

# みんなくりポジトリ

国立民族学博物館学術情報リポジトリ National Museum of Ethnology

## Wartime Anthropology : A Global Perspective

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 公開日: 2009-04-28 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Bremen, Jan van メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.15021/00002713">https://doi.org/10.15021/00002713</a>

# Wartime Anthropology: A Global Perspective<sup>1)</sup>

Jan van Bremen

We need a more layered understanding of the forces – both external and internal – that formed anthropology. (Eric Wolf, 1999b: 121)

## I. Traits and trends in a history mute and elusive

The purpose of the present volume is to describe, as completely as possible, the activities of the Japanese anthropologists, and their collaborators, during the wars that Japan waged in Asia and the Pacific, from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. Academic and professional anthropology was established in Japan and other imperial and colonial powers in this period. This chapter argues that professional academic anthropology grew most vigorously in times of war and their aftermath. Histories of anthropology do not usually give information on what anthropologists did in wartime, their work on the home front, in areas under military administration, and in theatres of war. It is not always due to a lack of data. The chapters in this volume show otherwise.

By comparing the anthropology in nations who were among the main contestants in the wars, and who established the leading centres of academic and professional anthropology in modern times, one may find some of the more general features of war anthropology and cultural and social anthropology in wartime in the twentieth century. In this chapter I compare anthropology in Japan, the United States of America, and to a smaller degree, in Great Britain and the Netherlands. Limited as the selection is, it represents a large part of mondial anthropology. The conclusion that may safely be drawn is that wars and wartime played a major part in the development and growth of professional and academic anthropology in these imperial nations and colonizing states.

Given the frequency and the duration of the wars fought by the nations in my sample, wartimes cover substantial periods in the history of modern anthropology. Nomenclatural and analytic clarity is a necessary first step to unravel the relations between war and anthropology. I distinguish (1) war anthropology, (2) wartime anthropology, and (3) the anthropology of war and warfare. *War anthropology* is deliberately applying the discipline for fighting a war, using academic and professional credentials, expertise, institutions and personnel directly to serve the war. *Wartime anthropology* is used as a cover term for all anthropology in times of war. Its forms range from military service to the use of anthropology as a cover for war activities or spying. It entails civil service, war profiteering, criticism of wartime anthropology, disapproval or rejection of anthropology for purposes of war. Finally, *the anthropology of warfare and war* is the ethnography and study of battles, the life and death of the combatants and non-combatants in war zones and wartime society. It

includes the study of societies in the phase of preparation and aftermath of wars.

Histories and textbooks have largely remained mute on the first two of these points. Little is said about anthropological engagements with wars. No tally is presented of the gains and losses it involved. Little insight is given into the short-term and long-term effects. The absence of war anthropology and wartime anthropology from the handbooks and textbooks of anthropology is mirrored by another lack. The ethnographic research of modern wars is thin. As a result, modern anthropology shows two large gaps, one historiographic, the other ethnographic. The lacunas are colossal and stunning in view of the frequency, the durations and the enormities of the wars of the past century. Adding the large-scale participation by anthropologists in the wars of the past century, one is left with a half-history of anthropology and a half-description of society. It amounts to uncover a new 'ethnographic present,' one of peace.

The gains from participation in wars and the effects of wars have been large for anthropology, both material and immaterial. But in addition to creative effects, wars and war work had destructive effects. Participation by anthropologists in war work was high. The transition between peacetime and wartime anthropology is marked by a swift switch. It is the retreat from peacetime academic standards and the embrace of war aims and wartime concepts. Wartime personnel lowered or dropped critical standards. They followed political and bureaucratic dictates and ethnocentric orientations. A few scholars objected to the use of anthropology for the purposes of war. Their arguments deserve close attention, for the sake of a more complete history, and more so for the sake of seeing one's way through the anthropological involvements with present and approaching wars.

The absence of wartime anthropology from anthropological text books and histories is mirrored in the dearth of ethnographic studies of the mechanized wars fought by nation states who in the past century ranked among the major producers and users of academic and professional anthropology. The scarcity of ethnographies of industrialized warfare, of life at the barracks, battles and home-fronts, constitutes one of the largest hiatuses in the ethnography produced in the twentieth century. A few anthropologists studied the wars of their times, but their number remained small. The work was taken over later in the century by social historians, folklorists, and anthropologists of the post-world war II generation. It marks a turning point and amendatory effort. They collect and analyze material about war anthropology and anthropology in wartime. They describe warfare and wartime society, and the preparatory phases and after-effects.

Their research is empirically rich, the studies full of new materials and discoveries. The effect is cumulative, creating a school of wartime research and scholarship. The cases and issues which individuals alone or in research teams take up lead to the uncovering and ordering of new materials. They add to our knowledge and insights. While valuable in their own right, they also provide the data and concepts that are needed to make the multi-layered analyses and comparisons which may shed a new light on each of the particular cases and reveal some of the common characteristics of the war anthropology and anthropology in wartime.

The large-scale involvement in and the small opposition to war anthropology is a common feature of professional and academic anthropology in the nations of this sample.

Another common trait is the gains and losses that war anthropology and anthropology in wartime inevitably entails. The common disregard of peacetime standards and procedures in war anthropology and anthropology in wartime may explain the generation-long silence maintained in public by those involved in war anthropology. The result was a gloss-over of war- and wartime anthropology in handbooks and histories, in Japan, Great Britain, the United States of America, the Netherlands, for half a century. It was an attempt to un-write history, to tidy the period up by leaving it out. Personally most participants seem to take a positive view of their wartime work, and of having contributed to the war effort (Starn 1986: 717, note 4).

## II. War-boons

### *The anthropology of war*

The contents of the war ethnography of the twentieth century in the English language may appear from a recent survey. Detailed empirical studies exist to some extent but comprehensive studies are mostly lacking. This conclusion was reached after the perusal of some 1,500 articles and books published between 1900 and 1986.<sup>2)</sup> The researchers defined war in these terms: 'The basic underlying phenomena characteristic of war can be described as follows: organized, purposeful group action, directed against another group that may or may not be organized for similar action, involving the actual or potential application of lethal force' (Ferguson and Farragher 1988: vii). The definition covers 'non-modern' warfare ('an inelegant term meant to exclude a variety of developments which characterize and complicate war since the fifteenth century in Europe, and the subsequent spread of European control around the world') but could also apply, in spite of the authors' reservations, to modern warfare.

The researchers encountered a wealth of descriptive materials from a wide variety of cultures and periods. They remark that theoretical debates have improved the understanding of warfare. But the results were not as cumulative as might be expected. Not enough work was done to synthesize the growing number of publications. It strengthens the impression that anthropologists do little work on war. What hindered the synthetic efforts? 'The first problem is the provincialism common throughout anthropology. A few issues related to war have been argued in the major anthropological journals and in books aimed at a broad audience. A few researchers have tried to integrate data from different world areas in their arguments. But a great number of investigations and controversies have been confined to single areas, printed in journals with a regional focus and books for area specialists' (Ferguson and Farragher 1988: i-ii). These conditions hindered and slowed academic exchange. Provincial mindsets continue to hold up a wider exchange in spite of the fact that the means of communication have diversified and improved by such leaps and bounds that localism need no longer obstruct global participation (van Bremen 2000a).

The number of publications in the anthropology of war was relatively small in the first half, but much larger in the second half of the past century. The numerical discrepancy need not express a greater interest in war. Foremost it reflects the gigantic growth of anthropology which occurred in the countries in this sample during the period when they were locked in

the Cold War (1947-1989).

### *Anthropology in belligerent times*

Besides studying primitive and pre-modern warfare, anthropologists in the countries compared in this sample, the United States of America, Japan, Great Britain and the Netherlands have taken part in the wars waged by their nations, or worked under wartime conditions. The growth of anthropology in the twentieth century is closely linked to its wars. The major belligerents and contestants in the modern wars built up the major centres of anthropology in the modern world. The case may be similar for other imperial and colonial nation-states, such as Imperial Russia, the Soviet Union and China.

Wars measurably furthered the growth of cultural and social anthropology, as can be seen from the increase in research facilities, personnel and training, research reports and publications in the countries in this sample. The growth began during the period of the Depression and the Second World War and became colossal in the Cold War period. 'The Second World War significantly restructured the contexts in which the discipline would go forward. It revealed the extent to which states had failed to develop the infrastructure of scientific research required to wage modern war. After war's end, governments took major steps to underwrite the sciences, both physical and social' (Wolf 1999: 129). It benefited anthropology but linked it to new wars. Anthropology experienced its largest growth in the Cold War period in these nations, in which the United States and Great Britain, and the Netherlands also fought hot wars.

Manifold relations exist between war and anthropology. Some are moulded by outside demands for services. Others spring from the dictates of conscience, or the exploitation of opportunities. Overall war budgets increased personnel and institutions on the home-front and overseas. The means came from different coffers, mostly governmental, military, commercial, educational, political groups and institutions. The price was ideological conformity and the forfeit of public criticism and debate. In general, anthropologists readily accepted and participated in war efforts. They seemed content to work with unexamined premises and follow political directives, and to voice and defend ethnocentric ideas. This trait is common in wartime anthropology in the United States of America, the Soviet Union, Franco Spain (Ortiz 1996), National Socialist Germany (Linimayr 1994), Imperial Japan and Communist China.

Detailed studies lead the way to the more layered understanding of the forces that shaped anthropology. They help solve dilemmas and enable paradigm shifts. As the one-time wartime American anthropologist Fred Eggan (1906-1991), having decided to write a history of ethnology and social anthropology, clearly saw:

The problem of establishing meaningful units for the development of ethnology and social anthropology is a difficult one. The histories of anthropology generally utilize chronological periods, but the progress of the different subfields varies, both in different countries and in relation to one another, so that chronology is at best a rough guide. An organization in terms of Kroeber's 'configurations of culture growth,' in which particular patterns originate, develop their potentialities, and are then abandoned or reshaped, might be more relevant and will be utilized to some extent. Of greater potential significance is Thomas Kuhn's conception of

'paradigms,' but Kuhn is primarily concerned with the natural sciences and is not sure whether any of the social sciences has as yet developed that far. Paradigms are based on scientific discoveries or achievements which attract adherents and provide a model or frame of reference for collecting and organizing data to solve the new problems which emerge. Evolutionism, diffusionism, and modern structural-functionalism approximate such a model or frame of reference in certain respects. We shall utilize chronological periods for convenience, but try to develop more meaningful units within them. (Eggan: 1970: 120; endnotes omitted)

The periodization that Eggan devised was prompted by *Configurations of culture growth* (1944), a study by Alfred Kroeber (1876-1960) published in America in the Second World War, but not a product of it. From early on Kroeber had taken a 'superorganic' view of culture. Eggan identified the period between 1860 and 1900 as the origins and first stage in the professionalization of anthropology. The time between 1900 and 1930 was characterized by the development of graduate schools, professional training, and fieldwork. In his own time, between 1930 and 1960, Eggan witnessed the further growth and spread of social and cultural anthropology. To extend the framework a moment longer, in this author's time, in the period between 1960 and 2000, one could witness a colossal growth and development in anthropology in the United States of America, Japan, Great Britain and the Netherlands.

Eric Wolf saw the Second World War as an important watershed in the development of anthropology in the twentieth century:

From 1943 on, social science organisations and government in the United States and England [...] began to sound the alarm over the academic neglect of the living present and the lack of qualified personnel with linguistic and regional knowledge. [...] This apparent knowledge gap became even more of an issue as the wartime alliance between the western powers and the Soviet Union gave way to the Cold War. (Wolf 1999b: 129)

The historian of anthropology George Stocking Jr. reached a similar conclusion: 'From a longer-run point of view, the wartime experience laid the basis for the tremendous growth of anthropology that took place in the post-war years' (Stocking 1992: 166). The explosive growth in education, and of anthropology in its wake, was a product of the Cold War and related to hot wars in the second half of the century.

From the nineteenth century, the state and military, commercial, and educational interests had asked for the services that anthropologists were able to render, beginning with library and documentary research and extending to fieldwork and participation in administration and pacification campaigns and wars. In return anthropology received recognition as a professional and academic field and the means to develop. Military incursions were preceded or followed by anthropological intelligence gathering and expeditions. Pacification campaigns secured the territories where the intensive fieldwork was conducted that constitutes social and cultural anthropology and is its hallmark. In this way a large body of ethnography was assembled, much of which survives and can be drawn upon today.

### ***Innovations and depredations***

In an effort to discover statistically significant correlates between warfare and characteristics of societies, with the help of a computer, a cross-cultural survey was made in the 1960s,

based on the ethnographic data held in the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF). It distinguished a number of types of societies, including in its own words, 'cultures where the threat of armed attack by alien societies is considerable; cultures where warfare is prevalent; cultures where warfare is not prevalent; cultures where warfare is common or chronic; cultures where warfare is rare or infrequent; and cultures unascertained' (Textor 1967: 160-162). On the one hand, the sample is world-wide and historically diverse. On the other hand, the industrialized societies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries remain largely beyond its scope. To this day, apart from the Ryukyu Archipelago, represented by a small number of American and European ethnographies, Japan has not found a place in the HRAF data base.<sup>3)</sup>

Primitive warfare has been the primary research field in anthropology. Modern warfare was mostly studied by other social scientists, such as those who monitored the military and the public in the United States in the Second World War (Stouffer et al. 1949). A few anthropologists have studied modern wars. Eric Wolf (1923-1999) turned to peasant wars of the twentieth century, basing his research on library and fieldwork (1969). Furthermore he examined relations between violence and ideology in different societies: The Kwakiutl, the Aztecs, and National Socialist Germany, seeking relations between ideologies of dominance and social crisis (Wolf 1999). KURIMOTO (1996) studied ethnic conflicts in Africa in the late twentieth century. Next he published a book on primitive warfare and modern warfare (KURIMOTO 1999), followed by a study of the militarization of the Japanese nation-state in the modern period (KURIMOTO 2000). Perhaps the longest bout of fieldwork in the annals of wartime anthropology was done in an elite unit of the Israeli Defense Force (Ben-Ari 1998). The period spans eight years and was conducted while combining the function of an officer with that of a participant observer. A pioneering spirit, the ethnographer has since turned to the Japanese Self Defence Forces, and to international peace keeping operations, once more breaking new ground.

If army life is mostly missing from the annals of ethnography, so is wartime life on the home-front. The life of non-combatants in wartime, affected by changes in social organization and behaviour and the place and role of the generations during and after the war, did not receive the share of attention in the ethnography of the twentieth century that it deserves. The situation is now on the mend. In Japan anthropologists, folklorists and historians in individual and concerted efforts, have turned to studying the military draft (KITAMURA 1999; HARADA 2001), the life of women in wartime society (KITAMURA 1999), the influence of garrisons on urban developments (MOTOYASU 2002), the effects of the devastating bombing raids made by the American Air Force upon Japanese cities late in the Pacific War (YOKOYAMA 2001), monuments and memorial rites for the military and civilian war dead (TANAKAMURA 2002).

The new studies begin to fill in the blanks in the ethnography of wartime life in Japan. They are of great value for the discernment of the more-layered understanding that is so much wanted. They identify misrepresentations of wartime life that have long remained uncontested and so hardened into stereo-types. 'Standardized errors', and also 'errors of convenience,' to borrow the names that John Embree adopted for the false or unproven theorems that people, blindly or willingly, use and accept.

One example of a stereo-typical claim, widely accepted in Japan and beyond, is that the

support for the military was stronger in rural than in urban areas. In the light of local data the situation appears to be different. The statement turns out to be an assumption instead of a fact, a bias resting on the presumed docility and backwardness of people in the country-side in contrast to the supposedly more defiant and enlightened stand of urbanites. In Tottori prefecture, rural households, hamlet and voluntary associations resented and resisted military conscription, from its imposition in 1873 until the end of the Pacific war in 1945. Men sought to evade the draft and were reluctant to serve in the army. People at the home front found it hard to cope with the ever more frequently recurring, lengthening, increasing and exacting war duties levied on everyone, the increasing hardships, and the steeply climbing and staggering loss of life and property during the Asia and Pacific War (KITAMURA 1999). Still, in Northern Kyushu, a large urban district, the cult of the military war dead was strongly supported (TANAKAMARU 2002). Patriotism was not simply tied to town or country.

Documentary and oral history begin to uncover the experiences of participants in the Asia and Pacific War who were so far ignored or mute in the accounts. The vicissitudes of the Chinese during the Japanese occupation of Java (Eisenhofer-Halim 1996), for instance, or the fate of the Chinese who stayed behind in New Guinea during the Japanese occupation and the Pacific War (TOYODA & ICHIKAWA n.d.).<sup>4</sup> The experiences of the different groups of people who remained in the Andaman islands – that isle classic in British anthropology – under the Japanese occupation and its different phases, and the different fates they met between 1942 and the end of the Pacific War have now been traced (Sareen 2002). Experiences with Japanese military administrations differed at times and places. Hussainmiya (in this volume) notes the emancipatory effects upon Brunei of the Japanese occupation.

The life of the military prisoners of war in their internment camps, and after repatriation for those who came back home largely remains an ethnographic blank. A Swiss master thesis based on interviews, documents and pictorial materials – sketches, drawings and paintings later made by survivors – gives insight into the experiences of the Japanese prisoners of war in the Soviet Union after their capture in 1945, during their life in the camps, and for the survivors, of life in Japan after repatriation, completed in 1956 (Dähler 2001). Coping with prisoner of war experiences is the subject of a British doctoral thesis, a study of the practices of reconciliation of British prisoners of war who experienced captivity by the Japanese army in the fall of Singapore, were deployed to build the Thai-Burma railway, and finally sent to work in a copper mine in central Japan (MURAKAMI 2002, 2003).<sup>5</sup>

### *War anthropology*

Different kinds of ethnographers were active in the colonial empires. The name ‘military anthropology’ might be given to the anthropological studies conducted by military personnel. The naval officer Shizuo MATSUOKA (SHIMIZU 1999) and the army officer Takao FUSAYAMA (1975) would belong to this class.<sup>6</sup> Both men, highly educated, conducted their self-taught ethnography while serving respectively in Micronesia during the First World War, and in North Sumatra during the Pacific War.

The overt or covert involvement of scholars with wars, single or in team, is a common feature of academic life. An early Dutch case of spying and counterinsurgency for the benefit



of colonial rule, and in support of a military campaign to suppress a rebellion in the province of Atjeh, a Muslim stronghold since the thirtieth century in northern Sumatra, involves the scholar of Muslim Law, Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje (1857-1936). He went to Jeddah in 1884, then under Turkish rule, to study the *Haj*, the pilgrimage to Mecca prescribed as a religious duty for Muslims. In 1885 he converted to Islam and as Abd al-Ghaffar entered Mecca. He received financial support from the Dutch colonial ministry, who wanted information about Muslims from the Dutch East Indies who stayed in Mecca. The colonial government feared a 'pan-Islamic' movement that could pose a threat to its rule and believed that Mecca would play a central role in the conspiracy. Snouck's counsel was also sought for the military campaign sent to suppress the Muslim rebellion in Atjeh, one of the bloodiest episodes in Dutch colonial history (Wertheim 1972; Van der Veer 2002: 11).

Japanese scholars smuggled themselves into forbidden religious centres in Tibet (Berry 1995). They also turned to Islam studies, learned Arab and other languages, read documents, patronized and sought advice and tutelage from local scholars, and converted to Islam. The Japanese government and armed forces, who saw the Muslims as a threat to themselves and other colonial powers in Asia in places with a large Muslim population, sought to encourage Muslim resistance against Chinese and European rule. Knowing the workings of Islamic institutions would help the civil and military administrations to administer the territories under Japanese rule with large Muslim populations. Islam specialists who worked in Central Asia were rushed to Southeast Asia when the Imperial Army and Navy occupied Malaysia, the Philippines and Indonesia and came to administrate their large Muslim population.

It is widely known that American anthropologists were involved in counterinsurgency operations in the 1960s and 1970s in Latin America (Starn 1994) and Southeast Asia (Wakin 1992). Actually, they served American interests in this region long before. When the United States acquired the Philippines in 1898, American anthropologists surveyed and classified the peoples of Luzon in much the same way, and about at the same time, as the Japanese anthropologists who determined the ethnic classification of the so-called indigenous peoples in neighbouring Taiwan, acquired by Japan in 1895 (Barclay 1999). In the last days of Dutch colonial rule in Southeast Asia, between 1950 and 1962, the Governor-General and Leiden-trained anthropologist, Jan van Baal (1909-1992), ordered a series of linguistic-anthropological studies to be carried out in Dutch New Guinea. A covert aim of the effort was to refute the claims made by the Indonesian government of the existence of close cultural connections between New Guinea and the Indonesian archipelago (Jaarsma 1990).

### *Scholarly gains and losses*

Wartime anthropology entails regression and destruction as well as progress and construction. Irrecoverable ethnological data, manuscripts, archives, libraries and collections were lost because of war. Numerous examples could be given. Some became famous in the history of anthropology. Legendary is the loss of his field notes that Edmund Leach suffered due to Japanese military action in Burma in the Pacific War. The same fate befell the Dutch anthropologist G. W. Locher (1908-1997). He worked in the island of Timor in East Indonesia from 22 March 1940 to 8 December 1941, the day of the general mobilization when he entered active service. When the Japanese forces landed on Timor in the night of 19

to 20 February 1942, Locher narrowly escaped capture. After fighting a guerrilla war for nearly ten months, he was evacuated to Australia in December 1942. He had to leave everything behind, including his materials and field notes. When Locher returned to Timor in August 1945 he found that all his materials had burnt (Vermeulen 1999: 11-13).

Eight millimetre ethnographic film taken in Southeast Asia in 1939 by the ethnomusicologist Takamoto KUROSAWA (黒澤隆朝, 1895-1987) was lost on account of the war. Before he returned to Japan, the Kodak Company had withdrawn from that country. The footage was left undeveloped and perished. The motion pictures and ethnomusicological recordings that he made between January and May 1943 in Taiwan and edited into ten cinematographic documentary films, were destroyed outright by the war (UMEDA 1997: 5; 19 note 1).

A major Japanese loss in the Pacific War was the destruction of more than one hundred notebooks, 12,000 handwritten pages, drafts of articles, numerous negatives, photographs and other materials. They went up in flames when fire burnt the house of the ethnographer Tsune'ichi MIYAMOTO (宮本常一, 1907-1981) in the O-otori district in the city of Sakai, in the aftermath of an American air raid on Osaka at one o'clock in the morning of 10 July 1945, consuming decades of work (SANO 1996: 201). In a lemma on the development of Japanese ethnology, published in the *Nihon shakai minzoku jiten* (Dictionary of Japanese society and folk customs) in 1960, Ei'ichirō Ishida (石田英一郎) recalled the many ethnological collections, publications and manuscripts that were irretrievably lost on account of the war (SHIMIZU 1999: 155). Another major loss was the unique collection of votif boards known as *ema* (絵馬), begun in 1919 by the stencil-dyer Keisuke SERIZAWA (芹澤銈介, 1889-1976), that burnt in 1945 during the Tokyo bombings at the end of the Pacific War. This collection was greatly valued by Muneyoshi YANAGI (柳宗悦, 1889-1961), a collector of folk art and a connoisseur, who called it the best in Japan (Mingei 2002: 5-6).

Worse, valuable lives and talents were lost to anthropology due to wars. I offer another pair of cases from Asia and Europe. Robert Hertz (1881-1915) lost his life on 13 April 1915 in one of those murderous but useless assaults that were regularly ordered on the Western Front in the First World War in Europe, that cost anthropology so dearly (Needham 1973: xi). In the Second World War the talented Japanese anthropologist Tadao KANO (鹿野忠雄, 1906-1945) went missing in the summer of 1945 in North Borneo where he was sent on a mission by the military.

A different variety of wartime experience is the collegial co-operation of scholars who, belonging as nationals to opposing camps, joined forces or lent a helping hand in saving one another's ethnographic work or collections from the destruction unleashed by their nation's armed forces. The above-mentioned Tadao KANO, who had received his doctorate in Taiwan in Taihoku Imperial University in 1941, was sent to Manila the next year by the Army. There he saved the valuable archaeological and ethnological material collected by Henry Otley Beyer, held in the University of the Philippines, from fire caused by vengeful activities of the Japanese military. In Indonesia, MABUCHI and FURUNO might have wanted to do joint research with Dutch scholars but the plan was vetoed by the military authorities (NAKAO in this volume). Evidently, in these matters local commanders took different attitudes.<sup>7)</sup>

By and large, Japanese ethnographic research of Indonesia proceeded in three stages. The

ethnographic field embraced in addition to Indonesia and Malaysia the Philippines and the 'indigenous peoples' of Taiwan (NISHIMURA 1966: 296). The first step was the acquisition of specialist knowledge obtained by research and study abroad in the 1920s and 1930s. The second step was making translations and excerpts of sources in foreign languages. This work commenced in the 1920s and continued until the end of the war. The third step was conducting expeditions, archive studies, and fieldwork in Indonesia in the 1930s and until the end of the Pacific War. The Dutch colonial authorities appear to have been unforthcoming to requests, if any were ever made, by Japanese anthropologists for permission to carry out fieldwork. In 1916, the Nichiran Tsūkō Chōsakai (日蘭通交調査會) was established with the aim to gather information amiably, produce a Japanese-Dutch dictionary, a Grammar of Dutch and conversation books, and engage in joint research projects (NAKAMURA 1995: 21). The Society remained active for about seven years but then ceased its activities.

Japanese ethnologists would not or could not do fieldwork in the Dutch East Indies. Expeditions were made by different scholars. A medical doctor, Seitarō OGURA (小倉清太郎), went on an expedition in Borneo, accompanied by native servants and two young Japanese assistants in 1933, lasting fifty days. They gathered information on the Dayaks, natural resources, and orang-utans. At the end of the chronicle of his tour, OGURA (1941: 319) wrote that he would like to do research together with Dutch scholars in future. The ethnomusicologist Takamoto KUROSAWA made a research trip of five months in Southeast Asia in 1939 which included the Dutch East Indies. He arrived in Batavia on 30 April having done research in Thailand, Malaya and Singapore. In Java he worked in Bandung, Jogjakarta and Surabaya. His stops were interspersed with visits to important ritual sites. KUROSAWA came to Bali on 18 May and worked on the island until his departure on 9 June. He returned to Japan via Surabaya and Taiwan and landed in Kobe three days later (KUROSAWA 1997; UMEDA 1998: 18-19). Travel was by air, boat, train and motor. The ethnographic equipment was modern and rich materials were obtained by research in ethnographic museums and collections, in consultation with local specialists, and by field visits and first hand observations and recording.<sup>8)</sup>

Anthropological fieldwork began during the Japanese occupation of Indonesia, which lasted three years and five months. In line with anthropological research in the service of Japanese administration, a committee was formed in Java on 24 October 1942 for the study of 'old customs' (舊慣制度調査會, Kyūkan Seido Chōsa-kai). The Sumatra Institute for the Study of the Customs and the History of the Minankabau was established on 17 March 1943 (FUKAMI 1993: 59; 79). Wartime studies had an impact on anthropology in Japan. 'Without MABUCHI and the war, Japanese anthropologists might have been stimulated less by Dutch structural anthropology, although only a few noticed the thin thread tying Japanese and Dutch anthropology via MABUCHI in wartime' (MIYAZAKI in this volume). After Indonesian independence and to this day Japanese ethnographers have been doing a great deal of fieldwork in Indonesia, adjacent Malaysia, the Philippines and Taiwan. This area of ethnographic studies is shared by Japanese, Dutch, British, Australian and American anthropologists.

The material gains for anthropology by participation in warfare were visible and large in

the allocation of means and the hiring of personnel. In their 'Summary and conclusion' to *Methodological approaches to the study of oriental society and culture*, composed for the Ohio State University Research Foundation as *Interim technical report* No. 2, July 1952, the authors, John W. Bennet and Iwao Ishino wrote: 'As the scale of international relations has increased, the social sciences have undergone considerable development, much of this inspired and supported by the needs of the government and the military for social research' (Bennett and Ishino 1952: 66-67). The two anthropologists worked for a post-war research project called *Research in Japanese Social Relations (RJSR)*, based in the Department of Sociology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, and sponsored by the Office of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy in Washington, D.C.

The war benefited linguistic anthropology of the school of Franz Boas, Edward Sapir and Leonard Bloomfield, which took flight in the 1940s. 'Successful application during the Second World War gave them an élan, a sense of common, useful enterprise, and momentum. There was a flood of ... work published after the war. [...] [T]he basic principles [...] were laid out in Bloomfield's 1933 book *Language* and the wartime outlines' (Murray 1980: 74-75). The war created opportunities for applied anthropology. It enabled Gregory Bateson, while serving in Southeast Asia in 1943 and 1945 for the Office of Strategic Services, to put to the test his theory of symmetrical 'schismogenesis'. By simulating a Japanese radio station, he created contorted Japanese war propaganda in Burma and Thailand, in an effort designed to cause a breakdown in enemy intelligence (Yang-McLaughlin 1986: 202-204; Price 2002a).

A common feature of wartime anthropology is an interest in ethnic minorities chosen for reasons explicitly connected to war. Small ethnic groups have been sought out to be used by armed forces as labourers, mercenaries, trackers, guides or spies in times of war. The Orochon on the northern Chinese-Soviet border were an object of special anthropological studies commissioned by the Japanese armed forces in Manchuria (NAKAO 1995). On similar missions Edmund Leach made his way among the hill tribes of Burma in the Second World War.

#### ***Labours sought, demanded, rendered, refused***

In a brief essay entitled *Lessons from Second World War anthropology*, David Price sketches the involvement of anthropologists in North America and Great Britain with military and intelligence agencies in the First and the Second World War (Price 2002b). He took for his epigraph these lines from the article 'Anthropology 1944' in the *Britannica book of the year 1944*:

Anthropologists were largely called upon to contribute their specialized knowledge to the war effort. The nature of the contacts they had established with native peoples the world over and the methods they had developed for understanding varied modes of life, permitted them to give realistic aid to intelligence units, or to those carrying on economic and psychological warfare and to advise concerning many types of postwar programs of rehabilitation. (Price 2002b: 14)

The passage captures the range of involvements of anthropologists in the camp of the Allied Forces in the Second World War and envisions new roles for the post-war period. Is this

model of the wartime anthropology of the Western Allied Powers duplicated in the wartime anthropology of their allies in Asia – Kuomintang and Communist China in particular – and their adversaries, the Axis Powers of Germany, Italy and Japan, and of their temporary allies, soon to be the enemies, the Soviet Union?

During the wars in which their nations were involved, the majority of anthropologists in North America, Europe and Japan put their knowledge and ethnographic skills to martial service. They worked as analysts, spies, linguists, peace activists, interrogators, geographers, detention camp managers, cryptographers, military guides, propagandists, advocates of the humane treatment of prisoners, culture brokers and in dozens of other military capacities (Price 2002a: 4). The research of anthropologists in America, Japan, Great Britain and the Netherlands was shaped by wars in the twentieth century. Numerous social scientists contributed to the war efforts of their nations. In the First World War in France, Emile Durkheim helped his government to persuade the United States to join the war in Europe. Max Weber served as an officer in the German Army Reserve Corps. War experiences shaped the views of Ralph Linton (a member of the 42nd Rainbow Division in the First World War) and influenced Leslie White's studies in anthropology (Price 2002b: 14 note 3). After the Second World War, the G. I. bill steered Clifford Geertz into anthropology (Geertz 2001: 3-20).

Experiences in Europe in the 1930s, and as an American soldier in the Second World War, kindled Eric Wolf's interest in anthropology. As a student in Queens College in New York he had taken a series of lectures by Kimball Young about Asia and found that he was interested in anthropology. In 1942 he volunteered for the American army because 'to be drafted would mean ending up in a unit I might not like; volunteering meant that you could make your own preferences known' (quoted in Blok 1982: 202). He chose the mountain troops, was sent to Italy with the US Army's Tenth Mountain Division, fought in Tirol, and was wounded. After the war he completed his undergraduate program in Queen's College and went to Columbia University to study anthropology. In an interview he said about his choice: 'I went into anthropology partly on the basis that I had money from the army to go and do something, and I had decided after four years of being in the army that's what I wanted to do' (quoted in Blok 1982: 202).

In 1960 Wolf returned to Europe to conduct fieldwork in the Italian Alps, in Bolzano Province, in the villages of St. Felix and Tret. He was interested in problems of national identity and the question of ethnic conflicts and loyalties. These matters had occupied him for a long time: as a child in Vienna, Sudetenland and the Val Gardena, as an internee in a British refugee camp, as a soldier in Tirol, as a graduate student in New York, and as an anthropologist doing research in Mexico. The fieldwork resulted in a book, *Hidden frontier*, written with his former student John Cole and published in 1974. This episode calls up another. Robert Hertz (1882-1915) went to the Cogne valley in Aosta in North-west Italy in 1912, shortly before the outbreak of the First World War, in which he would be killed in 1915, to study the cult of *Saint-Besse* and the local conflicts and loyalties which it involved. *Saint-Besse: Étude d'un culte alpestre* saw the light in 1913 (Hertz 1928).

Anthropologists who opposed the First World War in America suffered for their views. Pacifist statements brought Franz Boas into conflict with Columbia University. The

ethnographer Leo Frachtenberg lost his job in the United States Bureau of Ethnology in 1917 because of his anti-war views. James Mooney, the ethnographer of the Ghost Dance Religion, a millennial uprising among American Indian tribes west of the Mississippi at the end of the nineteenth century, was marginalized after he spoke out in defence of Frachtenberg's right to maintain the dissenting political opinions privately outside of the workplace. At the end of the First World War, the American Anthropological Association censured Boas for publicly denouncing the espionage of four American anthropologists who had used their professional credentials as a front for spying. The accusation was correct, but the Association did not believe that it was wrong for anthropologists to use their professional positions as a cover for espionage (Price 2002b: 14 note 2). Censorship and dismissal disgraced the academy in the United States in the First and the Second World War and during the Cold War McCarthy communist witch hunts.

In Japan in the years 1925 to 1945, political censorship was imposed under the *Maintenance of the Public Order Act* promulgated in 1925. Until the end of the Pacific War in 1945 this act authorized the arrest and dismissal of numerous people, intellectuals and academics among them. Nevertheless, many a censored scholar continued to play a role in Japanese folklore studies and anthropology during this time and in the Fifteen Years War, the Pacific War and the post-war period.

One example is Tokuzō ŌMACHI (大間知篤三, 1900-1970). He was arrested in 1928 as a Marxist plotter and received a three-year sentence under the Maintenance of the Public Order Act. After his release in 1931 he made a living as a translator of German literature. Between 1933 and 1939 he found academic shelter and employment in the private folklore academy of Kunio YANAGITA (柳田國男) (TSURUMI 1998). He conducted his first fieldwork in 1934 in the Izu archipelago. His publications in these years are concerned with rites of passage, household organization and kinship in rural Japan. The YANAGITA school was most productive during the time of the Fifteen Years War.

In February 1939 ŌMACHI went to Manchuria to teach German in Manchuria University (滿洲建國大學, Manshū Kenkoku Daigaku) newly established in the city of Changchun (長春), renamed Shinkyō (新京) by the Japanese. The ethnographic training that he had received from YANAGITA qualified ŌMACHI for the post of associate and then full professor of anthropology and primitive religions in the Department of Sociology. The department followed the common research repertoire standard in Japanese colonies. It was called 'research of old customs' and may be considered as the equivalent to the 'customary law' studies made in the Dutch East Indies.<sup>9</sup> The Japanese research on China took a two-pronged approach. It combined archival and documentary research with fieldwork (TSU 1999).

ŌMACHI worked in Manchuria until the end of the war. Much of his research was centred on shamanism. Under the influence of fieldwork and new schools of ethnology he came to adopt the methods of social and cultural anthropology. In 1946 ŌMACHI returned to Japan and rejoined Kunio YANAGITA's Folklore Institute where he worked until 1954. He returned to his research on marriage, family and kinship in Japan and gained recognition as a leading expert in these fields. In 1955 ŌMACHI was appointed a professor at Chūō University in Tokyo, lecturing on the German language and on Ethnology until his retirement in 1968 (TAKEDA 1982; UENO 1994; TSURUMI 1998).

An exceptional dissenter incarcerated under the Maintenance of the Public Order Act was a young aristocrat nick-named 'the red baron.' In 1928, while still a student, Eiichirō ISHIDA (石田英一郎, 1903-1968) was arrested as a Marxist and a member of the Kyoto Imperial University Sociological Research Society. He refused to recant and was jailed in Osaka in 1929. He remained in prison for five years. In these years he began to read American and European anthropology: L. H. Morgan, James Frazer, Wilhelm Schmidt and others of the Vienna school, where later he went to study. ISHIDA met Kunio YANAGITA and Masao OKA (岡正雄, 1898-1982) in 1935. He began to frequent YANAGITA's Mokuyōkai (木曜會, 'Thursday Club') devoted to folklore studies. In February 1937 Ishida was able to go to Vienna where he studied ethnology at the university until July 1939. With the outbreak of the European War in September, he left for Japan. The pact between the Axis Powers enabled ISHIDA and OKA to study in Vienna. It enabled Matthias Eder to work in China and Japan, and Fosco Maraini in Japan until his internment in 1944. Wartime alliances open and close academic traffic and transactions between countries.

As the Fifteen Years War escalated and rapidly spread with the onset of the Pacific War, former dissidents were called up. ISHIDA, who had returned from Vienna in the autumn of 1939, was assigned in July 1940 to the Tōa Sho-minzoku Chōsa Inkaikai (東亞諸民族調査委員會, Research Committee on East Asian Peoples) newly formed by the Imperial Academy, established in Tokyo in 1906. It sent ISHIDA to Sakhalin in 1941 to conduct research on the indigenous peoples who had been relocated there. In the summer of 1942 ISHIDA researched Muslim nomads in Mongolia. He left the Imperial Academy for the Minzoku Kenkyūjo (民族研究所, Ethnic Research Institute) when it was established in 1943 in Tokyo.

In January of the next year, ISHIDA went to Kalgan (張家口) as the vice-director of the Seihoku Kenkyūjo (西北研究所, Northwest Institute (1944-1945)), established in that city by the Mōko Zenrin Kyōkai (蒙古善隣協會, Mongolian Friendship Association), itself founded in 1934 in Japan with the help of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The word 'good neighbourly relations' (*zenrin*) apparently comes from the texts of Ōmoto-kyō (大本教), a new religion akin to Shinto that arose in the Meiji era. During the Russo-Japanese war (1904-1905), and in the war with China, its millenarian character was pronounced. In 1921, Ōmoto-kyō was charged with disrespect of the emperor and violating the press law. The head of the sect was arrested and the organization nearly destroyed. Ōmoto-kyō had sympathizers in the Japanese army in Manchuria and was encouraged by military intelligence to establish contacts with Mongolian leaders. In 1935, the sect was charged with *lèse-majesté* for the second time, and violating the Maintenance of the Public Order Act.

The overseas headquarters of the Mongolian Friendship Association was opened in Kalgan in 1938. In 1944 the Association moved its research branch to that city and set up the Northwest Institute as a continental branch of the Ethnic Research Institute. The director of the new institute was Kinji IMANISHI (今西錦司, 1902-1992) from Kyoto Imperial University. The Ethnic Research Institute of Tokyo appointed Ei'ichirō ISHIDA as the vice-director. The anthropologists on the staff included Tadao UMESAO (梅棹忠夫, b. 1920). These scholars played a leading role in post-war anthropology. UMESAO, then a young scholar just graduated in 1943 in Zoology from the Faculty of Geography in Kyoto University, later became the founding director of the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka, the largest

anthropological research facility established in post-war Japan in 1974. Wartime ethnography was supported by a variety of foundations, associations and companies. Research was commissioned by the large Takarazuka Theatre, who served propaganda purposes during the war (Robertson 1999). Whether Ōmoto-kyō had a stake in the Mongolian Friendship Association is not clear. If it did, it could show a tie between wartime anthropology and a religious organization (NAKAMAKI 1994; TSURUMI 1998).

ISHIDA returned to Japan in 1946. His unbroken stance as a dissenter made him an untarnished and credible post-war leader. ISHIDA held that the research conducted by anthropologists under wartime conditions should be judged on scientific terms and not by the motives of the civic or military authorities that ordained it at the time. On the whole, wartime Japanese anthropologists have little reason to hide. Yet the precaution was widely taken by the author(s) and/or editor(s), with or without the knowledge and permission of all parties concerned, to remove wartime names and slogans from the post-war editions. *Dai Tōa* (大東亞, Great East Asia) and *Dai Tōa Kyōeiken* (大東亞共榮圈, Great East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere), names which appear in Tokuzō ŌMACHI's wartime publications, have been removed from his collected writings published between 1975 and 1978 in four volumes. The omission of some or all war-time works from post-war publications, collected writings and complete works of wartime authors is a common form of voluntary censorship. The evasion of war anthropology lasted for nearly fifty years in the post-war academic discussions and publications. Up to the end of the Cold War it remained common to avoid direct references to war anthropology, or make it a subject of discussion or research.

The histories and textbooks of anthropology written in this period tend to stress particular scholars and schools and activities in peacetime. Used nearly back-to-back, *senzen* (戦前, pre-war) and *senjo* (戦後, post-war) were widely employed as nomenclatural devices. It buffers out and covers up the wartime activities of anthropologists. In reality, the time of the Depression, the Fifteen Years War, the Second World War, the Pacific War and the Cold War brought a rising demand for local knowledge and research of the kind that anthropologists were able to do. Social and cultural anthropology took great strides in Japan, Europe and the United States of America in these decades.

At the end of the Cold War the silence around war anthropology was broken. Wartime was given a place in textbooks, handbooks and histories of anthropology and folklore studies written after the Cold War in Japan. Ethnography is on the rise with studies of wartime life at the home front. A post-war generation of anthropologists and social historians, students of former colonial and wartime anthropologists, followed by scholars from the next generation, have made the wartime activities of Japanese anthropologists a topic of research and discussion in the academic and professional circles in Japan.<sup>10)</sup>

In Great Britain anthropologists supported the war effort. In the Second World War Evans-Pritchard (1902-1973) joined the British Army's campaigns and engaged in ethnography, combat service and intelligence work in Ethiopia, Sudan and Libya. S. F. Nadel (1903-1954) joined the Sudan Defence Force, served in the British Army's East African Command in Eritrea and ended the war as a senior staff officer to the military government of Tripolitania (Price 2002b: 15).

Critics spoke out against the use of anthropology as an instrument of war in the United



States of America. Franz Boas, who had been censored in the First World War by the American Anthropological Association for speaking out against espionage under the cover of anthropology, again opposed the use of anthropology for war in the Second World War. Paradoxically, Boas's refutation of the concept of race inspired many anthropologists to take part in the Second World War. They saw the National Socialists as an enemy of the core principles of anthropology on account of their racist ideology and practice of ethnocide. But in that situation, concerns over the use of anthropology in the service of war, or as a cover for espionage, seemed of lesser importance to most (Price 2002b: 15).

The approval of espionage under the mantle of anthropology by professional associations in the First World War made it easier for anthropologists in the Second World War to use fieldwork as a cover for spying. The war was generally seen as a just war and had wide public support in the United States and the United Kingdom. American anthropologists discussed the moral issues and the ethics of their profession on a much larger scale in relation to the wars in Latin America and Southeast Asia in 1960s and 1970s. Whether or not the number of opponents and rejecters was larger than before is an open question. The number of anthropologists had been rapidly growing, but was the number of dissenters larger? Mostly, deliberations were pushed aside in the Second World War. New military and intelligence agencies came into existence in 1942 and 1943 and anthropologists worked for them in large numbers. Nevertheless there was some discussion about the principle of committing the university to the war effort (Price 2002b: 16).

The anthropologies in the twentieth century in the countries examined in this chapter have much in common and run synchronous. In America, Great Britain and Japan, social and cultural anthropology began to advance in the 1930s and the 1940s. The mobilization of society, the administration of colonies, and waging wars provided employment and means. It is easy to see the expansion in the growth of new projects, agencies, personnel, armchair and field research. Social and cultural anthropology came to the fore in the period of the Fifteen Years War and the Cold War in Japan, and in the years of the Depression, the New Deal, the Second World War and the Cold War in the United States of America (Starn 1986: 705). The New Deal agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service hired anthropologists in the same way as wartime agencies later did, and post-war administrators would do again to assist in the administration of occupied or mandated areas. The governments and the military escalated the mobilization of their nation for the war effort, claiming all inhabitants and resources on the home-front and in areas under their colonial administration or military rule. Anthropologists were recruited and served in official and semi-official roles and capacities. From their side, anthropologists used what chances crises and wars offered their discipline and themselves.

## II. Personnel, institutions and employment

### *Japan*

The Minzoku Kenkyūjo (民族研究所, the Institute of Ethnology by its official English name), can be said to represent wartime anthropology on the national level. It was created in 1943 under the auspices of the Ministry of Education. The task of the institute was to conduct

research in the empire on the different populations and peoples and to assist the ethnic and national policies of the Japanese civil or military administration in the realm. For this reason the institute has earned the name 'Ethnic Research Institute' when it is spoken of in English by Japanese anthropologists today.<sup>11)</sup> A common characteristic of wartime anthropology is the policy-oriented research demanded of anthropologists. Japanese anthropologists appear to have done more ethnographic research, while their counterparts in America were predominantly engaged in evaluating the policies of the agencies who employed them. It gives the Japanese work a more lasting value than the policy evaluations on which their counterparts in America spent most of their time and that lost their value almost instantly.

At first, the Institute was staffed by twenty-one persons. A year later another fourteen people were added. In order of numerical strength, the staff consisted of six sociologists; four anthropologists (Masao OKA, the head of the Administrative Department and the Second Department; Kiyoto FURUNO [古野清人, 1899-1979], the head of the Third Department and the Fifth Department; Ken'ichi SUGIURA [杉浦健一], and Jirō SUZUKI [鈴木二郎]); four historians (Namio EGAMI [江上波夫] among them); two folklorists (Yasumoto TOKUNAGA [徳永康元] and Keigo SEKI [關敬吾]); one archaeologist (Ichirō YAWATA [八幡一郎]); one linguist; and a scholar in religious studies (SHIMIZU in this volume).

Most of the fieldwork was done in China, Manchuria and Inner Mongolia. Masao OKA went to Manchuria and North China for a month, and again for forty days to co-ordinate the numerous research actives carried out in the area, in 1944. At the behest of the Imperial Navy, the Ethnic Research Institute dispatched scholars to South China and Hainan Island for two months and to South China for one month. Kiyoto FURUNO and Hiroshi OIKAWA worked in the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, Java, Celebes, French Indochina and Thailand in late 1943 and early 1944 for six months commissioned by the Army (SHIMIZU, Miyazaki, NAKAO in this volume).

Of the research departments run by corporations, the South Manchurian Railway Company operated by far the largest. In 1908 a Research Division (調査部, Chōsabu) was established in the Tokyo headquarters of the company. It was moved to Dalian (大連) later in the year and renamed Research Section (調査課, Chōsaka). It employed a staff of over 2,000 persons, who concentrated on Manchuria, Mongolia and North China. In addition the Company set up Mansen Rekishi Chiri Chōsabu (滿鮮歴史地理調査部, Research Division for the History and Geography of Manchuria and Korea). The Tōa Keizai Chōsakyoku (東亞經濟調査局, East-Asiatic Economic Investigation Bureau) was set up in 1908 in Tokyo to cover the rest of Asia. The personnel in the Indonesia section once included the anthropologists Kiyondo FURUNO and Tōichi MABUCHI.

A large number of research desks, branches and institutes were set up and staffed by different agencies at home and in the colonies and areas under Japanese military administration overseas. An idea of their range and numbers may be gleaned from this volume. One group was attached to the state and private universities. The Dozoku-jinshugaku Kōza (土俗・人種學講座, Institute of Ethnology) was opened with Taihoku Imperial University in 1928 in Taiwan. During the Pacific War in 1943, Taihoku Imperial University founded the Nanpō Jinbun Kenkyūjo (南方人文研究所, Institute of Southern Cultures). It was staffed by members of the Institute of Ethnology: Nenzō UTSUSHIKAWA

(移川子之藏), Nobuto MIYAMOTO (宮本延人), Tōichi MABUCHI and Tadao KANO (鹿野忠雄). The government of Manchukuo established the National Foundation University (建國大學) in 1939 and the Department of Ethnology. The inclusion of the department was related to the war in Manchuria and China. Tokuzō ŌMACH was the leading figure in this division.

Four scholars formerly of the Institute of Ethnology alias the Ethnic Research Institute met after the war in Ochanomizu, Tokyo, in May 1948 to discuss the origins and the formation of the early state, culture and population of Japan. The exchanged views were based on the disciplines which they represented: anthropology, history and archaeology. Ei'ichirō ISHIDA (anthropologist) chaired the discussion. The debaters were Masao OKA (anthropologist), Ichirō YAWATA (archaeologist) and Namio EGAMI (Oriental history) (EGAMI 1995). The record of the exchange was edited and published in a special issue of the *Japanese journal of ethnology* (Volume 13, No. 3) in 1949, and later as a book (ISHIDA et al. 1956).

The discussion had a deep impact. Questions about the origins of Japan and their scientific research had been tabu under the wartime regime when autocratic ideology ruled. After the end of the war and the regime these matters could again be openly discussed and researched. What was a wartime negation, in the post-war years turned into a major field of research and discussion. The study of the emergence and early history of the population, the state, society and culture in Japan occupied a large number of anthropologists and scholars in related fields, for decades in the second half of the twentieth century. The importance of the topic is reflected in its selection as the first of the three special research projects embarked upon for a ten-year period by the National Museum of Ethnology when it opened in 1977. Named *Comparative studies on the origins of Japanese Culture*, wide ranging research was conducted between 1978 and 1987. By this great project and others in the post-war period rapid strides were made in replacing a package of myths and outdated research with a supply of new facts and reliable knowledge. The size of the project and the speed of its progress were made possible by the huge financial and economic resources that were placed at the disposal of anthropology in the period of the Cold war.

### *The United States of America*

During the twentieth century in America, most anthropologists supported the war effort in various ways. A few scholars objected to the use of anthropology as a false front for the sake of warfare, or criticized a school of anthropology being applied in the war. John Embree (1908-1950) declared the 'Culture and Personality' school of anthropology as scientifically unsound. It was much relied on by the organs of the United States government and the Armed Forces who employed anthropologists during the Second World War. Embree was one of the few American anthropologists who had done fieldwork in Japan before the outbreak of the Pacific War. He served in the Foreign Morale Analysis Division in the Office of War Information, where Geoffrey Gorer and Ruth Benedict were among the advocates and practitioners of the culture and personality approach; the Japan Section in the Far Eastern Division of the Research and Analysis Branch of the Office of Strategic Services; the Civil Affairs Training School; and the Army Special Training Programs in the War Department during the war (Janssens 1995: 74; 76). Embree's involvements with war

anthropology showed him some of its harmful sides: the surrender of peacetime standards of objectivity and critical evaluation, the exaltation of one's own culture, the debasement of the enemy and his culture, the work as wardens of wartime Japanese internees.

American war anthropology followed the assumption that American culture was the best in the world, and that it was the duty of anthropologists to assist the United States government in maintaining it at home and spreading it abroad. In the process, critical standards were lowered or cast off, information uncritically accepted, ethnocentric and racist views espoused. In Embree's assessment the Culture and Personality anthropologists, the creators of National Character Studies, were the worst. He exposed the faults in their methods and branded them as creators of lore instead of knowledge. By pronouncing the national character studies invalid, Embree openly declared his mistrust in the value of the government and military anthropology that was dominated by that branch (Embree 1945).<sup>12</sup>

Peter Suzuki (b. 1928), a member of the next generation, is a stern critic of American government anthropology as it was used in the Japanese American internment camps in the Second World War. In the war Suzuki was a teenage inmate of an internment camp.<sup>13</sup> Later he became an anthropologist. He reckons Weston LaBarre to the most questionable examples of anthropology in the service of ideology and bureaucracy (Suzuki 1980: 33). LaBarre's reports and publications frequently 'slide into a paean of praise for the superior ethos and values of the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant Male, especially when contrasted with those of the Indians of South Asia, Chinese, and Japanese. [...] [T]he three Asian groups fare rather badly when compared with LaBarre's typical American' (Suzuki 1980: 34). In May 1943, LaBarre worked for forty-four days for the War Relocation Authority in the internment centre at Topaz, Utah. His methods were faulty and his work on the Japanese Americans was 'mean-spirited, shabby, and intellectually dishonest' (Suzuki 1981: 56, note 173). La Barre's work was not a lone exception. Suzuki's conclusion is that 'It is not too much to say that the methods, assumptions, and pretensions of conventional American anthropology were tested in the Japanese internment camps during world war II and were found wanting' (Suzuki 1981: 46).

The War Relocation Authority (WRA) ran one of the largest American anthropology projects in wartime. Established on March 17, 1942, by June it had engineered the internment of 110,000 Japanese Americans – two-thirds of them American citizens – in ten detention camps. It hired more than twenty anthropologists in its Community Analysis Section, who worked as community analysts in the camps. The group included John Embree as the first Director of the Community Analysis Section in Washington, D.C., and Elizabeth Colson (Poston, Arizona), E. Adamson Hoebel (Granada, Colorado), Marvin K. Opler (Tule Lake, California), Morris E. Opler (Manzanar, California) among the camp researchers. Conrad Arensberg (1942), Robert Redfield (1943), and Laura Thompson worked as consultants (Suzuki 1981: 24). Many had the good intention of improving camp conditions and defusing anti-Japanese public opinion, but later studies show that their writings had a series of unintended effects, including the promotion of racial stereotypes about the Japanese (Starn 1986).

The Community Analysis Section was set up by the War Relocation Authority to conduct research on the Japanese American inhabitants of the internment camps using community

analysts.

Community analysts at each of the relocation centers prepared regular reports on administration and camp life, as well as Weekly Summaries (30 issues), Community Analyst Notes (15 issues), a Project Analysis Series (24 issues), and a general newsletter (14 issues). Read by both camp administrators and WRA authorities in Washington, this literature discussed the relevance of everything [...] for administrative strategy. (Starn 1986: 703)

The anthropologists who worked in the Community Analysis Section – community analysts and advisors – produced about 4,500 documents in all (Suzuki 1981: 33-34). The analysis of this material leads to a number of conclusions. One finding is the wide-spread adoption of political aims and ethnocentric views in this sector of wartime anthropology. Another one is the dominant role of the governmental bureaucracy. The anthropologists had to assimilate the vocabulary, perspectives, categories of thought, organizational codes, concerns and values of the encompassing bureaucracy in order to be successful. The most discouraging finding is how little ethnography of camp life was produced. In every camp priority was given to policy analysis studies.

Nearly all the reports and publications written by the community analysts deal with policy analysis and have only a contingent value as records of the life of the Japanese Americans in the internment and relocation camps. Of the thousands of documents produced by the community analysts only a few are ethnographic in nature. Only a fifth of the anthropologists wrote what may be considered timeless and excellent ethnographic reports: John Embree, Marvin K. Opler and Morris E. Opler (b. 1907). In contrast to the policy studies, they sought to uncover and describe the life of the interned Japanese Americans. In this light 'Marvin Opler's five publications based on research in Tule Lake are noteworthy for several reasons. All are refreshingly free of the jargon and rhetoric of the WRA policies imposed upon internees and so ubiquitous in the writings of his colleagues. His articles deal with the concerns and behaviour patterns of the inmates as they worked them out at Tule Lake; accordingly, the categories of thought and action are those of the Japanese Americans, not Opler's' (Suzuki 1981: 40). Morris Opler was nearly fired for being 'an old-fashioned ethnologist'. However, the 'old-fashioned ethnographic nature' gives the work of these scholars its value and lasting importance (Suzuki 1981: 41-42).<sup>14)</sup>

A number of doctoral dissertations about aspects of camp life, which significantly enriched the meagre wartime ethnography, were written by Japanese American anthropologists in the aftermath of the war. Their authors had worked in the Community Analysis Section as data-gatherers, or for the Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study, a covert research project conducted by the University of California at Berkeley that included two anthropologists. They earned their Ph.D. in the University of California at Berkeley (1949), Chicago (1949, 1951), Cornell (1954) and Harvard and became professors in major universities (Suzuki 1981: 55, note 145).

In the training and employing of the Japanese American research assistants one detects another common element of war anthropology. Native experts and local assistants were employed as assistants in wartime anthropological projects by Japanese and American anthropologists. Students were trained as data-gatherers and instructed to obtain them by

means of questionnaires.

A dip in academic opportunities set in for anthropology in America when the Second World War ended (D'Andrade 1975). Also in Japan, where the professional association was reconstituted in 1946, anthropology fell on hard times. In both countries its fortunes were restored with the onset of the Cold War.

On the eve of the outbreak of the Korean War (1950-1953), John Embree again spoke out against academic blindness and conceit, in 'A note on ethnocentrism in anthropology', published as a 'Letter to the Editor' in the *American anthropologist*. His concluding paragraph is just as applicable today as at the time of writing:

Just as America, now the richest and most powerful nation on earth, must learn some self restraint if she is not to ruin the peoples and cultures of the rest of the world, American anthropologists who have so many opportunities for intellectual leadership must beware falling in love with their own culture and their own professional folkways to such an extent as to lose sight of their primary object: to study the nature of man and his culture, of the relations between men and their cultures. (Embree 1950a: 431-332)

A commentator of today, David Price, warns against ethnocentrism in the final paragraph of an essay on Second World War anthropology, composed at the dawn of the 'war on terrorism'.

As the American President seems intent on committing his nation to a prolonged war against the ill-defined concept of terrorism – and many of his citizens seem suddenly frightened into supporting his quest – anthropologists have new reasons to focus on the issues embedded in their discipline's militaristically mobilized past. (Price 2002b: 20)

That past embraced two world wars, the cold war, intelligence and counter-insurgency wars, wars in Southeast Asia (Wolf and Jorgensen 1970), Latin America, Africa, Europe and the Middle East.

The scale of the participation in the Second World War is illustrated by a report to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, sent by an assembly of American anthropologists. It states that in 1943,

Over one-half of the professional anthropologists in this country are directly concerned in the war effort, and most of the rest are doing part-time war work. The comprehensive knowledge of the peoples and cultures of the world which anthropologists have gathered through field research has proved of great value to both the Army and the Navy, and to the various war agencies. The Association cooperated in setting up the *Ethnogeographic Board*, the *Committee on the Anthropology of Oceania and Africa*, and the *Committee for Latin American Studies*. (quoted in Price 2002b: 16)

Later in 1943, the American Anthropological Association created the Committee on Anthropology and the War Effort with Ralph Beals as the chair and Margaret Mead and David Mandelbaum to coordinate anthropological warfare in America and abroad.

*Japanese anthropology during the Asia and Pacific War*

The Pacific War shaped anthropology in Japan as deeply as it moulded anthropology in the United States of America. Both sides recruited regional specialists and personnel able to carry out the local research needed for administrative or strategic purposes. The demand steeply grew when the Japanese Imperial Forces had occupied British, Dutch and American colonies in Southeast Asia. The intensification and spread of the war increased the need for local research.

In a state of total war, the Japanese government pressed national and private universities and business conglomerates to come to the aid of the armed forces. The Tōa-keizai Kenkyūjo (東亞經濟研究所, Institute of East Asian Economies) of the Tokyo University of Commerce responded by sending twelve researchers to Singapore. The Tōa Kenkyūjo (東亞研究所, East Asia Institute) sent a group of about sixty researchers to Java. The Mitsubishi Keizai Kenkyūjo (三菱經濟研究所, Mitsubishi Economic Institute) sent a group of about twenty researchers to the Philippines. The Research Bureau of the South Manchurian Railway Company sent two groups, each consisting of about fifty members, to Sumatra and Burma. The Institute of the Pacific (Taiheiyo Kyōkai, 太平洋協會) sent a group of twenty-three researchers to North Borneo. These numbers include academic specialists of human, social and natural sciences, as well as the support staff. Among the academic staff, Kano TADAO who went to the Philippines and Hisakatu HIJIKATA (土方久功) who went to North Borneo may definitely be considered anthropologists. They worked under the orders and jurisdiction of the military branches to which they were assigned. The Navy established the Makassar Kenkyūjo (マカッサル研究所, Makassar Institute) in Celebes and recruited the anthropologist Tōichi MABUCHI as a researcher. The anthropologist Seiichi IZUMI (泉靖一), a graduate of Keijō Imperial University in Korea, was sent to the former Dutch New Guinea as a member of a research expedition organized by the Navy in 1943 (SHIMIZU, MIYAZAKI and NAKAO in this volume).

Area studies were institutionalized in wartime social science. In the East Asia Institute in Japan, four of the six research departments were assigned to regional studies. The areas were constituted by the Soviet Union, Outer Mongolia, China, Manchuria and Inner Mongolia, the South Seas, Oceania (i.e. Australia and New Zealand), India and Burma, West Asia and major Western countries. It is true for the United States of America also.

The wartime experience of applied anthropology stimulated visions of a wide range of new uses of anthropology that would require a great expansion of university training programs. And in fact the "area programs" that later became so important for the growth of the discipline were themselves largely the outgrowth of the wartime university experience in the training of military personnel. (Stocking 1992: 166)

At the peak of its activities the East Asia Institute had about two hundred and fifty researchers on its staff. One counts a number of anthropologists among them, including the insular Southeast Asia specialist Asahitarō NISHIMURA (西村朝日太郎) and Jōji TANASE (棚瀬襄爾), a specialist of the anthropology of religion. Research was assigned to the individual staff members, to the research committees, and to outside specialists. The staff did much desk work, mostly summaries, translations and compilations that heavily depended on

sources in European and Asian languages. The output was high. The *Nanyō nenkan* (the Southern Yearbook), published in 1929, 1932, 1937 and 1943 may testify to the size of it. Thirty authors contributed to the yearbook published in 1943. It consists of two volumes and numbers 2,760 pages. About 1,000 pages concern Indonesia. The ethnographic and ethnological contents and nature of Japanese wartime work is held to be high.

In spite of the fact that the war reduced and depleted the remaining resources, in the worsened conditions ethnological research continued to enjoy a priority for Japan. Means were allocated until the very end of the war even as resources were rapidly dwindling. The research committees of the East Asia Institute conducted nine projects: three in natural sciences; two collecting data on the current war; and four in social sciences. The social scientists were charged with the task to supply information on the following topics: 'Japanese and foreign investments in China' (the First Research Committee); 'Overseas Chinese in the South' (the Third Research Committee) which included issues such as 'the anti-Japanese and "Save the country" movements of Overseas Chinese'; 'Chinese customs' (the Sixth Research Institute); and 'the demand and supply of food in Japan, Manchuria and China' (the Fifth Research Institute). The empirical data were collected by fieldworkers and local agents. The research projects conducted by the committees were extensive and involved more than two hundred persons in the case of the First Research Committee (SHIMIZU in this volume).

The Sixth Research Committee was charged with research in customary law. It had to outline and describe in detail Chinese customs in rural and urban society. The committee split the project accordingly. The Faculty of Law in the Imperial University of Tokyo, and the Faculty of Economics in Kyoto Imperial University, delegated members to the academic steering committee who with a managerial steering committee ran the project. Tokyo took charge of research in the rural sector, Kyoto of the urban side. The Beijing Branch of the South Manchurian Railway Research Department did the fieldwork and collected data from 1940 to 1942 in both sectors. The Department also had staff members on the academic steering committee. The fieldwork was literally conducted in war zones. The researchers had to be constantly guarded by Japanese troops. Many of the research projects carried out by the East Asia Institute are highly valued for the results, the high scientific quality, and the contributions which they have been making to the post-war development of Asian studies (SHIMIZU in this volume).

### *American anthropology during the Pacific War*

During the Pacific War anthropologists in America studied the impact of the war on the civilian population besides the incarcerated Japanese Americans. W. Lloyd Warner studied a Midwestern conservative town and found that small American communities were apprehensive of the war, yet full of the social effervescence that accompanied the war. Anthropologists contributed to domestic propaganda programs designed to keep the American populace on a wartime footing, or to change American dietary habits for the wartime National Research Council's Committee on Food Habits, where Margaret Mead worked. Military diets were popularized in wartime and post-war Japan (Cwierka 2002: 1-30).



Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish sought to dissipate racist attitudes in the American military. They wrote a pamphlet on race in 1943 to be distributed by the army to officers and enlisted men. The pamphlet clearly stated the scientific case against claims of racial superiority. It was found too controversial and the distribution of the brochure was barred by the military and the United Service Organization (Price 2002b: 17).

In the Second World War American anthropologists worked in intelligence agencies of the armed forces such as the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Army Intelligence Division, the Army Special Training Program, and the Air Force Intelligence. They served in the Ethnogeographic Board, the Office of War Information, and the Office of Strategic Services, the institutional predecessor of the later Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Cora DuBois, Felix Keesing, Alexander Lesser, Edwin Loeb, Alfred Metraux, and George Murdock were among them. The anthropologists performed a variety of tasks, ranging from policy analyses to research to using their anthropological credentials as a front for their under-cover operations. Some anthropologists were fully secret agents. In the early 1940s, the Office of Strategic Services engaged Carleton Coon to smuggle firearms and explosives to French resistance groups, and collect strategic intelligence in Morocco under cover of fieldwork (Price 2002b: 17).

The anthropologists in the Office of War Information had to fight their own governmental policies, attitudes and strategies as much as the enemy. Racism was rife within the United States War Department and in other government agencies. The attitude was encouraged, willingly or not, by the notions expounded by the Culture and Personality School of anthropology, dominant in these circles. As Embree recounts a situation:

At a recent meeting of persons interested in Japan, some of the social "scientists" present made remarkable generalizations about the "adolescent" and "gangster" qualities of our Asiatic enemy – overlooking for the moment the youth of American culture, and such little matters as American lynching parties and race riots. To explain the causes of war in terms of individual behavior or even cultural patterns is to ignore the whole complex of socio-economic developments that lead to international conflicts. The writings of the national character structure group have been largely in the form of 'confidential' mimeographed pamphlets and so not subject to scientific criticisms; nonetheless their conclusions are presented to government agencies as the findings and methods of "anthropology." (Embree 1945: 636, n. 3)

The Deputy Director for the Far East at the Office of War Information, a British historian of China named George Taylor, believed that an understanding of culture was vital to success. He engaged over a dozen anthropologists who worked on Japanese analysis and propaganda campaigns. They included Clyde & Florence Kluckhohn, Alexander Leighton, Dorothea C. Leighton, Alexander Lesser, Geoffrey Gorer, Ruth Benedict, Kathrine Spencer and John Embree. The anthropologists had to answer questions about Japanese national character and to guesstimate the possible impact of the various military strategies that could be used against the Japanese. The low level of cultural sophistication in the leaflets that the military proposed to drop on the Japanese troops and villages alarmed Taylor. He believed that a better understanding of cultural nuances could change the effectiveness of such pamphlets. Anthropologists, assisted by second generation Japanese Americans, redesigned

the pamphlets and with success as increased Japanese soldier surrender rates showed (Price 2002b: 18).

Taylor's cultural team could not convince the US military that it was not necessary to engage in acts of mass annihilation to end the war. Military leaders and President Roosevelt and his advisors were convinced that the Japanese would not surrender but resist to the last. Even as Taylor and his staff were fighting this mind set, American military and political leaders developed plans to use nuclear weapons against Japanese civilian targets, actions that were seen as politically and militarily unnecessary by the anthropologists and other staff members at the Office of War Information (Price 2002b: 18-19).<sup>15</sup> In the end the anthropologists and their Japanese American helpers in the Office of War Information but little influenced the decision makers. What success they had was in the field of propaganda (Janssens 1995: 221-227).

### III. A mode of knowledge like no other

In mid-life Eric Wolf (1964) entrusted to paper his views of anthropology in an insightful, inspiring, concise book that oddly is rarely cited. Late in his life he was able to condense his views in two sentences. 'Anthropology at its best is analytic, comparative, integrative, and critical, all at the same time. It is a mode of knowledge like no other' (Wolf 1999b: 132-133). The deeds of anthropologists during the past wars need to be viewed in the context of their places and times. Part of a scholarly tradition, anthropologists should know the history and the participation of their discipline in wars and of anthropology in wartime. Histories of the discipline must include these accounts. They are needed for counsel and reflection when taking a stance in the present and steering a course ahead. The interpretation of past actions is difficult but to ignore war anthropology is to increase the risk of misunderstanding, misapplication and manipulation in wartime. Anthropologists will be pressed, and take initiatives, to apply their knowledge and skills in wartime, do military and intelligence work.

The study of wartime anthropology in the nations examined in this chapter shows that the largest belligerents developed the largest anthropology. The history of anthropology is linked to the history of these nation-states in a massive way. Global warfare in the twentieth century was made possible by industrialization. Mass production of weapons, mechanization, and organization of armies made possible mass violence across vast territories. The past decades witness the growing computerization of warfare by means of laser- and satellite-guided bombs and rockets. Warfare can now strike anywhere and any time (Kwok 2002: 63-64). The types of war keep changing.

A search for more general traits of war anthropology and wartime anthropology in the past century was the concern of this chapter. A discussion of the concept of war was largely avoided. It is a methodic wont of anthropology, when beginning to study a complex matter, to first turn to clearly defined and circumscribed cases. The wars fought in the twentieth century between the nation-states in my sample tended to have clear beginnings – an attack or a declaration of war – and clear ends, marked by a formal surrender, perhaps followed by a peace treaty. Other kinds of armed conflicts in the past century were less clearly bounded. They include civil wars, peasant wars, liberation wars, ethnic wars, religious wars and even

commercial wars.

Considering the wartime anthropology in the industrialized nations in this sample, some of the differences presumed to exist between them appear to shrink under scrutiny. One clear lesson is that interests other than academic ones tend to hold sway over the discipline of anthropology in every case. A variety of agents, political, commercial, ideological and military, set the agendas, the objectives and tasks, and allot the means, institutions and personnel. It is a fact in the dictatorial regimes but also in the democracies. Naturally, also differences exist. In contrast to America, in Japan anthropologists have less been employed to wage a psychological war on the enemy or make policy evaluations.

The military were among the first to support academic anthropology in the Netherlands. The first chair for anthropology was established in this country by the Royal Military Academy in Breda, in 1836, designated as a chair in the Malay language and the Geography and Ethnography of the East-Indian colonies. The conclusions drawn from this study of wartime anthropology should be augmented and compared with the findings on war anthropology and wartime anthropology in other nations and parts of the globe. War anthropology and anthropology in wartime have been similar in America, Japan and Great Britain. Anthropologists responded to the requests or demands for their knowledge and skills, spontaneously offered their services, or acted under duress. They worked for civil and military authorities while also taking initiatives of their own. They fulfilled a range of functions, and supplied information through research activities or undercover work. A dual structure surfaces in the anthropological engagements in war. The road of anthropologists to the wars of the twentieth century is forked. One form of involvement follows state orders. The other form of attachment is made voluntarily and by personal initiative.

The participation of anthropologists in the wars of the twentieth century has been large. Their involvements in the preparations, the waging and the after-math of wars have deeply affected the discipline. In reverse, the influence of anthropology upon the wars has been small to negligible. Anthropology gained and lost. State ideology harnessed the discipline as it harassed its opponents. On the other hand there were chances for innovation. Challenging situations were met by the inception of new research methods and techniques. New organizations were built on the basis of new perspectives and their adoption guided subsequent developments. The compilation of data bases and the development of interdisciplinary research and area studies are salient examples.

*The chrysanthemum and the sword*, a classic American wartime study of Japan, generated a research method developed under wartime conditions (Benedict 1967 [orig. 1946]).<sup>16)</sup> Later called 'the study of culture at a distance' (Mead and Metraux 1953), it was widely used in the Cold War (1947-1989) that soon followed upon the end of the Second World War. Anthropologists studied the Soviet Union, the East European Communist Block, Communist China, Albania, Cuba and the other territories, as inaccessible to scholars from America and allied nations as the Japanese territories had been during the Pacific War, at a distance.

Wartime anthropology stimulated and furthered the study of industrialized societies in America and Europe. Japanese anthropology had an advantage over anthropology in Europe and America in this respect. Japanese ethnographers were used to dealing with advanced

societies and well prepared for this work. They carried out their research in the highly literate societies of East Asia. Anthropologists in America and Europe also studied their own societies and complex societies outside their boundary, namely Mexico, China, India and Japan, but on a much smaller scale.

Eric Wolf noted of the impact of the war:

In Britain and the United States the war experience demonstrated that the academy had done little to gather [...] knowledge about major regions of the world [...] that would soon become a strategic zone of contestation among the industrial super-powers. [...] From 1943 on, social science organisations and government in the United States and England therefore began to sound the alarm over the academic neglect of the living present and the lack of qualified personnel with linguistic and regional knowledge. [...] This apparent knowledge gap became even more of an issue as the wartime alliance between the western powers and the Soviet Union gave way to the Cold War. (Wolf 1999b: 129)

The massive growth of anthropology in Japan occurred in the years of the Korean War and the Cold War, times of great economic expansion and financial growth. Anthropology grew spectacularly, driven by the same set of forces that boosted anthropology in the United States, Great Britain and the Netherlands.

Knowledge, points of view, and understandings are tied to times, places and situations. They can become obsolete as reliable guides and maps as the result of change in the present. 'Transmigration' may be incorporated as a concept to appraise the global and intergenerational dimensions of anthropology, so as to enchain the inter-cultural and inter-local routes of academic and professional exchange, the 'flows, networks, fields, chains, linkages and connections' (Pansters and Siebers, quoted in Grillo 2002: 136) which from a mondial point of view, constitutes anthropology as much as local personnel and institutions.

Against the gains of wartime anthropology stand wars' destructions. Much ethnographic work was lost and scholars lost their lives. In wartime, academic standards espoused in peacetime were surrendered and replaced by political or ethnocentric norms. Hot wars and cold wars closed borders and stopped scholarly relations in some arenas. In others they opened up cooperation and exchange. The engagement of academic and professional anthropologists with war and warfare is a recurring fact. The history of these practices must be investigated and known. For the sake of a more precise and complete knowledge of the discipline's past, and to take counsel, when staking out positions, making decisions in the present, projecting a course into the future. War anthropology, anthropology in wartime, and the anthropology of war need be researched by scholars who were involved, and by scholars who were uninvolved or from another generation or part of the world.

## Notes

- 1) This chapter is based on papers read in the Graduate School of Anthropology in Osaka University on 14 June 2002; the Institute for the Study of Humanities in Kyoto University on 1 July 2002; and the Department of Anthropology in Tokyo University on 22 July 2002. I should like to thank the organizers for the invitations and the opportunities. I have much benefited from the

discussions and the statements of the commentators, among whom I should like to thank Eisei KURIMOTO, Serge Tornay, Shinji YAMASHITA, Takami KUWAYAMA, Akitoshi SHIMIZU, Peter Suzuki and Hideharu UMEDA.

- 2) The authors explicitly note that the references collected did not by far exhaust the field.
- 3) This situation continues and was reconfirmed by this author and the other members of the Japan Anthropology Workshop, then meeting in Yale University for the 14<sup>th</sup> conference, who were received by the director and members of staff in the HRAF in the morning of 10 May 2002.
- 4) I should like to thank Brigitte Steger for a copy of the first article, and Tetsu ICHIKAWA for a copy of the manuscript.
- 5) A small workshop about prisoners of war was convened in Leiden on 4 April 2003 with the support of the Isaac Alfred Ailion Foundation and the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation. See the report by Ethan Mark, 'Camping with the consequences: POW's in the Asia-Pacific War and its aftermath,' in the *Japan anthropology newsletter* 36, 42-44, 2003.
- 6) I should like to thank Katsumi NAKAO for bringing FUSAYAMA's work to my attention.
- 7) Beyer (1952) gives his appreciation of the work and views of KANO in an English preface to a Japanese publication on Southeast Asian studies.
- 8) KUROSAWA's travelogue has been edited and published by UMEDA (1997) who also wrote accounts of Japanese ethnomusicological research in Korea, Taiwan, China, Japanese Micronesia, Southeast Asia and Bali until 1945 (UMEDA 1995, 1997, 1998).
- 9) 'Customary Law' is a contested concept (de Josselin de Jong 1948).
- 10) Among them are contributors to this volume.
- 11) One can sympathize with this translation but still argue for the retention of the official English name, for reasons of nomenclatural historicity. Otherwise one would have to say 'ethnic studies' for ethnology from the late ninetieth to the late twentieth century. In the whole world anthropologists defined and used ethnic classifications.
- 12) John Embree was trained as a social anthropologist in the University of Chicago in the 1930s. Among his teachers was A. R. Radcliffe-Brown.
- 13) Peter Suzuki was thirteen when he was evacuated from his home town of Seattle to Puyallup Assembly Center in Washington and then to Minidoka Relocation Center in Hunt, Idaho (Suzuki 1981: 47, note 12).
- 14) Marvin Opler's and Morris Opler's publications are given by Suzuki (1981: 57, note 180) and included in the references of the present chapter.
- 15) The United States government was seemingly prepared to atom bomb eleven cities in Honshū in addition to Hiroshima, and five cities in Kyūshū in addition to Nagasaki (Kyoto Museum for World Peace, Ritsumeikan University 1997: 059).
- 16) For a new critical analysis of this work see Suzuki 1999.

## References

- Arensberg, Conrad  
 1942 Report on a developing community: Poston, Arizona. *Applied anthropology* 2(1), 1-21.
- Barclay, Paul David  
 1999 *Japanese and American colonial projects: Anthropological typification in Taiwan and the*

- Philippines*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota.
- 2001 An historian among the anthropologists: The Inō Kanori revival and the legacy of Japanese colonial ethnography in Taiwan. *Japanese studies* 21(2), 117-36.
- Ben-Ari, Eyal
- 1998 *Mastering soldiers: Conflict, emotions, and the enemy in an Israeli military unit*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Benedict, Ruth
- 1967 *The chrysanthemum and the sword: Patterns of Japanese culture*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Originally published in 1946.)
- Bennett, John W. and Iwao Ishino
- 1952 *Methodological approaches to the study of oriental society and culture* (Interim Technical Report 2). Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Research Foundation.
- Berry, Scott
- 1995 *Monks, spies and a soldier of fortune: The Japanese in Tibet*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Beyer, Henry Otley
- 1952 An appreciation of the work and views of Tadao KANO. In Tadao KANO: *Tōnan ajia minzokugaku senshigaku kenkyū* (Studies in the ethnology and prehistory of Southeast Asia), vol. 2, pp. v-viii. Tokyo: Yashima Shobō.
- Blok, Anton
- 1982 Eric Wolf (1923). In *Beroep: Antropoloog* (eds) Geert Banck and Barry van Heijningen, pp. 198-212. Amsterdam: Intermediair.
- Bremen, Jan Gerhard van
- 2000 Open gateways over blind alleys: Disciplinary perspectives and their effects upon international discourses in anthropology. In *Japanese scholarship in international academic discourse* (guest editor) P. Asquith (Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia Pacific Studies 6), pp. 34-49.
- 2002a The work of our hands: Anthropological transactions between Japan and the Netherlands. In *Tales from academia: History of anthropology in the Netherlands* (eds) Han Vermeulen and Jean Kommers (NICCOS, Nijmegen Studies in Development and Cultural Change 40), part 2, pp. 839-65. Saarbrücken: Breitenbach.
- 2002b Monuments for the untimely dead or the objectification of social memory in Japan. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Monuments and Memory Making in Japan*, pp. 1-26. Singapore: Department of Japanese Studies, National University of Singapore.
- Cwiertka, Katarzyna J.
- 2002 Popularising a military diet in wartime and postwar Japan. *Asian anthropology* 1(1), 1-30.
- Dähler, Richard
- 2001 Die japanischen Kriegsgefangenen in Sibirien 1945-1956: Verarbeitung der Lagererlebnisse in Wort und Bild. *Lizentiatarbeit der philosophischen Fakultät in der Universität Zürich*.
- D'Andrade, R. G. et al.
- 1975 Academic opportunity in anthropology 1974-90. *American anthropologist* 77(4), 753-73.

- Dower, John W.  
 1986 Primitives, children, madmen (Capter 6). In J. W. Dower: *War without mercy: Race and power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- EGAMI Namio (ed.) (江上波夫編)  
 1995 『日本民族の源流』(講談社学術文庫)、東京:講談社. (*The origins of the Japanese*. Tokyo: Kōdansha).
- Eggan, Fred  
 1970 One hundred years of ethnology and social anthropology. In *One hundred years of anthropology* (ed.) J. O. Brew, pp. 119-49. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (Originally published in 1968.)
- Eisenhofer-Halim, Hannelore  
 1996 Die japanische Besetzung Javas aus der Sicht dreier Augenzeugen. *Asien* 60, 43-50.
- Embree, John F.  
 1939 *Suye mura: A Japanese village*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
 1943 Resistance to freedom: An administrative problem. *Applied anthropology* 2(1), 2-14.  
 1945 Applied anthropology and its relationship to anthropology. *American anthropologist* 47, 635-7.  
 1946 Anthropology and the war. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 32, 485-95.  
 1950a A note on ethnocentrism in anthropology. *American anthropologist* 52, 430-2.  
 1950b Standardized error and Japanese character: a note on political interpretation. *World Politics* 12(3), 439-43.
- Ferguson, R. Brian and Leslie E. Farragher  
 1988 *The anthropology of war: A bibliography* (Occasional papers 1). New York: Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation.
- FUJII Tadatoshi and ARAI Katsuhiko (eds) (藤井忠俊・新井勝紘編)  
 2000 『戦いと民衆』(人類にとって戦いとは、3)、東京:東洋書林. (*War and people* (The war and the mankind 3). Tokyo: Tōyō Shorin.)
- FUKAMI, Atsuo (ed.) (深見純生編)  
 1993 『日本占領期インドネシア年表』大阪:インドネシア史研究会. (*Indonesia under the Japanese occupation: A chronological table*. Osaka: Indonesia shi kenkyūkai, 1993.)
- FUSAYAMA Takao (総山孝雄)  
 1975 『秘境トバ湖に生きる神秘のバタック族』東京:日本インドネシア協会. (*The legendary Batak in the hinterland of Toba Lake*. Tokyo: Japan-Indonesia Association.)
- Geertz, Clifford  
 2001 *Available light: Anthropological reflections on philosophical topics*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001. (Originally published in 2000).
- Goody, Jack  
 1995 *The expansive moment: The rise of social anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gorer, Geoffrey  
 1943 Themes in Japanese culture. *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Section II, vol. 5, pp. 105-24.

- 1953 National character: Theory and practice. In *The Study of culture at a distance* (eds) M. Mead and R. Métraux, pp. 57-82. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grillo, Ralph
- 2002 Transnational migration, multiculturalism, and development. *Focaal* 40, 135-48.
- Herskovits, Melville J.
- 1946 Anthropology during the war, IV: Belgium and Holland. *American anthropologist* 48 (2), 301-4.
- Hertz, Robert
- 1928 *Mélanges de sociologie religieuse et folklore*. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan.
- ISHIDA Eiichirō, EGAMI Namio, OKA Masao and YAWATA Ichirō (石田英一郎・江上波夫・岡正雄・八幡一郎)
- 1956 『日本民族の起源』東京：平凡社. (*The origin of the Japanese people*. Tokyo: Heibonsha.)
- Jaarsma, S. R.
- 1990 *Waarneming en interpretatie: Vergaring en gebruik van etnografische informatie in Nederlands Nieuw-Guinea, 1950-1962*. Ph.D. thesis, Catholic University of Nijmegen. Utrecht: Interdisciplinair Sociaal-Wetenschappelijk Onderzoeksinstituut Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht (ISOR).
- Janssens, Rudolf V. A.
- 1995 "What future for Japan?": U. S. wartime planning for the postwar era, 1942-1945 (Amsterdam Monographs in American Studies 5). Amsterdam; Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Josselin de Jong, J. P. B. de
- 1948 Customary law (a confusing fiction), Koninklijke. Vereeniging Indisch Instituut (Royal Institute for the Indies Amsterdam), Mededeling No. LXXX, Afd. *Volkenkunde* No. 29, pp. 3-8.
- Kirksey, S. Eben and J. A. D. Roemajauw
- 2002 The wild terrorist gang: The semantics of violence and self-determination in West Papua. *Oxford development studies* 30(2), 190-203.
- KURIMOTO Eisei (栗本英世)
- 1996 『民族紛争を生きる人びと——現代アフリカの国家とマイノリティ』京都：世界思想社. (*The people who live ethnic conflicts: Minorities and states in Modern Africa*. Kyoto: Sekai Shisō-sha.)
- 1999 『未開の戦争、現代の戦争』東京：岩波書店. (*Primitive war, modern war*. Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten.)
- 2000 Nation-state, empire, and army: The case of Meiji Japan. In *Nation-state and empire* (eds) T. UMESAO, T. FUJITANI and E. KURIMOTO, pp. 95-109. Osaka, National Museum of Ethnology.
- KUROSAWA Takatomo (黒澤隆朝), (ed.) UMEDA Hideharu (梅田英春編)
- 1997 『東南アジア音楽紀行』東京：大空社. (*A travelogue on Southeast Asian music*. Tokyo: Ōzora-sha.)
- KWOK Kian-Woon
- 2002 Cultural policy after September 11. *International House of Japan bulletin* 22(2), 62-73. Kyoto Museum for World Peace, Ritsumeikan University (立命館大学国際平和ミュージアム)



- 1997 『常設展示詳細解説』京都：立命館大学国際平和ミュージアム。(Catalogue for the permanent display. Kyoto: Kyoto Museum for World Peace, Ritsumeikan University.)
- LaBarre, Weston  
1945 Some observations on character structure in the Orient: The Japanese. *Psychiatry* 8, 319-42.
- Lang, Kurt  
1972 *Military institutions and the sociology of war: A review of the literature with annotated bibliography*. Beverly Hills; London: Sage Publications.
- Linimayr, Peter  
1994 *Wiener Völkerkunde im Nationalsozialismus. Ansätze zu einer NS-Wissenschaft*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.
- Mahiwo, Sylvano D.  
1995 Japanese studies in the Philippines. *Social science Japan*, November, 34-5. Tokyo: Institute of Social Science, University of Tokyo.
- Mead, Margaret and Rhoda Metraux (eds)  
1953 *The study of culture at a distance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Métraux, A.  
1948 Anthropology in Germany. *American anthropologist* 50, 717.
- Minear, Richard H.  
1980a The wartime studies of Japanese national character. *The Japan interpreter* 1980: 36-59.  
1980b Cross-cultural perception and world war II: American Japanists of the 1940s and their images of Japan. *International studies quarterly* 24(4), 555-80.
- Mingei, editor (民藝編集部)  
2002 「芹澤銈介蒐集の小絵馬について」『民藝』590, 5-7. (SERIZAWA Keisuke's collection of ko-ema. *Mingei* 590, 5-6.)
- MURAKAMI Kyoko  
2002 *Revisiting the past: Social organisation of remembering and reconciliation*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Department of Human Sciences, Loughborough University, Leicestershire, U.K.  
2003 Revisiting the past: Former British prisoners of wars experiences of reconciliation. *Japan Athropology Workshop nwsletter* 36, 54-63.
- Murray, Stephen O.  
1980 Gatekeepers and the Chomskian revolution. *Journal of the history of the behavioural sciences* 16(1), 73-88.
- NAKAMAKI Hirochika (中牧弘允)  
1994 「石田英一郎——その研究と人」瀬川清子・植松明石編『日本民俗学のエッセンス』pp. 257-69, 東京：ペリかん社。(ISHIDA Eiichirō: His works and personality. In *The essence of Japanese folklore studies* (eds) Kyōko SEGAWA and Akashi UEMATSU, pp. 257-69. Tokyo: Pelican.)
- NAKAMURA Shigeo (中村茂生)  
1995 「南洋群島と松岡静雄」『史苑』55(2), 17-36. (The ethnography of the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate and MATSUOKA Shizuo. *Shien: The journal of historical studies* 55(2), 17-36.)

## NAKAO Katsumi (中生勝美)

- 1994 「植民地の民族学——満州民族学会の活動」『ヘルメス』52, 135-43. (Ethnology in the colony: The activities of the Manchurian Ethnological Society. *Hermes* 52, 135-43. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.)
- 1996 「張家口の旅」『アジア研究』10, 83-8. (A sojourn to Zhangjiakou. *Asian studies* 10, 83-8.)
- 1997 「民族研究所の組織と活動——戦争中の日本民族学」『民族学研究』62(1), 47-65. (The organization and activities of the Institute of Ethnology: Japanese ethnology during the Second World War. *Japanese journal of ethnology* 62(1), 47-65.)

## National Museum of Ethnology (ed.) (国立民族学博物館編)

- 1984 『国立民族学博物館十年史』吹田：国立民族学博物館. (*The history of the National Museum of Ethnology, 1974-84*. Senri, Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.)

## Needham, Rodney

- 1973 Introduction. In *Right and left: Essays on dual symbolic classification* (ed.) Rodney Needham, pp, xi-xxxix. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

## NISHIMURA Asahitarō (西村朝日太郎)

- 1996 「東南アジア(1)——インドネシア」日本民族学会編『日本民族学の回顧と展望』pp. 296-327. 東京：日本民族学協会. (Southeast Asia, 2: Indonesia. In *A retrospect and prospect of Japanese ethnology* (ed.) Japanese Society of Ethnology, pp. 296-327.)

## OGURA Seitarō (小倉清太郎)

- 1941 『ボルネオ紀行——その生活と資源を探る』東京：畝傍書房. (*A travel through Borneo: In search of the people's life and resources*. Tokyo: Sebō Shobō.)

## Opler, Marvin K.

- 1945 A "Sumo" tournament at Tule Lake Center. *American anthropologist* 47.
- 1946 A recent trend in the misrepresentation of the work of American ethnologists. *American anthropologist* 48, 669-71.
- 1950a Two Japanese religious sects. *Southwestern journal of anthropology* 6.
- 1950b Japanese folk beliefs and practices, Tule Lake, California. *Journal of American folklore* 63.

## Opler, Morris E. and Robert S. Hashima

- 1946 The rice goddess and the fox in Japanese religion and folk practice. *American anthropologist* 48, 43-53.

## Opler, Marvin K. and F. OBAYASHI

- 1945 Senryu poetry as folk and community expression. *Journal of American folklore* 58, 1-12.

## Ortiz, Carmen

- 1996 The political uses of folklore by the Franco regime. Paper read for the workshop, 'Alternative histories of anthropology: the world outside Europe', Fourth Biennial Conference of the European Association for Social Anthropology, Barcelona, July 15, 1996

## Passin, Herbert

- 1947 A note on Japanese research in Formosa. *American anthropologist* 49(3), 514-8.

## Pelzel, J. C.

- 1948 Japanese ethnological and sociological research. *American anthropologist* 50(1), 54-72.

Port, Matthijs van de

- 1994 Het einde van de wereld. Beschaving, redeloosheid en zigeunercafés in Servië. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam: Babylon-De Geus. (*Gypsies, wars and other instances of the wild: Civilisation and its discontents in a Serbian Town*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.)

Price, David

- 2002a Past wars, present dangers, future anthropologies. *Anthropology today* 18(1), 22-3.  
 2002b Lessons from Second World War anthropology: Peripheral, persuasive and ignored contributions. *Anthropology today* 18(3), 14-20.

Redfield, Robert

- 1943 The Japanese-Americans. In *American society during wartime* (ed.) William Ogburn, pp. 143-64. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Robertson, Jennifer

- 1999 Staging ethnography: Theatre and Japanese colonialism. In *Anthropology and colonialism in Asia and Oceania* (eds) Jan van Bremen and Akitoshi SHIMIZU, pp. 266-84. London: Curzon Press.

SANO Shin'ichi (佐野眞一)

- 1996 『旅する巨人——宮本常一と渋沢敬三』東京：文藝春秋. (*Travelling giants: MIYAMOTO Tsune'ichi and SHIBUSAWA Keizō*. Tokyo: Bungei-shunjū.)

Sareen, T. R.

- 2002 *Sharing the blame: Subhash Chandra Bose and the Japanese occupation of the Andamans 1942-1945*. Delhi: S. S. Publishers.

SHIMIZU Akitoshi

- 1999 Colonialism and the development of modern anthropology in Japan. In *Anthropology and colonialism in Asia and Oceania* (eds) Jan van Bremen and Akitoshi SHIMIZU, pp. 115-71. London: Curzon Press.

Spicer, Edward

- 1946 The use of social scientists by the War Relocation Authority. *Applied anthropology* 5(2), 16-36.

Starn, Orin

- 1986 Engineering internment: Anthropologists and the War Relocation Authority. *American ethnologist* 13, 700-20.  
 1994 Rethinking the politics of anthropology. *Current anthropology* 35(1), 13-38.

Stocking, George W., Jr.

- 1992 Ideas and institutions in American anthropology: Thoughts toward a history of the interwar years. In G. W. Stocking, Jr.: *The ethnographer's magic and other essays in the history of anthropology*, pp. 114-77. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Stouffer, Samuel A. et al.

- 1949a *Adjustment during army life* (The American soldier, vol. 1). Princeton: Princeton University Press.  
 1949b *Combat and its aftermath* (The American soldier, vol. 2). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Suzuki, Peter T.

- 1976 The ethnolinguistics of Japanese Americans in the wartime camps. *Anthropological linguistics* 18.
- 1980 A retrospective analysis of a wartime “national character” study. *Dialectical anthropology* 5(1), 33-46.
- 1981 Anthropologists in the wartime camps for Japanese Americans: A documentary study. *Dialectical anthropology* 6(1), 23-60.
- 1986 The University of California Japanese evacuation and resettlement study: A prolegomenon. *Dialectical anthropology* 10(3/4), 189-13.
- 1989 Talcott Parsons unpublished wartime study on the Japanese national character. *Asian profile* 17, 227-34.
- 1995 Analyses of Japanese films in wartime Washington. *Asian profile* 23, 371-801.
- 1999 Overlooked aspects of The chrysanthemum and the sword. *Dialectical anthropology* 24(2), 217-31.
- TAKEDA Akira (竹田旦)
- 1982 「解説」『大間知篤三著作集』6, 541-57. 東京：未来社. (An explanatory note. In *The collected works of ÔMACHI Tokuzō*, vol. 6, pp. 541-57. Tokyo: Mirai-sha.)
- TANAKAMARU Katsuhiko (田中丸勝彦)
- 2002 『さまよえる英霊たち——国のみたま、家のほとけ』東京：柏書房. (*The wandering spirits of the fallen heroes: Guardian souls of the state, ancestors of the family*. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō.)
- Textor, R. B.
- 1967 *A cross-cultural summary*. New Haven, Conn.: HRAF Press.
- TOYODA Yukio and Tetsu ICHIKAWA
- n.d. *Chinese memories of the Pacific War in New Guinea*. Unpublished manuscript. 11 pp.
- TSU Yun Hui, Timothy
- 1999 Japanese colonialism and the investigation of Taiwanese old customs. In *Anthropology and colonialism in Asia and Oceania* (eds) Jan van Bremen and Akitoshi SHIMIZU, pp. 197-218. London: Curzon Press.
- TSURUMI Tarō (鶴見太郎)
- 1998 『柳田國男とその弟子たち——民俗学を学ぶマルクス主義者』京都：人文書院. (*YANAGITA Kunio and his followers: The Marxists who studied folklore*. Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin.)
- UENO Kazuo (上野和男)
- 1994 「大間知篤三——その研究と方法」瀬川清子・植松明石編『日本民俗学のエッセンス』pp. 223-41, 東京：ベリかん社. (ÔMACHI Tokuzō: His works and methods. In *The essence of Japanese folklore studies* (eds) Kyōko SEGAWA and Akashi UEMATSU, pp. 223-41. Tokyo: Pelican.
- UMEDA Hideharu (梅田英春)
- 1995 「1945年以前の日本におけるバリ島芸能研究経緯」音楽図書館協議会編『音楽情報と図書館』pp. 221-30, 東京：大空社. (A survey of the research on the Balinese performing art conducted in Japan before 1945. In *Information on music and the museum*, pp. 21-30. Tokyo: Ôzora-sha.)
- 1998 「20世紀前半の日本におけるアジア音楽研究——黒澤隆朝の東南アジア音楽観の変遷」『MLAJ Newsletter』18(4), 17-24. (Studies of Asian music in Japan in the first half of the

- twentieth century: KUROSAWA Takatomo's ideas of Southeast Asian music. *MLAJ Newsletter* 18(4), 17-24.
- UMESAO Tadao (梅棹忠夫)  
 1956 『モゴール族探検記』東京：岩波書店. (*An expedition to the Mogol*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Van der Veer, Peter  
 2002 Empathy or empire? *Biblio: A review of books* 8,10-3.
- Vermeulen, Han F.  
 1999 Structuur en Verandering. In Memoriam Gottfried Wilhelm Locher: Overdruk. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 155(1), 1-44.
- Wakin, Eric  
 1992 *Anthropology goes to war: professional ethics and counterinsurgency in Thailand*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Center for Southeast Asian Studies.
- Warner, W. Lloyd  
 1949 *Democracy in Jonesville*. New York: Harper.
- Wertheim, W. F.  
 1972 Counter-insurgency research at the turn of the century: Snouck Hurgronje and the Aceh war. *Sociologische Gids* 19(5/6), 320-28.
- Wolf, Eric R.  
 1964 *Anthropology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.  
 1996 Global perspectives in anthropology: Problems and prospects. In *The cultural dimensions of global change: An anthropological approach* (ed.) Lourdes Arizpe, pp. 31-43. Paris: UNESCO.  
 1999a *Envisioning power: Ideologies of dominance and crisis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
 1999b Anthropology among the powers. *Social anthropology* 7(2)2, 121-34.
- Wolf, Eric and Joseph G. Jorgensen  
 1970 Anthropology on the warpath in Thailand. *New York review of books* 15(9), 26-36.
- YAMAJI Katsuhiko and Masakazu TANAKA (eds) (山路勝彦・田中雅一編)  
 2002 『植民地主義と人類学』西宮：関西学院大学出版会. (*Colonialism and anthropology*. Nishinomiya: Kwansei Gakuin University Press.
- YAMAZAKI Tsukane (山崎柄根)  
 1988 「鹿野忠雄」綾部恒雄編『文化人類学群像』京都：アカデミア出版会. (Kano Tadao. In *Profiles of cultural anthropologists* (ed.) Tsuneo AYABE. Kyoto: Academia Shuppan-kai.)
- Yans-McLaughlin, Virginia  
 1986 Science, democracy, and ethics: Mobilizing culture and personality for World War II. In *Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict and others: Essays on culture and personality* (ed.) George W. Stocking Jr., pp. 184-217. Madison, Wisconsin.: University of Wisconsin Press.