care. We could have delivered quick and efficient aid in a matter of a day or two--but we had to watch with growing indignation, along with a lot of you Japanese, the clumsy and confusing mess that was in helping this entirely beautiful city, Kobe-shi. Was it nationalistic pride of a stubborn kind?

Was it what we Americans call "false pride" or "foolish pride?" Was it wanting to keep "big brother" or U.S.A. out or to keep U.S.A. paramilitary, emergency aid out of Japan? Or, was it the hiding of embarrassment? We can all identify with death, injuries, loss of loved ones, loss of home, lack of water, lack of food, lack of medical, fire, and rescue services, and we *can* feel the trauma of others deep in our bones--whether we are Japanese, Americans, or whatever. It may be that this incident is an example where the natural empathy of common ground was not allowed to be used. Why? Could we not even imagine the sources of friendship building? Does not a rigid tree break easily in the wind? Humanitarian trees bend to the force of tragedy.

Recently, the rape of a helpless, young Okinawan girl by U.S. military young men took up the headlines and airways of both countries. Most Americans felt so embarrassed and angry. Many of us would like to see swift and very firm punishment of these stupid and violent men by the Japanese government after a period of fair trial. We Americans seem to train our military people to be superior-acting, arrogant, and just plain stupid-acting in other countries. But, what was the response of our military people, our American government? Are we Americans so stupid not to know how to apologize and express our sorrow and convey our honest feelings? Are our American (and Japanese) government officials too numb-of-heart to be incapable of empathic communication? Is this so? Was this another opportunity lost for our countries to share in the humane, the humanitarian sharing of feelings and concern? I think so, and I also think that we will not improve our Japan-U.S. relationships until we more gentle souls, people of compassion and respect for others, start to speak out and exert some positive empathic influence in our countries.

Both of our countries seem naturally intent and prone to act with needs for nationalist identity, which seem to diminish our similarities and expand our differences. My claim here in this brief and inadequate essay (given the many problems) is that we must begin to study our thousands of similarities, our bleedings, our pains, our mutual hopes, our humor (we are both a funny and witty peoples), our many common problems of everyday living, and so forth. It is difficult to dislike those we perceive

as being similar to ourselves! This view is seldom mentioned in the comparative cultural literature. We need to begin to study and, then, communicate our commonalities. The evidence points to the failure of our present approaches as *not* being even slightly successful or effective in building friendships between us. This seems a little critical of our successes, but is not intended to be. Both the U.S. and Japan have so much to lose and so little to gain on our present course of relations. It seems quite odd and unusual to me that more effort has not been done in developing empathy for one another and attempting to practice more mutual empathy. Where dark clouds gather too long we can sometimes forget the light.

NOTES

(1) See, for example, Tom Bruneau (1988) "Conceptualizing and Using Empathy in Intercultural Contexts," *Human Communication Studies* (Communication Association of Japan) 16, pp. 37-70; (1989) "Empathy and Listening: A Conceptual Review and Theoretical Directions," *The Journal of the International Listening Association*, 3, No. 1, pp. 1-20; (1989) "The Deep Structure of Intrapersonal Communication Processes," In: *Intrapersonal Communication Processes: Original Essays*, C. V. Roberts and K. W. Watson (Eds.), Scottsdale, Arizona: Gorsuch Scarisbrick Publishers, 1989, pp. 63-81; (1993) "Empathy and Listening," In: *Perspectives on Listening*, A. Wolvin and C. Coakley (Eds.) Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co., pp. 185-200; (In Press) "Peace Communication and Empathic Processes," In: *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, L. Samovar and R. Porter (Eds.), 8th. Edition, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Press, (originally presented at the 1994 Communication Association of Japan conf., Tama-shi, Japan, June; and, "Empathic Intercultural Communication: State of the Art and Future Potential," presented at the Conf., "Intercultural Communication: The Last 25 Years and the Next," Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY, July, 1995 (in editorial review).

(Dr. Tom Bruneau is Professor in the Department of Speech Communication, Radford University, VA, U. S. A.)

Japanese Rhetorical Scholarship Revisited

Yoshihisa Itaba

西洋においてレトリックは、実践的あるいは哲学的学問分野として独立した地位を持ち続けてきた。西洋の見地に立てば日本にはレトリックの伝統がないように映り、実際そのような指摘が欧米のレトリック学者によってなされた。しかし独立した学問分野がなくてもレトリックは存在しうる。日本人も言語や非言語、話し言葉や書き言葉を駆使して社会的影響をもたらそうという行為、つまりレトリックと関わりを持ってきたのである。本稿はこの点を指摘したものである。

Since World War II, the image of the Japanese has been produced and revised by American scholars in their own discursive space, but its essence has never changed. The Japanese have constantly been a different-looking object of curious American scholars' gaze in search of "news value" (Lutz & Collins, 1993, 120). Our discipline, too, tended to portray the Japanese as distinct--either in kind or degree--from Westerners but without looking at their real-world persuasive communication itself. Based on the evidence that was mostly secondary, anecdotal, or experiential, some scholars (e.g., Glazer, 1968; Becker, 1991) argued that Japanese rhetorical styles and their thinking patterns are not rational, while others (e.g., Lomas, 1946; Morrison, 1972) suggested that the Japanese are so non-Western--undemocratic, pre-democratic, or incapable of Western logic--that they do not value public speaking, discussion, or debate. Although the universe of discourse concerning the Japanese as "different" communicators had a built-in system of self-criticism (e.g., Branham, 1994), scholars, after all, did not pay much attention to Japanese rhetorical action itself, i.e., Japanese persuasive texts and contexts that invite them. Instead, they searched for Western formats for public decision-making in Japan or attempted to discover historical facts of rhetorical theory and practice similar to, or imported from, the West. Some failed and downgraded the culture as deficient; others succeeded and censured the former in the name of ethnocentricity. Yet all of them ignored actual practice of the Japanese in persuading.

Confined in this camp, we would not come

to grips with the problem in hand, the serious inquiry into how the Japanese indeed use symbols to influence each other in real social life. A rhetorical study need not stick to the Aristotelian tradition, the traditional way of viewing rhetorical interaction through the speaker's eyes in relation to his/her immediate audience adaptation skills (See Brock, Scott, & Checebro, 1989, 27-28). Rhetoric, I submit, is not merely a school of thought that teaches how to speak well, a format with rule-of-thumb advice for speech-making, or an oration "effectively" delivered to an audience. Comparing the traditional approach with dramatism in a study of radical Black rhetoric, Campbell (1971) argues that, because the traditional view of rhetoric emphasizes what is rational and orderly in the discourse, the traditional critic "is more likely to condemn [radical Black rhetoric] than to find ways to reveal its assumptions and internal workings (132)." Likewise, it is little wonder that applying the traditional view of rhetoric to Japan resulted in regarding its culture as deficient rather than generating insight into workings of Japanese symbols used for persuasion. Granted, I would urge the importance of expanding what rhetoric means and of examining texts and contexts to describe dynamic processes of Japanese rhetorical communication itself.

What I propose, then, is a non-traditional, practice-centered approach to Japanese persuasive texts without assuming any "ideal" formats or rules *a priori* and with respect to contexts in which those texts have come into being. This discourse-centered method seems better-suited to revealing Japanese rhetorical assumptions, because indigenous schools or textbooks of Rhetoric--in some traditional senses--did not exist in Japan unlike in the West where "ideal" persuasive models have been constantly produced, criticized, and revised. The Japanese rhetorical scholarship seems to be at a stage where their persuasive patterns, submerged in language practices, ought to be revealed for theorizing, as Jensen (1987) rightly argues:

The fact that rhetoric was not focused on [in East Asia] as a separate field of thought as in the West was not due to considering it unimportant, but because on the con-

trary it was so important that it was intertwined with, and inseparable from, philosophy, religion, ethics, psychology, politics, and social relations. (219)

Jensen here implies that Japanese rhetoric may be studied by examining, say, the language practice in Japanese politics.

This perspective, for instance, would allow the critic to visit Japanese texts that discussed Japan's foreign policies before Perry (1853) and to find some rhetorical devices employed therein as well as rhetorical strategies adopted to overcome obstacles inherent in the context.

Let me supply an example of what came to light as a result of departing from the traditional perspective in a study of this pre-Perry discourse (Itaba, 1995). Concerned with Japan's relations with the West, Japanese rhetors during the pre-Perry period did not speak in public like Western orators did; they wrote persuasive texts to express their views. They did not show them to the public immediately, however. At a time when the Tokugawa notion of *shoshi ogi* (or political discussion beyond the station of the commoners) condemned public expression of political opinions, writing down their views allowed them to wait for an emergence of an audience, which they often hoped would include decision makers of the shogunate; the rhetors looked for audiences that might be receptive to their views. Some texts, indeed, reached their readers within the government, while others were promulgated through personal relationship of those who handcopied them. Their views were thus communicated. This implies that writing a text was itself the rhetor's strategic choice in order for a rhetorical transaction to occur at the most appropriate moment involving a receptive and sympathetic audience. This kind of rhetorical pattern, which I call "the receptive act," would not have been identified if the critic had persistently worn the orator-centered lenses to find and/or evaluate "the speech act." Or more broadly, this kind of study itself would not have been possible because the pre-Perry symbolic acts would otherwise have been overlooked as being "unrhetorical" inasmuch as the writers I examined did not emphasize their leadership by seeking to produce imme-

diate impact.

This short essay has examined the U.S.-based literature that portrayed the Japanese in relation to rhetoric, in order to suggest that Aristotelianism is not the only approach available and that rhetorical studies be concerned with all kinds of human action for symbolic inducements. This broader view of rhetoric should enable us to more fully understand theoretical assumptions for Japanese engagement in persuasion. And seen in this light, more studies about dynamic processes of Japanese persuasion per se ought to be generated.

References

- Becker, C.B. (1991). Language and logic in modern Japan. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 18: 441-73.
- Branham, R.J. (1994). Debate and dissent in late Tokugawa and Meiji Japan. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 30: 131-49.
- Brock, B.L., Scott, R.L., & Checebro, J.W. (1989). *Methods of rhetorical criticism: A twentieth-century perspective*. Detroit: Wayne State UP.
- Campbell, K.K. (1971). The rhetoric of radical Black nationalism: A case study in self-conscious criticism. *Central States Speech Journal* 22: 151-60.
- Glazer, H. (1968). *The international businessman in Japan: The Japanese image*. Tokyo: Sophia U, in cooperation with Tuttle Rutland.
- Itaba, Y. (1995). *Reconstructing Japanese rhetorical strategies: A study of foreign-policy discourse during the pre-Perry period, 1873-1853*. Doctoral dissertation, U. of Minnesota.
- Jensen, J.V. (1987). Rhetorical emphases of Taoism. *Rhetorica* 5: 219-29.
- Lomas, C.W. (1946). Public discussion in Japan--index to democracy. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 32: 311-16.
- Lutz, C.A., & J.L. Collins (1993). *Reading national geographic*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- Morrison, J.L. (1972). The absence of a rhetorical tradition in Japanese culture. *Western Speech* 36: 89-102.

(Dr. Yoshihisa Itaba is Assistant Professor of Speech Communication at KUIS.)

☆…………… ☆…………… ☆……………

研究所からのお知らせ

研究所直通の電話、ファックス番号を新設しました。研究所宛のお問い合わせ等、従来の番号以外にもこちらで直接受け賜りますのでご利用下さい。

異文研直通番号(Tel/Fax) 043-273-2324

講演会報告

異文研主催第34回異文化コミュニケーション講演会が、5月24日(金)に神田外語学院(東京)で開催された。本学スペイン語学科教授の戸門一衛氏が「ヨーロッパ統合の実験—経済のボーダーレス化と民族アイデンティティーの融合は可能か」という演題のもと、約90名の参加者に熱弁を振るった。EUの現状、特に労使関係・言語政策等について大きな流れを指摘しつつ、具体例を多々盛り込み、さらには、スペインにおけるカタルーニャ地方の人々のアイデンティティーの模索における諸活動を論じた意義深い講演内容であった。参加者との質疑応答も活発に取り交わされ、2時間の講演時間が瞬く間に終了した。

第6回 異文研夏期セミナー

本年度セミナーは前回に引き続き、8月末に福島県白河にある研修センター、British Hillsで行います。昨年度の参加者からのご希望にお応えして、今回は従来の2泊3日のプログラムに加えてPre-Seminar Sessionも企画しました。開催案内をご希望の方は当研究所までファックスまたは郵便でお申し込み下さい。

日時: 1996年8月29日(木)～31日(土)

*Pre-Seminar Session 8月28日(水)～29日(木)

会場: British Hills (福島県)

テーマ: 異文化コミュニケーションの教育と研究
—多文化共生社会に向けて—

内容: 講演、研究発表、ワークショップ(6セッションのうち2つを選択)、ディスカッション等

*Pre-Seminar Session ワークショップ(3セッション)

申込締切日: 1996年6月28日(金)

[定員となり次第、締め切らせて頂きます。また、先着順に参加希望ワークショップに振り分けさせていただきます。]

研究発表者、パネリスト募集

セミナー第1日目に行われる研究発表の発表者を参加者の中から6名募集します。コミュニケーション、異文化コミュニケーション、比較文化に関するテーマであれば発表できます。

また、第3日目に予定しているパネル・ディスカッションのパネリストを5名募集しています。詳細は応募用紙(開催案内に添付)をご覧ください。

応募期限: 1996年6月21日(金)

異文化コミュニケーション・キーワード集発刊

異文化コミュニケーションという領域において、ものが語られるとき、共通の用語が必須であるという認識のもと、1994年3月に用語研究プロジェクトが異文研に発足しました。それから約2年の歳月をかけて、キーワードの選定、分類を行いました。この度、この研究プロジェクトの集大成といえるキーワード集を刊行しました。

ご希望の方には、実費でお頒けいたします。相当額分の切手を同封の上、お申し込み下さい。なお、部数に限りがありますので、早めにお申し込み下さい。

一部 810円 (郵送料310円込)

『異文化コミュニケーション研究』論文募集

1996年度紀要編集委員会では『異文化コミュニケーション研究』第9号の論文を1,2篇募集しています。異文化コミュニケーション、コミュニケーション及び関連分野の研究者は自由に投稿できます。提出期限は9月30日です。執筆要項は紀要第7号の最終頁に記載されています。

なお、第8号は4月に刊行しました。ご希望の方には実費でお頒けしています。相当額分の切手を同封の上、お申し込み下さい。

紀要 一部 810円 (郵送料310円込)
抜刷 論文一点 230円 (郵送料130円込)

修士論文・博士論文寄贈依頼

異文研図書室では、資料内容の充実を図るため、本格的な論文収集を開始しました。その第一歩として、修士、博士論文コーナーを図書室に創設しました。文化とコミュニケーションに関するテーマで論文を執筆された方は是非、一部ご寄贈下さい。図書室の論文コーナーに保管し、学内外の学生、研究者に供用させていただきます。

学会・研究会予告

日本コミュニケーション学会 第26回年次大会

日時: 1996年6月22日(土)~23日(日)

会場: 大妻女子大学多摩校(東京都)

テーマ: コミュニケーションと世界化

問い合わせ先:

〒157 世田谷区砧5-2-1 日本大学商学部

日本コミュニケーション学会学術局 成毛信男

名古屋異文化コミュニケーションセミナー

日時: 第1期: 1996年8月21日(水)~24日(土)

第2期: 1996年8月25日(日)~28日(水)

会場: 修道院研修センター(岐阜県多治見市)

第1期開講セミナー(4コースのうち1つを受講):

異文化コミュニケーション入門
外国人留学生アドバイザー入門他

第2期開講セミナー(4コースのうち1つを受講):

短期留学(受け入れ)プログラムの開発
異文化間臨床心理学入門他

申込締切日: 1996年7月10日(水)

参加費: 第1期または第2期のみ参加: 38,000円

第1、2期ともに参加: 78,000円

問い合わせ先:

〒466 名古屋市昭和区山里町18

南山大学外国語学部英米科 近藤祐一

Tel. 052-832-3111 ex. 552 Fax 052-832-5490

E-Mail: kondo@ic.nanzan-u.ac.jp

The Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication 1996

Session 1: July 17-19, 1996

Session 2: July 22-26, 1996

Session 3: July 29-August 2, 1996

Internship Session: July 12-27, 1996

For more information, please contact:

The Intercultural Communication Institute

8835 SW Canyon Lane, Suite 238, Portland, Oregon 97225

Phone: 503-297-4622 Fax: 503-297-4695

E-Mail: ici@pacificu.edu

Communication and Culture: China and the World Entering the 21 Century

August 13-16, 1996; Peiking University, China

For more information, please contact:

D. Ray Heisey, School of Communication Studies

Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242

Phone: 216-672-2649 Fax: 216-672-3510

E-Mail: rheisey@kentvm.kent.edu.

Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity and Global Communication

July 11-14, 1996;

Rochester Institute of Technology, New York

For more information, please contact:

Michael Prosser, Kern Professor in Communications

Rochester Institute of Technology

92 Lomb Memorial Drive, Rochester, N.Y. 14623-5604

Phone: 716-475-2804 Fax: 716-475-7120

E-Mail: mhpgpt@rit.edu.

比較文明学会 第14回大会

日時: 1996年10月31日(木)~11月1日(金)

会場: 名護屋城博物館(佐賀県)

研究発表申込期限: 1996年7月1日(月)

問い合わせ先: 第14回大会実行委員会事務局

〒812-81 福岡市東区箱崎6-19-1

九州大学文学部東洋史学研究室内

Tel. 092-641-1101 ex. 3214 Fax 092-651-3792