to say, these institutions are now indispensable institutions for the promotion of Asian Studies; that, however, is not fully discussed in this book.

Another point that the reviewer regrets is that the book lacks any reference to "Asian Studies before Asian Studies." Though the book refers to European (and Japanese) colonial interests in Asia (especially in Chapters 2 and 11), most of the chapters in this book seem to make the assumption that Asian Studies is the product of the Cold War, which is not necessarily the case, in this reviewer's opinion. For example, Japan has a rich history of Asian Studies before World War II, which was driven by geopolitical considerations in some institutions, including the Institute of Oriental Culture (established in 1941, now having changed its name to the Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia) at the University of Tokyo, to which the reviewer is affiliated.

The same can be said to be the case of Chinese scholarship on Asia. The end of World War II in Japan as well as the end of the Civil War in China created an intellectual discrepancy before and after the wars; this makes it difficult for outside observers to have a closer look at the continuity/discontinuity in the intellectual tradition of Asian Studies.

The cause of this neglect of pre-war traditions can be partially attributed to the fact that Japanese scholars and Chinese scholars who were trained in their local academic communities were not invited to take part in this book (or perhaps did not respond to the call for papers at the very beginning), but mainly because this book project started from the doctoral dissertation of one of its three editors, "Framing Sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore: Geopolitics, States and Practitioners," in which Dr Tzeng dealt with the development of sociology in these three societies as a spreading process of sociology as a Western discipline during the Cold War period. As long as these "three little tigers" are analyzed, it is acceptable to set the beginning of the Cold War as a starting point for the argument (it would be arguable, however, whether there is any pre-war history of sociology in Taiwan), but once Japan and China, which have a long tradition of their own "Asian Studies," are included in the argument, we would have a much deeper understanding of how geopolitics and institutions have played a variety of roles in shaping Asian Studies in Asia. For instance, Marxism in Japan and China heavily influenced social scientists in pre-war Japan and China, eventually producing a complicated constellation of understanding of Asia in these two countries.

The reviewer greatly appreciates the editors' painstaking efforts to bring together many different countries' experts on Asian Studies (especially those from post-socialist countries, which are often forgotten in Asian Studies) to discuss core issues of Asian Studies through the publication of this book. Probably, though, the next book project ought to have a focus on the dialogue between "Asian Studies before Asian Studies" and "Asian Studies after Asian Studies" to enable a better understanding of the future direction of Asian Studies at a time when we are witnessing the "Asianization of Asian Studies."

Architects of Buddhist Leisure: Socially Disengaged Buddhism in Asia's Museums, Monuments, and Amusement Parks

By Justin Thomas McDaniel. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016. Pp. xiv + 224. ISBN 10: 0824865987; ISBN 13: 978-0824865986.

Ryosuke Kuramoto

The University of Tokyo, E-mail: kuramoto@ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Architects of Buddhist Leisure is Justin McDaniel's third single-author book. It follows his second book, *The Lovelorn Ghost and the Magical Monk*, in which he rejected analytic classifications of opposing

heterodox and orthodox religious practices in search of a true Thai Buddhism.[1] *Architects of Buddhist Leisure* similarly eschews the binary opposition between secular and religious ideals by investigating Buddhist leisure sites in Asia.

What does the phrase "Buddhist leisure sites" entail? While McDaniel does not offer a categorical explanation, it appears to include monuments, museums, amusement parks, and gardens that are "characterized by their public accessibility, their ecumenism, and the long and complicated processes involved in their construction" (p. 169). Specifically, the Buddhist leisure sites discussed in the book's three chapters are as follows: (1) the life of Kenzo Tange and his design of the Lumbini master plan to honor the birthplace of the Buddha in Southern Nepal (this is compared to other Buddhist monuments and alternative monastic spaces); (2) the lives of Braphai and Lek Wiriyaphan, who jointly created three massive Buddhist historical amusement parks in Thailand (these are compared to other sculpture gardens), "hell" parks, and entertainment complexes across Asia; and (3) Shi Fa Zhao's continuing efforts to construct a multipurpose "temple" in Singapore (this planned structure is compared to other new Buddhist museums).

Before further discussion, I here introduce McDaniel's assertions about Buddhist leisure sites according to three points. He first insists on the "public" nature of these sites, a notion that is largely synonymous with the terms "non-monastic" and "nonsectarian." Buddhist leisure sites are designed and promoted by non-monastics, architects, and visionaries with little formal knowledge of Buddhism. Such sites are thus run by laity who are unaffiliated with any single monastery or are only loosely connected to the formal spaces, activities, and concomitant ordained hierarchies. There are virtually no restrictions on religious affiliation, gender, or ethnicity, and information is offered in multiple languages. In short, these are not spaces for didactic sermons, forced spirituality, or ethical directives; they are for fun.

Second, McDaniel values these sites as places of Buddhist "ecumenism." There has been no concerted Buddhist effort to develop universal strategies or guiding principles. However, non-monastic Buddhist leisure sites often promote assembly and display through accumulation, which is the notion that all Buddhist schools and cultures are equal and should coexist. These institutions generally lack formal, formidable, ritual, ecclesiastical, or sectarian boundaries and make little effort to be "authentic." They emphasize display, performance, juxtaposition, and an anachronistic conglomerate of various traditional Buddhist elements. McDaniel says this is important because it provides a completely different image of contemporary Buddhism that emphasizes innovation and ecumenism rather than purity and authenticity.

Third, McDaniel describes Buddhist leisure sites based on ever-changing processes rather than outcomes. He refuses the "great man" approach to history, which posits that major achievements are the products of exceptional outliers. McDaniel instead takes a material culture approach that considers the contributions of multiple creators, materials, laborers, licensing agencies, funders, critics, and visitors. Buildings, parks, and the material objects assembled at leisure sites are never simply the creations of one architect; they are altered by each new manager, repairperson, renovator, and visitor. Governments change, zoning laws are rewritten, and access roads are moved. That is, these sites must compromise to achieve local optima over time. This is a process of architectural "metabolism." Here, buildings are not seen as isolated monuments or functional structures, but as the nodes of energetic couplings. By stressing this process, McDaniel offers alternative ways of interpreting Buddhism as an ever-changing world religion.

Through its analysis of Buddhist leisure sites, this book competently illustrates how the religious and secular are intertwined in contemporary Asian society. It also expresses appreciation for several new research trends and welcomes the possibilities of new religious studies. *Architects of Buddhist Leisure* has much in common with recent religious studies concepts, including the theory of religious commodification (e.g. Pattana 2008)[2] and religious tourism (e.g. Raj and Griffin eds. 2015).[3]

---

[1]Justin McDaniel, *The Lovelorn Ghost and the Magical Monk: Practicing Buddhism in Modern Thailand* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011).

Consumption is conspicuously practiced at many Buddhist leisure sites. This phenomenon can be called "religious practice without belief." That is, people do not visit these sites because of their beliefs. Rather, they treat them like any other tourist spots. While many visitors have various experiences with "religious" themes, there is no systematized doctrine attached. Therefore, activities at leisure sites cannot be captured through the traditional concept of "religion" as defined by belief.

Architects of Buddhist Leisure also has common elements with recent social science developments that stress the importance of the "institution" or "institutionalization" (cf. Merleau-Ponty). From this perspective, it is increasingly common to describe economic, political, and social processes as "path dependent." Such processes do not steadily progress toward a pre-determined or unique equilibrium. Rather, the nature of any achieved equilibrium depends on the process of getting there. For example, anthropologist Tim Ingold contrasts the "hylomorphic" model with a "morphogenetic" approach that enacts "making" as a contingent process of growth. That is, making involves entering the grain of the world's becoming and bending it to an evolving purpose (Ingold 2013).[4] We can positively evaluate that McDaniel's analysis applies institutional theory to religious studies. It will thus aid in elucidating the actual state of religion as an institution.

The book also employs a unique analysis method. The author states the following: "Although my research here has looked at specific places in Nepal, Singapore, and Thailand, as well as other examples from Vietnam, Japan, Hong Kong, China, India, Laos, and Louisiana, I do not necessarily see this as a comparative study. I am not comparing individual spaces site to site, but identifying trends and motivations across many sites divided into categories" (p. 166). The data are thin on individual cases compared with ordinary ethnographies. However, McDaniel successfully reveals the features and patterns of Buddhist leisure sites as described above by arranging many cases in parallel. There is a methodological approach in anthropology called "Multisited ethnography." The methodology used in this book appears to approve of this concept and shows new ethnographic possibilities.

From a theoretical point of view, *Architects of Buddhist Leisure* asks what "Buddhism" is and how we can study it. I have two questions concerning this issue. First, how do we evaluate previous studies on the monastic world? McDaniel says that "most studies of Buddhist culture and history are rooted in the institution of the monastery" (p. 13). Is this perception reasonable? While writing an ethnography about modern Myanmar monasteries (Kuramoto 2014),[5] I discovered that very few anthropological studies focused on monasteries or monks. Anthropological Buddhist studies, which began through a differentiation of Buddhist doctrinal studies, thus tend to focus on the religious practices of laypeople, which are different from doctrine and cannot easily be deduced thereby. Therefore the monastic world has become a kind of "black box." McDaniel also seems to see the monastic world as an essential and substantial entity, although his outstanding first book, *Gathering Leaves and Lifting Words*, examined Buddhist monastic education in Laos and Thailand.[6] However, my research has indicated that the monastic system is also regarded as a process of "metabolism" and contains characteristics that cannot be grasped by traditional concepts of "religion" and the "secular."

Second, how do we understand the relationship between the lay and monastic worlds? McDaniel does not fully explain the relationship between his first work and this book. To the contrary, he seems to overemphasize the contrast between the two worlds. This contrast can be seen in other variations of Buddhist Studies. For example, it is evident in religion and secularism, doctrine and

---

[2]Pattana Kitiarsa ed., *Religious Commodifications in Asia: Marketing Gods* (London: Routledge 2008).

[3]Razaq Raj and Kevin A. Griffin eds., *Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage Management: An International Perspective*, 2nd edition (Wallingford, UK: CABI, 2015).

[4]Tim Ingold, *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture* (London; Routledge 2013).

[5]Ryosuke Kuramoto, *Sezoku wo Ikiru Shukkeshatachi: Jozabukkyoto Shakai Myanma Ni Okeru Shukke Seikatu no Minzokushi* 世俗を生きる出家者たち：上座仏教徒社会ミャンマーにおける出家生活の民族誌 ("The Hermits Living in This World: An Ethnography of Renunciation in Theravada Buddhism in Myanmar") (Kyoto: Hozokan, 2014).

[6]Justin McDaniel, *Gathering Leaves and Lifting Words: Histories of Buddhist Monastic Education in Laos and Thailand* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008).

practice, monasteries and pagodas, center and border, and piety and ordinary life. However, I worry that continuing to reproduce these dichotomies will prevent further understanding of the Buddhist world. Are the monastic and lay worlds two incompatible universes? Is the Buddhist world composed of these two universes? How can we think about the relationship between the two?

Buddhism is itself an institution that is an ever-changing process of formation and transformation. Two vectors coexist in this process. One heads toward a public and ecumenical direction (as McDaniel shows in this book), while the other heads the opposite way, that is, toward a private and sectarian destination. Stanley Tambiah, a researcher of Thai Buddhism, argued that these two vectors have caused the Buddhist world to sway between domestication and fundamentalist reform.[7] However, with such a pendulum model, it is impossible to fully describe the entanglement of the two worlds. Solving the relationship between these two worlds, therefore, remains an important topic in Buddhist Studies.

Conceptions: Infertility and Procreative Technologies in India

By Aditya Bhardwaj. New York: Berghahn Books, 2016. Pp. xvii + 292. ISBN 10: 1785332309; ISBN 13: 978-1785332302.

Mizuho Matsuo

National Museum of Ethnology, Email: matsuom@minpaku.ac.jp

Infertility and assisted reproductive technologies (ART) is a topic garnering significant attention in India in academia and in the media, mostly because of India's substantial transnational commercial surrogacy in the last decade. Aditya Bharadwaj's *Conceptions: Infertility and Procreative Technologies in India* is surely a pioneering work in this area. This multi-sited ethnography based on fifteen years of fieldwork focuses on procreative technologies, their seekers, medical practitioners, and policymakers in six Indian cities. It provides a comprehensive understanding of what the author refers to as "cultural conceptions". The work covers analyses found in ancient Hindu texts and literature, to modern media discourses on India's first "test-tube baby", to doctor–patient interactions in the consultation rooms of *in vitro* fertilization (IVF) clinics. With this wealth of information, Bharadwaj argues that fertility and infertility are culturally constructed and that these concepts structure and reconcile cultural ways to understand and implement reproductive technologies.

Conceptions: Infertility and Procreative Technologies in India is organized into four sections plus an introduction and afterword. The introduction presents an overview of the anthropological debates on infertility and reproductive technologies in Western societies followed by those of non-Western societies. Ethnographies on reproductive technologies and surrogate motherhood in India have been consistently published in recent years, but Bharadwaj insists that the theoretical and critical debates are not adequate and further investigation is needed. Thus, the purpose of this book is to "add a critical Indian chapter to this expanding cultural universe of biotechnological interventions into an ever-increasing number of lives facing reproductive disruption around the globe" (pp. 24–25).

Chapters 1 and 2 consider cultural perceptions of fertility and infertility. From the Hindu perspective, fertility is quasi-sacred because it is embedded in religious and cultural norms. On the other hand, infertility is considered deviant, and infertile women (and men) are highly stigmatized. Stigma is a key word for understanding infertility in pronatalist societies, such as India, where it is understood as not

---

[7]Stanley Jeyaraja Tambiah, *The Buddhist Saints of the Forest and the Cult of Amulets : A Study in Charisma, Hagiography, Sectarianism, and Millennial Buddhism* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984).