

# The Ryukyuanist

A Newsletter on Ryukyuan/Okinawan Studies

---

No. 62

Winter 2003-2004

---

## REVIEW ARTICLE

*The Demise of the Ryukyu Kingdom. Western Accounts and Controversy.* Edited with notes by Eitetsu Yamaguchi and Yuko Arakawa. Okinawa, Ginowan : Yôjushorin, 2002, xxiv-270 pp. ¥ 2000. ISBN 4-947667-86-9 C1021.

This book gathers twelve articles dealing with the dispute between China and Japan over the possession of the Ryûkyû Islands, or to take into account China's perhaps more benign approach to the issue, over the political status of the Kingdom of Ryûkyû. With one exception, these articles, a majority of them anonymous, appeared in the *Tokio Times*, the *London Times*, the *Japan Gazette* and the *New York Herald* from August to December 1879. They thus relate to the preliminary phase of the negotiations, when General Ulysses S. Grant acted as a mediator between the two parties. But for his international repute, the former U.S. president's involvement with the Ryûkyû question owes it all to chance. While visiting China as a private individual in June 1879, he found himself requested by the highest Chinese authorities, namely Viceroy Li Hongzhang (Li Hungchang) and Prince Regent Gong (Kung), to hear China's claims concerning Ryûkyû and to defend her cause during his projected sojourn in Japan. As yet, Grant had no acquaintance whatever with the Ryûkyû question. Apparently convinced that some wrong had been done to China, he promised to exert his good offices in broaching the subject with Japanese officials.

China was then in an uncomfortable situation, to say the least, as a result of the course of the action followed by Japan in Ryûkyû during the 1870s. The facts are well known. In 1872, one year after the abolition of the *han* or feudal domains, Tokyo had taken official control of the Kingdom of Ryûkyû and transformed it into a *han* that was successively administered by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and, from 1875, by the more intrusive Ministry of the Interior, until its final dissolution and the creation of Okinawa Prefecture proclaimed together on April 4, 1879. That last move had been sealed by King Shô Tai's forced resignation and exile to Tokyo. Obviously, Japan held the field.

In September 1872, China, battling with other threats on her borders, refused to comply with Tokyo's demand for the chastisement of the Taiwan aborigines who massacred some fifty-four Ryûkyûan castaways in December of the previous year. She not only considered having sole rights on, or sole responsibility for, Ryûkyû, but had already settled the incident directly with the kingdom by the spring of 1872. However, a similar but much less serious incident occurred in 1873 involving Japanese from Oda Prefecture. Using China's lack of punitive action against the aborigines as an excuse, the Japanese leaders sent an expeditionary force to Taiwan in May 1874, with unofficial U.S. assistance. That military operation ended in October of the same year with the conclusion of a Sino-Japanese agreement in which Japan's action was described as [a state's] legitimate action to protect its subjects and China took the position not to object to it as improper. The agreement also provided for Chinese relief money to the households of the murdered victims. Yet, the Agreement's wording was imprecise enough to allow the Japanese government to stretch its interpretation to make foreign observers thereafter believe that China had assented to the designation of the Ryûkyûans as Japanese subjects.

From 1875, after a Ryûkyûan mission had reached China and asked for her help, through early 1879, Beijing had appealed repeatedly, in less and less amiable terms, to Tokyo for a halt in its annexation policy. An interesting summary of these diplomatic approaches and of the correspondence between the governments of China and Japan prior to Grant's intervention is found in the September 1, 1879 issue of the *New York Herald*. In the Japanese capital, the Chinese diplomats, through the agency of the Ryûkyûan envoys, had also alerted the U.S., French, and British legations — the first two countries having signed a treaty with Ryûkyû — to the current fate of the kingdom and of its inhabitants. Their plea, couched in Chinese, called for an urgent restoration of Ryûkyû to its traditional status of dual subordination to China

and Japan, a solution, even if temporary, ill-suited to modern times. Unsurprisingly, this tardy and desperate agitation had been of no avail.

Thus, shortly after his arrival in Tokyo, General Grant was invited at the Chinese embassy to examine China's case against Japan closely. Thereupon, assisted by the U.S. minister John Bingham, he intimated that he would like to confer about Ryūkyū with the Japanese authorities. The latter already considered their country's sovereignty over these islands to be well established. Accordingly, they refused to have Washington brought into the dispute, as Beijing was then hoping. Conscious, however, of Japan's vulnerability in case of a war with China, and of the advantages that European powers could gain from such an event, they did not oppose the opening of discussions with their prestigious but unofficial guest. For that purpose, a meeting was arranged in Nikkō on July 22, 1879, that gave Grant the opportunity to debate freely with the Minister of the Interior Itō Hirobumi, the Minister of War Saigō Tsugumichi, and Japan's representative in the U.S. Yoshida Kiyonari. Grant himself could not see how Japan would now recede on Ryūkyū, but he, nonetheless, insisted that China's susceptibilities had to be spared for the sake of peace.

What came next is reported only in the last article reprinted here, published in 1883 in the Yokohama-based Presbyterian monthly *The Chrysanthemum*. Its author, ex-Captain Francis Brinkley, was a major figure of the foreign press in Meiji Japan. He had arrived in the country in 1867 and had served as an instructor in the Japanese navy before turning to journalism.\* Fluent in Japanese, he later became an authority on Japanese arts, and a discreet adviser to the Japanese government as well. His article, entitled "The Story of the Ryūkyū Complication", gathers information from articles previously published in the weekly edition of the *Japan Mail*, a newspaper that he had owned and edited since 1881.

To sum it up briefly, upon Grant's recommendation, and faced with China's rather successful efforts to arouse the attention of western diplomats, the Japanese government eventually agreed to undertake direct negotiations with Beijing in order to find a solution that would satisfy both sides. Not only was the Ryūkyū issue on the agenda, but also the renewal of the 1871 treaty between the two countries. The conference was held in Beijing, a gesture of Japanese goodwill, between mid-August and late October 1880. China was represented by Prince Gong, the head of the *Zongliyamen* (Foreign Office), and Japan by her minister in China, Shishido Tamaki. A first proposal put forward by the Chinese, not mentioned in Brinkley's, was abandoned at once. It envisaged a tripartite division of the Ryūkyū Islands: Amami-Ōshima to remain Japanese, Miyako and Yaeyama to be given to China, and Okinawa, made independent and neutral, could have perpetuated a restored Kingdom of Ryūkyū.

Finally, on October 21, the negotiators came to a more realistic agreement confirming Japan's sovereignty over Okinawa and the northern islands while granting Miyako and Yaeyama to China. The official sealing of the documents was scheduled to take place ten days later. But nothing like it was ever to happen. Although both Prince Gong and Shishido Tamaki were supposed to have received full powers to negotiate, Beijing then decided to have the documents further approved by the Northern and Southern Superintendents, a dilatory maneuver reflecting the resentment of some officials at a settlement that seemed too advantageous a deal for Japan. The limbo situation so created dragged on for two months, despite the unconcealed indignation of Tokyo and of its minister in Beijing. By early January 1881, the latter ran out of patience and left China. For Japan the case was definitively closed, to her own undeniable advantage.

Apart from the account of Grant's dealings with Chinese and Japanese officials, the articles found here introduce readers to the whole array of historical and cultural arguments set forth by China and Japan to support their respective views on Ryūkyū. It is not to be doubted, according to this reviewer's conviction, that the Japanese side demonstrated much insincerity in the matter. Most of its arguments, from the vague reference to the "Southern Islands" in ancient texts to King Shō Nei's supposedly willing acceptance of Satsuma's domination, not to mention the legend of Tametomo or the alleged common worship of Shintō gods, appear at least specious, if not plainly false. Only the practical subjection, political and commercial, of Ryūkyū to Satsuma, just as the inclusion of its revenues into the latter's resources, leaves no room for refutation. In other words, Japan was reshaping vague feudal rights based on coercion into a fully-fledged title deed that could justify her grasp on Ryūkyū in the eyes of the West.

By contrast, China's plea fares much better in terms of historical evidence. The description of the old political and cultural bonds between the Kingdom of Ryūkyū and the Chinese empire may well tend to emphasize the latter's generosity, but it still rests on well-documented grounds and barely needs any amendment. The problem with the Chinese approach lies elsewhere, namely in its blindness to the Japanese involvement. It is a fact that former Chinese rulers had remained indifferent to Japan's parallel influence in Ryūkyū. Whether they were unaware of it or they chose not to react as long as it did not prevent the tributary kingdom from properly fulfilling its duties no longer mattered much. That situation having prevailed for over two and a half centuries, it had now become pretty hazardous for China to plead that Satsuma's and Edo's interference in Ryūkyūan affairs constituted an infringement of some law between the nations, a law yet to be written. Conversely, it was very easy for the Japanese to maintain that "the Chinese government has allowed itself to be deceived" by the "double game" of the people of Ryūkyū, thus having also the latter share their responsibility in the concealment of their activities from the Chinese, as later from western visitors (p.141).

At the same time, and this would make China's attitude altogether more friendly, the Chinese notion of tributary status, at least as applied to Ryūkyū, entailed no territorial control. On the contrary, the Kingdom of Ryūkyū, so goes the Chinese memorandum, was supposed to have freely chosen to enter the tribute system on account of China's political and cultural preeminence, but remained a foreign and independent country, recognized as such by the Chinese rulers (what the Japanese shrewdly rephrase as "honorary overlordship", as opposed to their effective "ownership", p. 25). This is a marked difference between the positions of Japan and China: while the former strives to depict the Ryūkyūans as true Japanese, the latter considers them fundamentally as a distinct people with specific customs. In her appeal to Japan and to the western nations, China is indeed not so much claiming the possession of the Ryūkyū Islands as she is denying Japan the right to hold a territory of some strategic importance.

In sum, the Chinese had been all too naïve, and the Japanese, who had discarded direct intercourse with China for political reasons, smart cheats. As to their bone of contention, the Ryūkyūans themselves, one is of course struck that no attention was paid here to their viewpoint, save perhaps for a few words in the London *Times* editorial of December 12. Admittedly, and the foreign zealots of Japan's policy were not the least prompt to mention it, the poor and rather reticent Ryūkyūans could not but benefit from the administrative and social modernization conducted at a brisk pace by Tokyo.

Assessing the validity of historical arguments referring mostly to long-past events, if not to antiquity, could seem of little significance now that the Japanese annexation of Ryūkyū had become a *fait accompli*. But no conflict goes without mobilizing truth and right. Whereas the articles of the *Japan Gazette* and of the *New York Herald* try to follow a neutral approach to the controversy, Brinkley's and those of the *Tokio Times* clearly adopt a pro-Japanese stance, taking for granted Japan's "immemorial rights" to Ryūkyū and her cordial spirit towards China. Both the *Tokio Times* and Brinkley's *Japan Mail* happened to be subsidized by the Japanese government.

The much publicized views of Tokyo on Ryūkyū's past meet with criticism in the letters addressed to the editor of the London *Times* by Robert K. Douglas, a British specialist on China, and by John Russell Young, a journalist on the *New York Herald*, as well as in the ironical editorial, but with a somewhat ambiguous ending, published in the latter newspaper on December 12. All three pieces were meant as a rejoinder to the shipbuilder and adviser to the Japanese navy Edward J. Reed whose letter to the *Times*, parroting the official Japanese statement, presented the readers of that publication with a Tokyo-biased and much simplified understanding of the Ryūkyū question. Still, the most comprehensive refutation of Japan's approach to Ryūkyūan history is provided in an article of the *Japan Gazette* straightforwardly entitled "Audi Alteram Partem" (Hear the Other Voice) and intended to counterbalance the learned argumentation of the Japanese government spread by the *Tokio Times* issue of October 11, 1879 (also reprinted here).

Two essays introduce the book, both ending with hopes that the evolution of old western nation states towards decentralization and a more flexible concept of sovereignty could eventually influence Japan and lead to the restoration of Okinawa's independence. However, it should not have escaped their authors that the administrative decentralization and the reinforcement of regional governments in Europe are paralleled by a process of global integration, still in its early stage, affecting all levels of social life. If more

independence from traditional centers of power is achieved, new bonds of mutual dependence, no less demanding and standardizing, are taking over.

The first essay, by Paul J. Best, is rather disappointing on account of its indiscriminate application of such notions as “ethnic group”, “people”, “minority” or “nationality” to all sub-national discontent or unrest within Europe and beyond. Ordinary contempt for democratic principles, racketeering, and too many bombings and murders perpetrated with scarcely any popular support should have also been included in the picture. They are sure symptoms of a “subjective recognition” of invented or insufficiently pertinent “distinctive features”, to borrow the author’s vocabulary, not those of a colonial situation that would allow or compel the liberators and future heroes to become terrorists. There are too many fallacies and mistakes here to point them out. Suffice it to say that Sardinia, twice mentioned as French, was a French territory only from 1805 to 1815! The author surely meant Corsica, some nearby island, but I doubt its activists would appreciate being called “Italic people”.

As a European, heir to a long history of countless wars conducted in the name of a nation, a religion, a race, or simply of civilization, I am very suspicious of any discourse fostering the political expression of “identity”, too subjective a notion to be trusted when there is no apartheid of any kind to give it substance. Differentiation is a bloody game which humans are too prone to play, and on the whole I would rather encourage people to free themselves from their “identity”, were it to endanger social solidarity. Actual injustice, oppression, segregation, and hindrances to democracy, both as a technique of representation and as an ethic, are, in my view, what should really matter.

Injustice, with all the sufferings attached to it, is precisely, alas, what best characterizes Okinawa’s past and present. In his essay, Taira Kôji draws its modern genealogy and shows with great sensitivity and soundness how lies, manipulations and contradictions have helped to perpetuate a situation of injustice, concretized mainly in the ongoing presence of U.S. bases, up to now. Though a foreigner, I personally adhere to his opinion that this situation provides, or could provide, legitimate grounds for political action aimed at achieving more autonomy or even secession. Yet, it cannot be overlooked that the Okinawans themselves, as voters, do not back up such a trend and most often accept, at least a majority among them, compromise with Tokyo in exchange for compensations. Another aspect of Taira Kôji’s rationale bothers me: his reference to the “unique ethnicity” of Okinawans, meaning race and culture. Although one can readily admit that Okinawan society is “ethnically” homogeneous, in sharp contrast with western societies, nurturing an Okinawan or Ryûkyûan national consciousness on that tenet would pretty much seem like mirroring Japan’s own cultural nationalism and innate particularism, with all their flaws, far away from Okinawa’s aspirations to be a crossroads of Asian cultures.

The editors have supplemented the articles with many notes providing the *kanji* for Chinese or Japanese names, titles and specific terms, together with complementary information in Japanese. Under the heading of complaints, I wish this book had benefited from an overall check to suppress, let alone misprints, the numerous erratic hyphenations or breaks, probably the consequence of some unfortunate software transfer. A better page design would have also made the texts easier to grasp, especially for Brinkley’s long article, in which the documents quoted are undifferentiated from the author’s comments. Last and not least, one may regret that the editors have chosen to Japanize the titles by substituting the name Ryûkyû for the original Lewchew and Loochoo, relevant witnesses to centuries of Chinese influence. The reviewer hastens to add that the newspaper articles edited here are made much more legible and accessible than in his own costly collection which, although more comprehensive in scope, happens to lack a few of them.\*\*

In conclusion, *The Demise of the Ryukyu Kingdom* is a most welcome publication reviving critical moments of modern Ryûkyûan-Okinawan history. It contributes to the knowledge of that period while inviting us to ponder again the respective weight of might and right in the development of contemporary societies. This book has simultaneously appeared in Japanese, translated by Yamaguchi Eitetsu, with four pages of photographs showing General Grant, Francis Brinkley, Li Hongzhang, and Prince Gong. Instead of the two introductory essays, one finds a presentation by Yamaguchi Eitetsu that usefully places the articles in historical context (*Ryûkyû ôkoku no hôkai. Dai dôranki no nitshû gaikôsen*. Yamaguchi Eitetsu *henyaku*. Okinawa, Ginowan: Yôjushorin, 2002, 238 pp. ¥3000. ISBN 4-947667-85-0 C1021).

Patrick Beillevaire

\* On Brinkley and the foreign press in Meiji Japan, see the excellent book of J. E. Hoare, *Japan's Treaty Ports and Foreign Settlements*, Richmond: Curzon, 1994.

\*\* *Ryūkyū Studies since 1854*, vol. 2, Richmond: Curzon; Tokyo: Edition Synapse, 2002.

**Dr. Patrick Beillevaire** is Director of Research at the French National Center for Scientific Research and Head of the Japan Research Center at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris. He is an anthropologist and a historian, currently engaged in research into the Kingdom of Ryūkyū in the mid-19th century and Satsuma's opening to the West. His recent publications include a 10-volume collection of historical materials titled *Ryūkyū Studies to 1854: Western Encounter, Part I* (5 volumes) and *Ryūkyū Studies Since 1854: Western Encounter, Part II* (5 volumes), published in 2000 and 2002 respectively by Curzon Press (Richmond, UK); and *Le voyage au Japon: Anthologie de textes français, 1858-1908* (Paris: Laffont, 2001).

---

### **Communication: Okinawa panel at the AAS annual meeting**

James Roberson organized a panel called "Performing Okinawa: Identity, Politics and Performance in/out of Okinawa" for the Association for Asian Studies annual meeting in San Diego, March 4-7, 2004. Papers were delivered by Roberson (Oxford Brookes University), Terada Yoshitaka (National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka), Chris Nelson (University of North Carolina) and Maetakenishi Kazuma (Columbia University). Gerald Figal (Vanderbilt University) acted as discussant. The panel's aim was to discuss issues of power, identity and resistance in Okinawan identity and experience through the lens of performance, locating the performance of self-affirming and contestational Okinawan identity politics in cultural practice.

Roberson's paper (Singing the Okinawan Diaspora: Songs of Home, Departure and Return) traced Okinawan articulations of music and migration as manifest in songs such as "Hawaii Bushi", "Nan'yō Gaeri", "Jokō Bushi", "Marijima Hanari", and "Gambateando" which narrate Okinawan diasporic experiences and identities. Terada's presentation (Drumming out a message: *Eisā* and the Okinawan diaspora in mainland Japan) discussed the socio-cultural environment in which *eisā* performances were started by the Okinawan minority in Osaka. He argued that the selection of *eisā* is significant because publicly performing this previously stigmatized art form shows how younger Okinawans have strived to develop pride and confidence. Nelson's paper (The Battlefield of Memory: The Politics of Memoriation in Contemporary Okinawa) focused on a workshop seminar series organized by Fujiki Hayato and discussed how the embodied learning of *asobimanabu* and comedic dialogue allowed the everyday to enact and narrate contemporary Okinawan experience and social memory. Maetakenishi's presentation (The Politics of Performance in the Local History of Okinawa) focused on *Kimutaka no Amawari*, a community-based school performance popular in the Yokatsu area, discussed the contribution of performance to the contestational re-interpretation of local history and the re-invention of local identities, not only in the context of the local community ritual but of civil society at large. Comments by Gerald Figal encouraged greater critical consideration of performance as embodied cultural practice involving also culturally and historically situated audiences of reception.

The panel's audience of about 40 included other scholars working on Okinawa such as Mike Molasky, Linda Angst and David Tobaru Obermiller--Obermiller also presented a paper at the conference called "Dreaming of Ryukyu: Labor and Resistance in Occupied Okinawa), scholars interested in performance (for example, Millie Creighton and R. Anderson Sutton), and at least one or two Okinawans (Mrs. M. Hibbett). A lively discussion arose from questions from the floor to the panelists. Terada Yoshitaka and Maetakenishi Kazuma both showed video clips. A number of people came up to talk with panelists after the end of the formal panel in order to ask further questions, indicating a rather broad interest in Okinawa and in Okinawan performance. One hopes that more people will present papers and write about various aspects of Okinawan performance and how it relates to Okinawan identity (politics).

James Roberson  
Oxford Brookes University

### **In memoriam: HIGA, Masanori (1929 - 2003) (I)**

Professor Masanori HIGA, who passed away on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2003, was a great Ryukyuan educator, scholar and administrator. When he was a student at the First Middle School of Okinawa Prefecture, he joined the Japanese army as a member of the Steel and Blood Student Corps during the Battle of Okinawa. He was severely wounded and lost his left arm. At that moment he realized that he would not be able to lead a life of manual labor and determined to devote his whole life instead to a profession. After the war was over, he went to the United States for higher education under the GARIOA scholarship program. Majoring in applied linguistics, he obtained his doctorate from Harvard University and taught at eight American and Japanese universities. Overcoming his physical handicap, he finally attained his goal. He was a man of iron will, great determination, courage, and fortitude. He was quite a personality, one we were most proud of.

On September 27, 2003, a memorial service took place at the Granvier Hotel Kyoto within the compound of Kyoto Station. About 300 people gathered there: his friends, students, and colleagues, including such distinguished scholars as Dr. Takeshi SHIBATA, professor emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Dr. Hujio IKADO, professor emeritus of Tsukuba University, Dr. Hiroshi IMADA, former president of Kwansai University, and Dr. Hiroshi KUSANAGI, former president of Tsukuba Women's University. Twelve professors delivered eulogies. Every one of them referred to Higa's very kind, generous, hospitable and yet rational and unbending character. Whenever Japanese scholars came to the United States, he invited them to dinner either at his home or at a restaurant. Many of those present at the memorial service expressed their heart-felt appreciation for his warm friendship and hospitality they received in the United States as well as in Japan.

I cannot forget the day I visited the Seta campus of Ryukoku University to attend the First Intercultural Conference. Higa had made a reservation of the best room at the best hotel in the capital city of Otsu overlooking the beautiful scenery of Lake Biwa. There he and his wife invited me to the best dinner I ever had. The following day he showed me around the Miidera, one of the most famous temples in Japan, as well as drove me around the lake by car. As he could not climb the slope to the temple, I really felt a sense of guilt when I heard that he was hospitalized once again. As a socio-linguist he always paid special attention to cultivating, maintaining, improving or restoring social relationships.

As a college teacher of English and linguistics, Higa made a great contribution to reforming of methods of teaching English in Japan. He criticized the traditional grammar-centered and word-for-word translation methods, which he considered the worst methods for teaching English. As a member of the Course Guideline Committee of the Ministry of Education, he proposed that communicative competence be emphasized. He demonstrated this not only in classes but also through a series of lectures on TV. In practice he never asked his students to translate English into Japanese or vice versa. Instead, students were required to paraphrase passages or write essays on specific themes in English only. He was one of the most inspiring professors of English, and he was invited to give lectures on English education at colleges and universities as well as at the academic conferences all over Japan. He held that the teaching of English should not be an "art," that is, a skill; but rather it should be a "science," by which he meant the application of linguistic theory to teaching practice. In response to the question what communicative competence was, he said that the aim of English education should be for students to get acquainted with cultures of English-speaking countries and to be able to introduce their own culture to those countries. In other words, English is a tool to communicate one's ideas and emotions for internationalization of Japan. The impact of the revolutionary reform of the Course Guideline on English Education was so great that English teachers now emphasize the importance of practical English.

In Japan Higa was a pioneer or a champion of socio-linguistics that originated in the multicultural and multiethnic United States of America. On the basis of linguistic theory, he made a historical survey of Ryukyuan language studies of the past. In his critical essay on Herbert John Clifford and Bernard Jean Bettelheim, he points out that their Ryukyuan translations or books on the Ryukyuan language cannot be highly regarded from a linguistic point of view. Bettelheim's translation is neither a perfect Ryukyuan translation nor an accurate Japanese translation. But Higa comments that Bettelheim's *English-Loochuan Dictionary* might be considered a contribution to Ryukyuan language studies. He criticizes Clifford

because he could not tell the difference between *yooka* ("eighth day") and *tooka* ("tenth day"). According to Higa, Clifford's *Vocabulary of the Loo-choo Language* is historically significant, the starting point of linguistics in Japan as well as in the Ryukyus. Linguistics proper starts, he argues, with Basil Hall Chamberlain, professor of linguistics at Tokyo University, who published an "Essay in Aid of a Grammar and Dictionary of the Luchuan Language" in 1895. Chamberlain was the one who linked the Ryukyuan language to Japanese, says Higa.

Higa was most concerned with a sociolinguistic study of the Ryukyuan and Japanese languages. He approached these languages from a historical, social, and psychological vantage point and applied sociolinguistic theory to his linguistic analysis of the languages, because language is a product of society and a part of culture. In spite of the fact that Ryukyuan is historically, culturally, and psychologically different from Japanese, Ryukyuan linguists are not interested in the differences. They are more interested in the linkage of Ryukyuan to Japanese. They regard Ryukyuan not as an independent language but rather as a dialect of Japanese. Higa argues that this kind of bias makes an objective and scientific study of Ryukyuan more difficult. Historically, for example, the Ryukyu kingdom had a long-term tributary relationship with China, Satsuma, and Korea, a fact that linguists should not ignore when they consider the relationship between Ryukyuan and the languages of those neighboring countries. In his study of Ryukyuan loanwords, Higa cites *hinpun* (Chinese), *sanpin* (Chinese), *samurê* (Satsuma Japanese), *hâmê* (Korean), *uchatô* (Satsuma Japanese), *hagama* (Satsuma Japanese), *tacchû* (Sanskrit), and so forth as good examples of such loanwords.

In addition to his "Study of the Use of Loanwords in Hawaiian Japanese," Higa conducted special fieldwork on the Ryukyuan language spoken by emigrants from the Ryukyus to Brazil, Argentina, and Bolivia in terms of their social assimilation or segregation in their respective communities. In those countries, he mentions that Ryukyuan is still spoken in everyday life, but that it will die out by the third generation. As a sociolinguistics scholar he made a great contribution to exploring the way to the sociolinguistic study of the Ryukyuan and Japanese languages for young linguists. His *Language and Culture* is said to be the first book ever published in Japan on the sociolinguistic approach.

Finally, Higa made a great contribution to the advancement of higher education as a university administrator. At Tsukuba University he served as Director of the English Language Center, Director of the University of the Air Library, and Dean of the College of Intercultural Studies he himself established at Ryukoku University. When the Video Study Center of the University of the Air was opened on the campus of the University of the Ryukyus, he was appointed Acting Director. In addition, it should not be forgotten, he was appointed by the Ministry of Education an inspector for junior colleges as well as a member of the Course Guideline Committee in Foreign Language Instruction for junior and senior high school teachers and a member of the Screening Committee for college and graduate level English teachers. In 1999-2001, he served as president of the International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies based at Trinity University, Texas. In recognition of his achievements as a progressive teacher, scholar, and administrator, he was appointed professor emeritus of both Tsukuba and Ryukoku universities, and decorated with the Third Class Order by the Japanese Government. His academic contributions are too numerous to mention in detail.

Eiki SENAHA  
University of the Ryukyus

### **In memoriam: HIGA, Masanori (1929 - 2003) (II)**

I first met Masanori Higa in the autumn of 1949 in the Bible class conducted by a Mr. Robert Smith and a nisei interpreter, Miss Mary Suzuki, both working at the U.S. military government in Chinen, Okinawa. Masanori was an English teacher at Chinen High School, and I was a translator at the U.S. military government. I remember him as a very intelligent young man with bright eyes and a good voice. In 1950 we took and passed the examination for study in the United States.

We were part of the group of 52 young men and women from the Ryukyus who left Okinawa aboard a U.S. military transport from White Beach on July 4, 1950. Stopping over in Manila, Guam, Pearl Harbor, we arrived in San Francisco on July 26. Then we were taken to Mills College in Oakland for an orientation

course. There were teachers such as Dr. Rotunda, Mr. Smith, Miss Wright, and Miss Galbraith. I remember Miss Galbraith once talking about Masanori. She said, "Higa has a wonderful spirit." After a five-week orientation course, we were sent to different colleges and universities. Masanori was sent to a college in Georgia, if I remember correctly, while I was one of the 28 sent to the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

After finishing college in Georgia, Masanori studied at Boston University, and finally earned his doctorate in applied linguistics at Harvard in 1962. First he taught at the University of the Ryukyus. Then he left Okinawa and taught at such schools as Kwansei Gakuin University, the University of Hawaii, Tsukuba University, University of the Air, and Ryukoku University in Kyoto.

For several years before and after 1970, he was teaching at the University of Hawaii. When the State University of New York at Albany celebrated its 125th anniversary in 1969, my wife and I decided to attend the event. I wrote him that we would be visiting my alma mater in Albany in May. He wrote back immediately, telling us to stop over in Honolulu on our way back from New York. We arrived in Honolulu on May 29. He took us around Honolulu and to different parts of Oahu. Notably, he took us to an old sugar manufactory where the immigrant workers from Okinawa used to work. He also took us to the Punch Bowl, the national cemetery on top of the mountain behind the city of Honolulu. We stayed at his place for three days. It was something amazing that he was teaching native English-speaking American students at the University of Hawaii. He also helped many Japanese scholars who came to the University of Hawaii for research work. He was always ready to help others who needed his help.

He was a very thoughtful person. When a publisher in Italy published a collection of my poems in Italian translation in 1990, I sent him a copy of the book. He was teaching at Tsukuba University at that time. Then he wrote me asking my wife and me to visit him at Tsukuba so that we might celebrate the publication of the book together. So we went and had a wonderful time together at a restaurant. He showed me his genuine pleasure seeing my humble book published in Italy. He was a person capable of sharing others' happiness.

I have the April 1983 issue of the monthly magazine, *Gengo* (Language) (Taishukan) in which he has two research papers, "Okinawa no Gairaigo" (Loanwords in Okinawa) and "Kaigai no Ryukyugo," (Ryukyuan Language Abroad), both very impressive, showing the width and depth of his research work related to the language of his homeland, Okinawa. In 1996 Tokyo Shoseki published an excellent dictionary, *Favorite English-Japanese Dictionary*, and Masanori was one of the six editors. It has been warmly received by many English teachers and students in Japan. I have it on my desk, and consult it all the time.

During the battle of Okinawa, Masanori was injured and had to have his left arm amputated at Haebaru Field Hospital. In addition to the wound, he suffered from malnutrition, illness and lice infestation of his clothes. He was so weak that nurses and medics deserted him when they fled. But he managed to learn to walk and left the cave. He was finally saved by American soldiers. He survived the horrendous Battle of Okinawa and went on to great achievements as a scholar and teacher.

Naoshi KORIYAMA  
Toyo University

The late Professor Masanori Higa was also an excellent essayist. Some of them, clearly inspired by socio-linguistics, are a series of thirteen Op-Ed type essays for the general public, initially published in *The Ryukyu Shinpo* in 1988. Each essay features a quintessential Okinawan word or phrase and illuminates its origin, meaning and cultural significance. (For a brief appreciative note on these essays of Professor Higa, see *The Ryukyuanist*, No. 21, 1993.)

*The Ryukyuanist* is edited by Koji Taira and Frank Jiro Shima. Contact: by post, F. J. Shima, 176 N. Carolina Ave., SE, Washington, D.C. 20003-1841; tel/fax, 202-547-1758; e-mail, <frank\_shima@yahoo.com>, <k-taira@uiuc.edu>. Free e-mail subscription. Hard copy: U.S.\$10.00 per year. Back issues are available at <www.iaros.org>, University of Bonn.