

In the cluster on gender, Michaela Haug (University of Cologne) talked about the impacts of environmental and economic changes in Kalimantan on gender relations among the Dayak. Drawing on her research among the Dayak Benuaq in East Kalimantan, she identifies growing inequalities among men and women. Rebecca Elmhirst (University of Brighton) adopts a “material feminist political ecology” framework to analyze gendered impacts of the oil palm industry in East Kalimantan. Her proposition is that these impacts reflect the interplay between historically and ecologically-embedded gender norms and the ways in which communities have been incorporated into oil palm systems. These gender norms and inequalities are given little attention in most Civil Society’s Organizations working on environmental issues, as Melani Abdulkadir-Sunito (IPB) explained in her talk. She proposes a plan of activities called “Gender and Resource Use Learning Circle” which aims to make members of local communities perceive and understand persisting inequalities. Siti Amanah (IPB) also addressed the question of how to enhance gender equality in environmental management. Focusing on coal mining in Central Kalimantan, she identifies the need to put effort into the promotion of a better understanding from the side of investors and operators in the field of gendered impacts of mining.

In the final cluster on transdisciplinarity, Yunita T. Winarto (UI) presented a joint research of agrometeorologists, anthropologists and farmers that aims at agrometeorological learning through “Science Field Shops”. Marion Glaser (University of Bremen) shared experiences of inclusive transdisciplinary knowledge generation based on field work in the Spermonde Island Archipelago of South Sulawesi. The talk by Martina Padmanabhan (University of Passau) focused on intercultural and interdisciplinary work within research teams. Arahmaiani Feisal contributed to the discussion on transdisciplinarity with a very unique approach as an artist. In her presentation, she gave insights into her work in Indonesia and Nepal, where she worked in villages on different ecological topics such as water use.

An initial outcome of the workshop will be a special issue with the tentative title “Contested Development. Environmental Transformations, Ethnicity and Gender in Indonesia and Beyond” published by the Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies (ASEAS).

Katharina v. Braun, Kristina Großmann, Martina Padmanabhan

Food Safety and Consumer Advocacy in Japan and East Asia

Japanese–German Centre Berlin, May 18–19, 2015

On 18 and 19 May 2015 an interdisciplinary group of scholars met at the Japanese–German Centre Berlin (JDZB) to discuss food safety and consumer advocacy in Japan and East Asia. The symposium was organised and opened by Cornelia Reiher (Graduate School of East Asian Studies, Free University of Berlin) and included presentations and panel discussions by renowned international scholars, as well as young researchers. Food issues assume a prominent position in many research areas, demonstrated by the plethora of publications concerning food safety and hygiene, international trade negotiations and other contentious issues relating to dynamic local, national and global agri-food systems. The two-day symposium attempted to bridge boundaries between different disciplinary approaches and to shed light on “politics of food”.

The first day of the symposium was opened by Kazuhito Yamashita (Canon Institute for Global Studies, Tokyo). In his keynote speech, he addressed the changing relations between food safety and international trade negotiations in line with scientific and technological

advances in food production and the intensifying globalisation of food businesses. Drawing on the example of Japan's current negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), Yamashita reflected on Japan's food safety policies. Assessing the Japanese situation from a risk-analysis perspective, he argues that Japan lacks risk communication. The role of food safety in the negotiations of preferential trade agreements was further debated in a round table discussion. Patricia Maclachlan (University of Texas), Linn Selle (Federation of German Consumer Organisations VZBV, Berlin) and Jutta Sundermann (ATTAC Germany) joined Yamashita to talk about different approaches to food safety in TPP and TTIP negotiations in Japan, the United States and Germany. Differences in civil society's responses towards regional free trade negotiations became particularly apparent. While there exist numerous examples of critical voices in Germany articulating demands to broaden the access to negotiations, US consumer activism appears comparatively weak, as it remains rather fragmented. Although Japanese activism is better organised, it seems to struggle with a clear articulation and promotion of consumer interests. The lively Q&A session following the roundtable discussion reflected the great interest in the topic, not only amongst academics, but also representatives of civil society.

The second day was structured according to four thematic panels on food risks in East Asia, food (safety) studies in Germany, food policy and politics in Japan, and food safety after Fukushima. Presentations in the first panel on food risks in East Asia covered topics ranging from global implications of China's food safety risks (Elizabeth Wishnick, Montclair State University), to the growing role of Chinese "Green Food"-promoting civil society groups (Angela Leggett, FU Berlin), and the development of food traceability systems for consumers in China and South Korea (Renee Boyoung Kim, Hanyang University). All contributions referred to a trend of growing awareness and increasing demands for safe food by consumers, which is particularly noticeable in Chinese society. Further, emphasis was placed on the interconnectedness of East Asian agri-food systems through transnational commodity chains.

The second panel represented food-related studies in Germany and the potential to bridge disciplinary boundaries. Specifically, syntheses of Food Studies and Area Studies could enable research that takes into account power struggles between (transnational) actors involved in negotiations over food safety (Sarah Ruth Sippel, Leipzig University). This potential was illustrated in a case study of a media-infused food scandal and its implications for consumer behaviour in Bangladesh (Markus Keck, University of Göttingen).

Panel three focused on food policy and politics in Japan and provided insights into changing consumer-producer relations and their implications for food safety advocacy's leverage (Patricia Maclachlan, University of Texas at Austin), the particularities of the Japanese protest movement against the TPP free-trade agreement and comparison with Germany (Cornelia Reiher, FU Berlin), as well as the changing perceptions of food imports from China influenced by the more general international relations climate (Tine Walravens, Ghent University). Presentations in the fourth panel elaborated on the rising importance of "citizen science" as well as "scientific citizenship" after the 2011 Fukushima nuclear accident in Japan. With a focus on civil radioactivity monitoring stations (Aya Kimura, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa), mothers' activities to learn about radiation after Fukushima (Nicolas Sternsdorff Cisterna, Harvard University) and organic farmers (Tomiko Yamaguchi, ICU), the presenters touched upon opportunities for and obstacles towards the politicisation of this kind of activism to increase advocacy leverage and promote food safety.

Symposium presentations culminated in a concluding discussion about further research topics, collaborations and possibilities to strengthen and further the institutionalisation of food studies as an interdisciplinary area of research. The discussants agreed that food studies can

draw together wider societal and political issues, including citizen–state relations, governance and power structures, and individual and collective agency. Establishing greater dialogue between natural and social sciences is a particular challenge, due to power relations underlying seemingly objective food safety standards and their political becoming. Lively discussions between presenters and audiences members throughout the symposium demonstrated the relevance of the topic, as well as the interest in and demand for future comparative research on the politics of food safety in different national and regional contexts.

Jan Niggemeier

Nation, Nationalismus und nationales Gedächtnis

1. Konferenz der ostasiatischen DAAD-Zentren, Universität Peking, 21.–23. Oktober 2015

Die Konferenz brachte mehr als zwanzig VertreterInnen der drei ostasiatischen DAAD-Zentren, d. h. der Universität Peking, der Universität Tokio sowie der Chung Ang Universität in Seoul, und aus Deutschland zusammen. Es gab im November 2013 bereits eine Vorkonferenz der drei Zentren zum Thema „Asien und Europa. Auf der Suche nach neuen Horizonten für das 21. Jahrhundert“ an der Chung-Ang Universität (CAU), Seoul (s. dazu meinen Bericht in ASIEN 130, S. 87–88).

Die jetzige Konferenz wurde veranstaltet vom Zentrum für Deutschlandstudien (ZDS) an der Universität Peking und geleitet von Prof. Dr. Liaoyu Huang. Erfreulicherweise waren auch eine Reihe von graduierten Studierenden beteiligt. Die gesamte Konferenz fand mit zwei Ausnahmen (chinesisch) auf Deutsch statt, obwohl es sich nicht nur um Deutschland- sondern auch Europa-bezogene Zentren handelt. Der erste Block am 21. Oktober vormittags widmete sich den Nationenbegriffen in China (HAN Shuifa), Korea (NA In-Ho), Japan (HIRAMATSU Hideto) und Deutschland; ein Highlight war sicherlich der Beitrag der früheren Bundesjustizministerin Herta Däubler-Gmelin. Sie beleuchtete sehr breit die Rolle von Nation und Nationalismus sowohl in der Geschichte Deutschlands als auch Europas. Dabei stellte sie den Begriff sowohl der inneren als auch der äußeren Souveränität – ein Ergebnis des Westfälischen Friedens von 1648 – in den Mittelpunkt ihrer Ausführungen. Als Juristin betonte sie die Rolle der Institutionalisierung von universellen Menschenrechten, aber auch den langen Weg dahin voller Rückschläge (Nationalsozialismus) sowie ständiger Gefährdungen. Die lebhaft Diskussions drehte sich insbesondere um die Fragen von Universalismus und Partikularismus, Transferprozessen zwischen modernen Staaten, Supranationalität, Xenophobie, Paranoia und dem Auseinanderfallen von Nationalstaaten.

Das zweite Panel fokussierte auf verschiedene Dimensionen der kulturellen Identität und des kulturellen Transfers sowohl aus juristischer als auch aus literaturwissenschaftlicher Perspektive. LIU Xiaofeng stellte dem westlichen Fortschrittsbegriff die konfuzianische Weltanschauung gegenüber, wobei durch den Import Hegelschen und Marxschen Denkens sich beide in China zunehmend überlagerten und zu einer Symbiose von Macht, Nation und Fortschrittsdenken führten. NAGASAWA Yuko präsentierte „Großdeutschland“ als Kulturgemeinschaft, HU Chunchun kontrastierte die beiden Autoren des Ersten Weltkriegs, Ernst Jünger und Gottfried Benn, und schließlich sah GU Yeon Jeong Berlin als idealisierten Raum für den koreanischen Nationalismus.

Das dritte Panel war gemischt: LIAN Yuru analysierte die EU aus chinesischer Sicht als subsidiären Staatenverbund, wobei das Spannungsverhältnis zwischen Eigenverantwortung und Solidarität auch die politischen Differenzen zum Ausdruck bringt. Manfred Hettling