SES no.065; Introduction

メタデータ	言語: eng
	出版者:
	公開日: 2009-04-28
	キーワード (Ja):
	キーワード (En):
	作成者: 清水, 昭俊, Bremen, Jan van
	メールアドレス:
	所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.15021/00002712

Introduction

Akitoshi SHIMIZU and Jan van Bremen

This volume is based on the papers read in the international workshop 'Wartime Japanese Anthropology in Asia and Oceania,' convened over a period of three days, 20-22 December 1999, under an institutional project of the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka. The theme of the meeting arose from two earlier workshops, dedicated to the discussion and investigation of the relations between anthropology and colonisation in Asia and the Pacific. The first meeting was a half-day experimental panel, convened 18 October 1994 at the Kyoto Conference on Japanese Studies, hosted by the International Research Centre for Japanese Studies. The panel focused on Japanese and Dutch colonial anthropology in Asia and Oceania, approaching the subject from a historical and comparative perspective. The historical span covered the period from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. The presentations were published in 1996 in the Conference Proceedings. To discuss the matter in more detail and depth, a three-day workshop was organised in Leiden on 18-20 May 1995 on anthropology and colonialism in East and Southeast Asia and Oceania. A volume based on this meeting appeared in 1999 (Bremen and SHIMIZU). The workshop discussions began to reveal the need to organise a further workshop. Clearly, the research in the history of anthropology in the colonial period was far from complete. Wartime anthropology was barely visible and researched the least of all. In Japan, social and cultural anthropology organised and grew in the period between 1930 and 1945, a time when the Japanese Armed Forces waged a continuous and expanding war in Asia and the Pacific. The need to investigate wartime anthropology was evident. In the course of the discussions and presentations in the present workshop, the insight grew that colonial and wartime anthropology are not identical, although they overlap at times and places.

To investigate such matters this workshop was called and dedicated to wartime Japanese anthropology in Asia and the Pacific. The invasion by the Japanese army of Manchuria in 1931, and soon of other parts of China, was the beginning of a long period of war, involving a growing number of people and a spreading terrain, wider and deeper into Asia and the Pacific, that ended for Japan in August 1945. What began as the 'Manchuria Incident' spilled deeper into China and after 1937 grew into a large-scale war. Over the next years new fronts were opened, in continental and insular Southeast Asia, and in the North, Middle and Southwest Pacific. Today in Japan this period is called the time of 'the Fifteen Years War' (1931-1945). For anthropology it was a boon time. Employment, research and training opportunities for anthropologists increased. Their roles in the new organisations and institutions changed the status of their discipline, *minzokugaku*, which meant ethnology or that part of general anthropology concerned with socio-cultural interests. They benefited greatly from the opportunities that wartime political and economic agents offered. Formally

1

minzokugaku, which will further be simply glossed as '(social and cultural) anthropology,' did not gain academic status in the universities in the homeland during the wartime years. Although the first chair for anthropology in Japan, established in 1893 in Tokyo University, was a chair for general anthropology, from the 1920s to the end of the war, 'anthropology' in the universities was nearly always 'physical' anthropology. Still the Fifteen Years War did much to uplift social and cultural anthropology in Japan. Anthropologists obtained a large number of positions and institutional footholds – large when compared with the status previously assigned to social and cultural anthropology in the domains of the humanities and the social sciences in academic institutions – in research institutes and think-tanks established in rapid succession in response to the growing demands made on the humanities and the social sciences to deliver practical knowledge. Social and cultural anthropology did gain an academic foothold in the imperial universities that were established overseas, in Japanese Korea in 1924, and in Japanese Formosa in 1927. During the Fifteen Years War, anthropology obtained a place in the Manchurian National University, founded in 1938. And then, near the end of the war, it gained a foothold in Tokyo Imperial University in 1943. As the need for anthropological knowledge arose and increased, it was not only anthropologists – that is to say those scholars, professional and amateur, who had previously been known as specialists of anthropological knowledge – but also academics from a variety of other backgrounds and disciplines were recruited to work for delivering knowledge extracted from ethnographic sources, making translations, composing manuals and compilations, and writing summaries. In the war years anthropologists were given ample occasion for fieldwork overseas. Many of these sites adjoined a Japanese war zone, or were within a theatre of war. The areas targeted for the exercise of Japanese influence and territorial expansion became a focus for research. It spawned an unprecedented number of publications, articles and chapters of an anthropological nature. An assemblage of government, military, commercial and educational agents supported anthropology but demanded certain alterations. Faced with that situation, anthropologists also realised that they had to innovate. The methods and scope of the regular research, done on the established colonial models, would no longer suffice or apply. They made some attempt to redefine anthropology but mostly just went ahead to develop a practical and politically useful science. The boom that Japanese anthropology experienced in the war years was the result of a larger force, the scientific mobilisation imposed by the government as part of the mobilization of the whole nation for total war.

Anthropology in the period of the Fifteen Years War in Japan is the primary interest of this volume: to investigate the relations between anthropology and war and the practice and status of anthropology in the wartime years and their aftermath. The research collected in this volume is full of original materials and suggests answers to a wide set of questions. What did the scientific mobilisation mean for anthropology and anthropologists? Which calls, coercive or voluntary, for participation and co-operation did anthropologists receive? From which agencies of the state, the military, the economic domain? Which benefits – jobs, facilities, opportunities, etc. – did they offer anthropologists? How did anthropologists, individually and collectively, respond to those calls for participation and co-operation? What sorts of work did anthropologists do when they answered them, accepted offers, or carried out plans

of their own? What did they receive in exchange? What were the benefits, what the circumstances in which they worked? What are the characteristic features of their work? In which way are they related to wartime society? Which definitions of anthropology did the external agents impose? Which definition(s) did anthropologists put forward in respond to these pressures? What knowledge and lessons can be drawn from these cases? Compared to Japan, which characteristics does wartime anthropology have in other nations?

We argue that wartime anthropology played a leading role in the consolidation and growth of social and cultural anthropology in the past century. In contrast, late twentieth century studies and analyses of the history of anthropology – as represented by Asad (1973), Fabian (1983), the seminar on *Writing culture* (Clifford and Marcus 1986), Kuper (1988), the project of the History of anthropology (Stocking 1991, et al.) and Goody (1995) among others – focused on colonial projects. They had little eye for the tremendous growth of anthropology in the context of modern industrial warfare. A second limitation is their nearly exclusive focus on the developments in the centres of anthropology in Western Europe and North America, in particular Great Britain and the U.S.A., consequently mostly on Anglophone anthropology. Within this domain they left wartime anthropology alone. They focused instead on the modes of representation that are found in the anthropological works and their influence on the conduct of the anthropologists from these countries. The usage of terms such as 'savage peoples' and 'primitive cultures' is seen as an expression and imprint of colonialism, a product of the times and places where such terms were used and made.

Undoubtedly the nomenclatural imprint of colonialism was strong on anthropology. Moreover, colonialism certainly conditioned the roles that anthropologists played. A notable imprint left by colonialisation on anthropological epistemology is the imperative to turn to ethnic classification and to recording what belonged to the 'pre-contact' period, to reconstruct the 'primitive' societies and cultures in their 'native' state. That was achieved by abstracting the peoples and societies from the historical contexts in which they actually existed and transposing them to a hypothetical time frame, called the 'ethnographic present' (Burton 1988; Thomas 1989). The analysts reveal a complicit relationship between the anthropological representations of 'primitive cultures' on the one hand and the colonial domination of colonised peoples on the other. By de-contextualising the peoples described, anthropologists participated in the colonial domination in a similar way as representations of the East devised in Oriental studies reflected imperial hegemony (Said 1978).

In America, Europe and Japan in the 1930s, anthropologists began to realise the methodological limitations of the colonial visions and approach. They began to see the peoples they researched in the context of the contemporary conditions (Malinowski 1929, 1938; also SHIMIZU 1999). Simplified as the images of colonial and wartime anthropology presented here may be, Japanese anthropologists endeavoured to understand the peoples they studied, as well as themselves, in the framework of the war and the scientific mobilisation.

Colonial domination is achieved in a variety of ways. Violent phases of war and military suppression alternate with more peaceful phases of civil administration. The ethnographic representations, singled out and stressed by the late twentieth century analysts of colonial anthropology, correspond to phases of civil administration rather than to those of war. The immediateness and the urgency of warfare demanded realistic information from

anthropologists. Hypothetical ethnography was not relevant. War anthropology and colonial anthropology differ in objectives and methods and as objects of study. Where the method of text analysis was useful for deconstructing the ethnographic categories of colonial anthropology, a familiarity with the functional approach helps to understand the features of wartime anthropology. Distinctive features of wartime anthropology in Japan lead us to expand the scope of the enquiry. New ethnographic representations and ideological connotations came to the fore as a result of the scientific mobilisation by the autocratic regime and its agencies. To paraphrase the summary comment made on the workshop by G.W. Stocking, the conclusive idea was that wartime anthropology must be recognized as a separate field of inquiry, distinct from colonial and post-colonial anthropology, in the general interest of the history of anthropology (cf. Stocking 2001: 285-6).

The chapters in this volume make clear that wartime Japanese anthropology comprises a field of its own. A variety of different agendas are examined in the chapters of this volume. The first two chapters are introductory in nature. In the chapter 'Wartime Anthropology: A Global Perspective,' Jan van Bremen looks for common and singular traits of Japanese and American anthropology in wartime. He argues that wartime anthropology is an important field of study for several reasons. The first is the frequency, the recurrence and the length of time when anthropology coincides with wartime. One has to consider that in the two nations the history of anthropology ran synchronically with the history of wars for as many decades as anthropology enjoyed a time of peace. Wartime anthropology has a stake, place and role besides other socio-historical frames, such as colonial anthropology. Anthropology in America and Japan lived through two world wars, the cold war, counter-insurgency wars. Wars deeply effected anthropologists and their work and influenced the discipline. Anthropologists were drafted, or volunteered, for military service. Some died in the war. Irreplaceable research was lost as the result of military action. Also in wartime, anthropological standards commonly kept in peacetime were widely abandoned. Political, administrative and ethnocentric orientations took their place. War favoured the expansion of cultural and social anthropology in terms of personnel, means and institutions. War anthropology spawned methodological innovations, opened up new research fields, new sets of disciplines. In spite of it all, until today wartime anthropology has been poorly presented in the histories and textbooks of the discipline. Poorly presented as well is the ethnography of warfare and wartime society, the second main theme of his chapter.

In the next chapter, 'Anthropology and the Wartime Situation of the 1930s and 1940s: Masao OKA, Yoshitarō HIRANO, Eiichirō ISHIDA and Their Negotiations with the Situation,' Akitoshi SHIMIZU surveys the wartime situation in Japan in the 1930s and 1940s and describes how anthropology and anthropologists were involved. By specifically referring to Japan in these two decades, he tries to give a definition of the wartime situation in terms of the autocratic regime's policy of the whole state general mobilisation. Then, he enumerates the particular cases of anthropologists who were involved in the wartime situation. While a variety of mobilisation agents demanded practical knowledge from anthropologists, anthropologists themselves directly approached the autocratic regime to draw official support for their discipline. SHIMIZU traces the process of interaction between the external agents and

anthropologists, the attempts made by both sides to redefine anthropology, and the changes (and non-changes) in the epistemology of the wartime anthropology in Japan. The post-war era started with the complete denial of the values that dominated Japanese society during the war, a situation in which any history of collaboration with the war could be seen as a stigma. Anthropologists had to purge their discipline of the suspicion of wartime complicity with the regime. In this situation, a reversion to scientism – to the style of ethnographic representation that was once characteristic of anthropology in the prewar colonial situation – was the best possible strategy of survival for anthropology. Referring to the discourses of three leading scholars, SHIMIZU analyses how anthropologists negotiated the changing situations during the wartime and post-war years, each time with a renewed interpretation of what anthropology should be.

The following three chapters discuss more focused topics concerning anthropological research in the wartime and post-war contexts in Japan. Kevin M. Doak in his chapter, 'NAKANO Seiichi and Colonial Ethnic Studies,' traces how Seiichi NAKANO developed his theory of *minzoku*. *Minzoku*, a Japanese concept, can be glossed, in a dictionary-like interpretation, as a 'nation, people, ethnicity, ethnic group, tribe.' It was the most essential concept in the leading wartime ideology of imperial nationalism in Japan and its manifestations such as the policy of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. The word was also considered essential to ethnology in Japan, to the extent that the discipline, while being considered the counterpart of Western ethnology or socio-cultural anthropology, was named *minzoku-gaku*, literally the study of *minzoku*. Nevertheless, in the end no anthropologist dared to construct a theory of *minzoku* during the wartime years. It was rather sociologists who had been eagerly discussing the concepts of *minzoku*, although in their case the discussions used to be speculative, primarily referring to prominent theories in the West, but rarely conducting empirical research of actual peoples. Doak regards the sociologist NAKANO Seiichi as the key person who filled the gap between the speculative sociology and the empirical ethnology, and who played a role in theoretically legitimising the ethnic policy of Imperial Japan. The young NAKANO, according to Doak, presented a sophisticated theory of *minzoku*, which he conceptualised as social groups based on the subjectivity of the members mediated by their communal concern for identity and culture. Among the factors contributing to national or ethnic unity, he emphasised the situational conditioning and operational subjectivity rather than the primordial ties of blood, history or cultural traditions. Thus, he developed an idea of nation and ethnicity that became generally accepted in social science only recently in the post-war era. But, once given an occasion of applying his theory to the policy of nation-building in Manchuria, he arbitrarily interpreted the subjectivity of *minzoku* and presented a formula of ethnic/national policy, which was nothing but a recapitulation of Japan's policy of the Co-Prosperity Sphere, although presented in the guise of a sophisticated sociological theory. Doak stresses that the peculiar turn that NAKANO's theorising took, when he was asked for practical utility and applicability for his theory, does hold true for contemporary theories of nation and ethnicity.

'Selves and Others in Japanese Anthropology,' the chapter by Teruo SEKIMOTO, traces the changing focuses of anthropological interests during the late 1930s and thereafter. SEKIMOTO uses the *Japanese journal of ethnology*, the official journal that started to be

published in 1935 by the nation-wide association for ethnological interests in Japan, The Japanese Society of Ethnology, as the source of data for his analysis. He classified the articles that appeared in the journal both by areas and by topics. By a statistical analysis he found a continuous trend in the anthropological interests throughout the years before, during and after the Pacific war. He concludes that, although the favourite geographical areas of anthropological research shifted from time to time, if an observation is made in each epoch of time, Japanese anthropologists always sought the Other, or the peoples and cultures of their ethnographic studies, in the remotest of the ever changing geographical areas in which Japanese society showed a general interest. For several reasons, his analysis appears to over-emphasise the continuity rather than the changes throughout the period of investigation. There was always a time lag between the time when a research was conducted and the time when the outcome was published. The journal to which he refers as the source of his data was forced to suspend publication in 1944 for more than two years. Even if anthropologists had undertaken their research from a renewed perspective of wartime anthropology, the Pacific War was too short for the outcome of their research to be published during the war.

'Physical Anthropology in Wartime Japan' by Atsushi NOBAYASHI is the only chapter in this volume which is focused on physical anthropology. He traces the general trends of enquiries in that discipline and points out that the interest in the Japanese population was always the most outstanding. The theory emphasising the homogeneity of the Japanese was dominant, but NOBAYASHI points out that some of the statistical studies were adopted by the colonial government of Korea as a scientific endorsement for its assimilation policy. He also refers to an attempt to produce gasmasks fitting the physique of the Japanese during the war, a first project of human engineering in Japan.

The following five chapters shift the regional focuses from Japan to either Japan's colonies or to the areas occupied by the Japanese military forces, and pursue a variety of topics, all concerned with a scholar or a group of scholars, their academic and non-academic practices, and the responses of the peoples whom they approached. These chapters are ordered geographically from the north in South Sakhalin to the south in Indonesia and Brunei. The order is also a chronological one from the early to the final phases of the wartime situation for anthropology.

In his chapter, 'Anthropological Studies of the Indigenous Peoples in Sakhalin in Pre-Wartime and Wartime Japan,' Shirō SASAKI examines Eiichirō ISHIDA's research in South Sakhalin, a case of anthropological fieldwork conducted in an early phase of the wartime situation for anthropology. Ironically, however, ISHIDA conducted his research in a colonial style that seldom referred to the colonial and/or wartime situation of the subjected peoples he researched. SASAKI points out a continuing tendency in colonial ethnography to depict 'primitive' peoples in an abstract, de-contextualised setting, between ISHIDA's study of South Sakhalin and the post-war Siberian ethnography presented by Russian scholars.

Kilsüng CH'OE, Yun Hui TSU and Lili NIE introduce an entirely new factor in their discussions, the responses from the local societies to the approaches of Japanese scholars. Kilsüng CH'OE in his chapter, 'Warfare and Ethnology/Folklore in Colonial Korea: The Case of AKIBA Takashi,' considers the issue of collaboration between Takashi AKIBA and the wartime regime in Korea. AKIBA is remembered in Japan primarily for his academic works.

Anthropologists in post-war Japan used to recognise him as an anthropologist, known for the extensive fieldwork on shamanism in Korea and Manchuria that he conducted together with his colleague, Chijō AKAMATSU. Their collaboration represented a new accomplishment in anthropology in Japan in a time when the anthropological style of intensive fieldwork was still in the making. The two were the earliest scholars who were accepted as specialists of ethnological sciences in the university system in Japan, although not in mainland Japan but in the colony of Korea. Their works used to be considered pioneering Korean studies in Japan. Against this conventional image of AKIBA, CH'OE marchals ample data to describe another aspect of AKIBA's academic life in Korea. AKIBA co-operated with the colonial government of Korea and disseminated the ideology of the unity of Japan and Korea, a cultural theory legitimising the colonial domination of Korea by Japan. AKIBA also participated in the educational mobilisation of Korean youths for the sake of the war. In the concluding section, CH'OE refers to several contemporary Korean scholars who criticised AKIBA's works, and attempts conscientiously to evaluate the academic legacy of AKIBA's works for the present-day studies of Korean folk culture in Korea. What Japanese consider accomplishments of Japanese scholars in Korean studies can never simply be accepted as a neutral academic legacy by Korean scholars. The critical reviews of the Japanese anthropological 'legacy' by Korean scholars can serve as a mirror for the present Japanese anthropologists to reflect on their past.

Yun Hui TSU in his chapter, 'For Science, Co-Prosperity, and Love: The Re-Imagination of Taiwanese Folklore and Japan's Greater East Asian War,' addresses *Taiwanese folklore*, a magazine published during the last four years of the Asia and Pacific War. The magazine was an entirely civil and commercial project. Japanese scholars took charge of editing the magazine, but in other respects the magazine was managed on a policy as liberal as possible in the critical wartime situation of the time. It was open to both Japanese and Taiwanese contributors, and to amateurs as well as professional academics. Although it was an entirely civil project, the wartime demanded that the magazine should explicitly legitimise its existence. Thus, the magazine was more devoted to topics highly relevant for the wartime situation in Taiwan and Japan. TSU places the discourses of the editors and primary contributors, all Japanese, into two categories: the colonial and the wartime discourses. In their colonial discourses, Japanese writers emphasised the scientific mission of the Japanese, a civilised nation, to conduct research and record the vanishing cultures of the colonised peoples who were rapidly being assimilated into the superior Japanese culture. In their wartime discourses, they argued for the practical value that the knowledge of Taiwanese folklore had for the government of South China, from where most Taiwanese originated, and the government of Southeast Asia, where the Chinese emigrants, mostly of the same origin as the Taiwanese, dominated the local economy. But, when a Taiwanese contributor criticised the policy of the magazine as too scientific and lacking love for Taiwanese folklore, the Japanese editor of the magazine revealed in his response, so TSU analyses, that the discourse of legitimisation expressed more than a tactical rhetoric. The editor in no way denied the premise of the Japanese cultural superiority, which would make it inevitable for the Taiwanese to be assimilated into Japanese culture, which in turn was the very reason that Taiwanese folklore should be studied with a love for what would perish. In his conclusion,

TSU suggests a limitation in the criticism from the Taiwanese contributor (i.e., a response to anthropological representation from the subjected people of anthropological research), because it was made in the framework of complete assimilation: the medium of his expression was a magazine dominated by Japanese, and the language he used was Japanese, the language of the coloniser.

Lili NIE in her chapter examines the 'Studies of Chinese Peasant Society in Japan: Before and During World War II.' She specifically refers to the research project on rural customs in China that was organised by the East Asia Institute, one of the major think-tanks established by the Japanese government in the framework of the scientific mobilisation. The scholars who designed the research programme on Chinese rural customs mostly did not come from sociology or anthropology, but from law studies, the mainstream branch of social science in Japan in those years. The scholars who drafted the research plan made a brief field trip to China, but the main body of the empirical data was collected through fieldwork conducted by the South Manchurian Railway Company (Mantetsu) Research Department. The outcome of the project, which was eventually published after the war, was highly estimated as one of the pioneering works on Chinese society conducted in the style of empirical sociology. In terms of the scholars' attitude in the wartime situation, the project is also praised for having maintained scientific conscience by seeking scientific accuracy at the expense of practical utility. NIE probes into the programme of research, clarifies the assumptions implicit in it, and points out the limitations in the recognition of Chinese rural societies presented by the project, by comparing it with the ethnographic works of several Chinese anthropologists and sociologists who conducted research on similar topics in nearly contemporary years in China. NIE concludes that the basic difference in the knowledge obtained by the Japanese and Chinese scholars resides in their different approaches: while the former approached Chinese society externally, the latter sought to comprehend their society internally. The difference in turn can be reduced to the difference in their initial incentives for research: while the Japanese scholars were commissioned to do their research, the Chinese scholars commonly had a moral motivation to save China in the face of the Japanese invasion.

Kōji MIYAZAKI and Katsumi NAKAO examine the works of Tōichi MABUCHI, who can be described as belonging to the first generation of 'trained field anthropologists,' raised within Japan, although not educated in the mainland of Japan but in the colony of Taiwan. Both MIYAZAKI and NAKAO emphasise that the aspect of MABUCHI as a structural anthropologist became apparent in his post-war publications. Both authors seek the basis of MABUCHI's turning to a structural orientation in the work he had done in the wartime years. MIYAZAKI in his chapter, 'Colonial Anthropology in the Netherlands and Wartime Anthropology in Japan,' outlines the history of the colonial studies of Indonesia in the Netherlands, and traces how MABUCHI elaborated his structural theories by incorporating what he had learned from the Dutch colonial studies during the war. NAKAO in his chapter, 'Tōichi MABUCHI in Makassar,' traces the academic life of MABUCHI from the years at Taihoku Imperial University, where he first studied anthropology as a student, and then joined the research project of the Institute of Ethnology, to the final years of the war when he worked for the Navy's research institute at Makassar. MABUCHI conducted both literature studies and fieldwork while staying at Makassar, but what he obtained during his years at Makassar was

reflected only in his writings published in the post-war years, which were basically constructed in the relational frameworks of structural analysis. In this sense, MABUCHI represents a shift from wartime anthropology to post-war peacetime anthropology in Japan that was grounded in his wartime anthropological work.

The last chapter, 'Resuscitating Nationalism: Brunei under the Japanese Military Administration (1941-1945)' by B. A. Hussainmiya, is unique in this collection in that it is not concerned with anthropological or other scientific research in Brunei. Instead, the author addresses the development of nationalism in Brunei while the Japanese military forces occupied the country. The policies of the Japanese occupation were basically planned for the sake of Japan's interests and hardly beneficial to the people of Brunei, whose economic life deteriorated sharply in comparison with prewar years. But the occupation policies comprised several measures that were so contrastive to the preceding British policies that the people of Brunei were awakened, so to speak, in their political and cultural abilities, to the effect of enhancing national sentiments among them. For instance, the Japanese military government, in its effort to eliminate British elements, brought the Malayan vernacular into public use. It appointed Bruneians to high positions in the government that had so far been occupied only by British. 'Asia for Asians,' the slogan of the Co-Prosperity Sphere, was accepted, with a re-interpretation as 'Brunei for Bruneians.' The Japanese military government implemented effective ideological policies, such as encouraging the compilation of Bruneian history and promoting popular performance arts as a medium of propaganda. Hussainmiya traces in detail how deeply those policies influenced the Bruneians who later developed an anti-British movement when Britain returned to Brunei as the suzerain after the war. The Japanese Army set up a military government for North Borneo, in which Brunei was incorporated as a part. That government applied a set of policies to Brunei, of which the Army's headquarters had only designed a general framework. Hussainmiya mentions no academic specialists who participated in the military administration of Brunei. The military administration in charge of Brunei was sophisticated enough to encourage and control national sentiments among the Brunei people. It was able to fulfil its assigned duties without any assistance of academic specialists, a fact commenting on the role that anthropology and other branches of social science actually played for the war purposes of Japan.

The present volume in turn suggests new agendas and further steps in our research. The former workshops were concerned with aspects of anthropology in the past. But our interest in the past has always been accompanied by an interest in the present and the future. Our coming meetings shall be more explicitly concerned with the present and the future of anthropology. We have questioned the very foundation upon which social and cultural anthropology have supposedly been based: the anthropology of colonised peoples. The relationship in the past was not always peaceful. It was based on colonial rule and military domination. Social and cultural anthropology owe their rise and consolidation to the influence of the industrialised wars fought by the leading nations for territorial domination and spheres of influence. The prospects are small that the world will become a more peaceful place in the near future. Colonial domination, warfare, conflicts and violence surface in many areas where anthropological research is conducted. Anthropological practices in such

zones of turmoil are on the agenda of our coming meetings. We have approached the history of anthropology with the intention of widening its scope and introducing a new perspective. We have tried to look from a perspective other than the usual but unsuitable dichotomy of Western vs. non-Western anthropology. We have tried to shed a fresh light on the assumption that anthropology investigates and represents the cultures of mute peoples. The anthropology of non-Western countries still remains invisible in the perspective of much of European and American anthropology. Not only non-Western peoples but also the anthropology nurtured by their nations are silenced by many mainstream scholars and schools. On the contrary, our workshops started from the viewpoints and approaches that arose from the point of view of the peoples subjected to occidental anthropological research. Our meetings in the future shall continue to focus on the anthropological practices conducted in contexts which are not dominated by the mainstream Western anthropology. Based on those features, it is hoped that broad international workshops can be organised on the topics of life under wartime conditions; the legacies of wartime anthropology in contemporary anthropology, particularly in the areas formerly dominated by colonial powers; present-day warfare and peace keeping operations; and the ethics and role of anthropology in warfare and in times of war.

Since the present volume addresses anthropological practices conducted in the years when both anthropology and social circumstances were rapidly changing, 'anthropology' is used rather freely in the broadest sense of the term. A variety of scholars with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds are represented in the present volume. As neither the editors nor the publisher feel able to decide which strain represents the most 'authentic' English, each chapter is printed in the English that the author wrote. The same policy was followed with respect to the personal names of East Asians. There are several policies on how to present Oriental names in an English text – whether to put the family name first or last in particular. Therefore, Oriental names here are printed as the authors gave them. To avoid confusion in this volume, in the table of contents and in the references as well as in the text, the family names of East Asians are printed in capital letters.

References

Asad, T. (ed.)
    1973   *Anthropology and the colonial encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.
Bremen, Jan van and Akitoshi SHIMIZU (eds)
    1999   *Anthropology and colonialism in Asia and Oceania*. London: Curzon Press.
Burton, John W.
    1988   Shadows at twilight: A note on history and the ethnographic present. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 132(4), 420-33.
Clifford, James and George E. Marcus (eds)
    1986   *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
Fabian, J.

1983   *Time and the other: How anthropology makes its object.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Goody, Jack

1995   *The expansive moment: The rise of social anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuper, Adam

1988   *The invention of primitive society: Transformations of an illusion.* London: Routledge.

Malinowski, Bronislaw

1929   Practical anthropology. *Africa* 2(1), 22-38.

1938   Introductory essay on the anthropology of changing African cultures. In *Methods of study of culture contact in Africa* (ed.) Lucy Mair (International African Institute memorandum XV), pp. vii-xxxviii. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Said, Edward W.

1978   *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Shimizu Akitoshi (清水昭俊)

1999   「忘却の彼方のマリノフスキー—— 1930 年代の文化接触研究」『国立民族学博物館研究報告』24(3), 543-634. (Malinowski rising out of oblivion: The culture-contact studies of the 1930s. *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology* 24(3), 543-634.)

Stocking, G. W., Jr.

2001   *Delimiting anthropology: Occasional essays and reflections.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Stocking, G. W., Jr. (ed.)

1991   *Colonial situations: Essays on the contextualization of ethnographic knowledge* (History of anthropology 7). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Thomas, Nicholas

1989   *Out of time: History and evolution in anthropological discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.