

Editor's Note

This issue of the *Journal* presents three essays on wartime and postwar Japan. Professor Leon Hollerman's analysis of the international economic controls imposed by the Occupation not only speculates on the Occupation's legacy to the Japanese economy, but also points up the interpretive problem of how to reconcile the Occupation's proclaimed goals with its actions. Professor Moore, to whom the *Journal* is indebted for a comment which is really an article in itself, discusses the historiography of the Occupation and then turns to the discrepancy between Occupation goals and actions which Professor Hollerman's article called to mind. Professor Rice's article on economic organization and political divisiveness in wartime Japan arrived too late to be included in our request for Professor Moore's comment, but it meshes well with Hollerman and Moore, and helps to form a reasonably integrated set of materials.

The other articles in this number—Dr. Aung Thwin's study of the interaction of the Burmese monarchy with Burma's monastic establishment, and Dr. Shulman's essay on the problem of evil in South Asian thought (as illustrated in the Tamil Tale of Rāma)—both, in our view, speak to concerns that transcend the individual cultures with which they deal. Though tight comparisons may be difficult, the relationship between the state and the propertied Buddhist order may be examined in numerous societies, while the problem of evil—of apparently reasonless and useless horror ("evil," we have just discovered, does not possess satisfactory synonyms)—lurks near us all.

To turn with a vengeance from the cosmic to the terrestrial, we need to raise the matter of romanization of Chinese. *Journal* policy is as follows: through the August 1981 issue, authors may romanize Chinese terms according to either the Pinyin system now employed in the People's Republic of China or the familiar Wade-Giles system. Pinyin is preferred, and authors are encouraged to employ it in their manuscripts. Beginning with the November 1981 *JAS*, we anticipate full conversion to Pinyin. This is obviously a difficult and troublesome question for a great many people in the China field; the dilemmas of scholarly publications like the *JAS* are dwarfed, for example, by the problems confronting the great library collections. Wrangling over the pros and cons of various systems will not end in August 1981. We felt, however, that the *JAS* ought to adopt a policy that avoided disruptive suddenness on the one hand, yet firmly promoted the currency of the now standard Chinese system of romanization on the other.