NAKANO Seiichi and Colonial Ethnic Studies

NAKANO Seiichi and Colonial Ethnic Studies

Kevin M. Doak

Introduction

In tracing the development of Japanese wartime anthropology, it is helpful to think against the grain of specialization that so often characterizes writing about Japanese academics. For institutional and personal reasons, Japanese academics and intellectuals have often been ensnared in what MARUYAMA Masao (丸山眞男) famously called the "octopus trap" of modern Japanese institutional structure: the narrow proprietary claims imposed by professionalization and disciplinization (MARUYAMA 1957: 163). To adopt a perspective that seeks to break free from this octopus trap runs risks of its own: specifically, the risk of ignoring the deep personal loyalties and close relationships that do in fact underlay professional academic research, in Japan as elsewhere. Yet, too tight a focus on such personal relationships may lead to an under-appreciation of the cross-fertilization that happens when academics and intellectuals follow their own intellectual curiosities and interests, when they read articles and books on related topics from other fields, and especially when a discipline is undergoing transformation or even new formation, as was the case with ethnology in wartime Japan. Ideas, it turns out, are exceedingly difficult to control.

A full understanding of how ethnology turned towards "ethnic studies" during the war years requires a more interdisciplinary approach than merely a focus within the boundaries of ethnology, or even anthropology. My argument for a more interdisciplinary perspective is not entirely original. I follow SHIMIZU Akitoshi (清水昭俊)'s nuanced approach that traces the origins of anthropological interests in Japan to a variety of sub-fields in the social sciences. SHIMIZU's suggestion that we need to include as anthropologists "those intellectuals with anthropological interests" (SHIMIZU 1999: 116) seems on the mark, not only in explaining how anthropology moved toward ethnology, but especially in trying to explain the shift from ethnology to ethnic studies during the late 1930s. Undoubtedly, the introduction of German *Völkerkunde* by OKA Masao (岡正雄) played a key role in encouraging this turn to ethnic studies among Japanese ethnologists (NAKAO 1997: 50-1). But the social sciences, and particularly sociology, were at least as important in turning anthropologists and ethnologists from professional ethnology to a broader concern with *minzoku* (民族, nationality) as a principle for reforming imperial policy and colonial governance.

The relationship of ethnicity to national identity was an important, perhaps the most important, topic of research among social scientists in Japan during the 1930s (Barshay 1996). Sociologists were especially involved, and they brought to the concept of "ethnos" a distinctly national frame of reference. The reasons for this are complex, but may be analyzed as a set of two distinctive theoretical problems. First, sociology, particularly as the modern

discipline founded by Durkheim and Weber, was informed at its inception by the new national social reality that emerged out of the French Revolution. As Greenfeld observed, modern societies are now national societies, and sociology was as founded on that premise as it was on the distinction between the political state and the nationalized sense of the people that generally informed modern sociologists' assumption of what in fact "society" was (Greenfeld 1996). Moreover, Greenfeld's point seems particularly accurate in the case of Japan, due to the enormous influence that Durkheim and Weber have had on the formation of Japanese sociology. Second, the history of the formation of Japanese sociology supports this interpretation of the close connection between national=the people concerns and the emergence of the modern discipline of sociology. The convoluted process by which the concept of society became translated and codified into modern Japanese in the late nineteenth century suggests that those most concerned with the problem of understanding society were also deeply concerned with providing a conceptual frame for a new sense of the Japanese people as a national unit.

This national concern emerged early in the formation of modern sociology in Japan, and is evident in the Social Policy Association which was founded in 1897. Two of the early members of the Social Policy Association, KUWATA Kumazō (桑田熊蔵) and KANAI En (金井延), tried from the beginning to work out a conceptual ordering of the distinctive claims of *shakai* (社会, society) and the *kokka* (国家, state), but without much success (ISHIDA, 1984). By the time KUWATA and KANAI died (1932 and 1933 respectively), Japanese sociology was on the verge of reconsidering its failure to account adequately for the national people as a distinctive object of study separate from the political state.

Between the late nineteenth century and the 1930s, significant changes had occurred that would reshape the discourse on society by incorporating the issue of ethnicity. This interest in ethnicity was in one sense a reflection of the fact that Imperial Japan now had a formal empire and the sense of *kokuminsei* (国民性, nationality) had extended beyond its origins in a domestic debate over the role of the Japanese people versus the power of their state. It now signified multi-ethnic membership in an imperial state rather than the contours of national sovereignty per se. In addition, nationalist movements within the empire converged with international rhetoric on nationality to emphasize a specifically ethnic sense of national identity. From the late Meiji period, but especially in Taisho and the years around World War I, a discourse on *minzokusei* (民族性, ethnic nationality) was being mobilized by liberal theorists of nationality, political theory and colonialism. Social scientists from a wide range of specializations, including the marxist ŌYAMA Ikuo (大山郁夫), colonial theorist YANAIHARA Tadao (矢内原忠雄), and the folklorist YANAGITA Kunio (柳田國男), were but a few of those who found this concept of *minzoku* appealing from a liberal perspective (Doak 1995; SHIMIZU 1999).

This self-avowedly liberal discourse on *minzoku* was highly conscious of ethnic identity as a cultural and social phenomenon, and frequently emphasized the distinction between ethnic nationality and biological race. Here, Japanese social scientists were participating in a global turn from biologically determined concepts of race in favor of an increasing fascination with a more culturally informed sense of "race" or ethnicity (Stocking, Jr. 1993). In early twentieth century Japan, the discourse on *jinshu* (人種, race) was following this

global trend and was increasingly displaced by or incorporated into a new concern with ethnos or the nation as *minzoku* (Doak 1998; SHIMIZU 1999). Especially after Wilson's proclamation of ethnic national self-determination (*minzoku jiketsu*, 民族自決), the problem of *minzoku* and its relationship to political categories like nationhood increasingly intersected with anthropological, sociological and economic theories. "Liberal" theorists of national identity embraced cultural and subjective factors as determining *minzoku* identity, while a few die-hard objectivists held fast to racial markers as the key to *minzoku* identity. But the racialists were in decline, and social theories helped accelerate that decline, even while making the concept of *minzoku* identity seem more respectable.

By the middle of the 1930s, the discourse over *minzoku* had moved from a marginal debate over racial characteristics to play a central role in defining social and political identity. This line of inquiry into ethnic studies first approached *minzoku* not from the distinction between race and ethnos, but by drawing on earlier distinctions between state and society in order to re-define society along ethnic lines. The origins of this development may be traced to the demise of TORII Ryūzō (鳥居龍藏)'s racial studies approach in the mid 1920s. But a more decisive turning point may well be identified around 1935. In 1934, a new Japanese Society of Ethnology was established to provide a new focus to the discipline of ethnos-studies as a "discipline distinct from physical anthropology and race-studies on the one hand and from folklore studies on the other" (SHIMIZU 1999: 147). Also in 1934 the Japan Sociology Association published its annual report *Sociology* that was entirely taken up with articles on *minzoku* and the problem of national or ethnic identity. Contributors included USUI Jishō (臼井二尚), KADA Tetsuji (加田哲二) and KOYAMA Eizō (小山榮三), whose ideas on *minzoku* were particularly influential during the following years (OTAKA 1934). The turn towards ethnic concepts of national identity was strong and ubiquitous from 1935 on, affecting literature through works by YOKOMITSU Riichi (横光利一)and the Japan Romantic School, philosophy through the Kyoto School, and sociology in particular through TAKATA Yasuma (高田保馬), NAKANO Seiichi (中野清一), and ŌYAMA Hikoichi (大山彦一) (the latter two had direct experience in Manchuria). This interdisciplinary influence on ethnic studies was felt in the organization of the Japanese Society of Ethnology, as SHIMIZU has already point out (SHIMIZU 1999: 149). Here I want to focus on the role of NAKANO Seiichi as an example of the contribution of sociology to the new direction of ethnic studies, especially in providing a national focus to the problem of ethnic identity after 1935.

I. Towards a Sociology of Ethnicity: NAKANO's Otaru Years

NAKANO Seiichi (1905-1993) studied sociology at Kyushu Imperial University from 1926 to 1930 under the direction of TAKATA Yasuma, who later served as the director of the Ethnic Research Institute. In 1930, NAKANO joined the faculty of Otaru Higher School of Commerce (小樽高等商業學校) in Hokkaido where he would remain until moving in 1939 to Foundation University (Kenkoku Daigaku, 建國大學) in Manshūkoku (Manchukuo). The decade spent at Otaru Higher Commercial School was a formative period in the development of NAKANO's approach to ethnic studies, just as it was an important turning point in the broader Japanese discourse on *minzoku* identity, as noted above. TAKATA's influence on NAKANO's approach is

evident and acknowledged in NAKANO's writings, but so are various other sources, including the Japan Sociology Association's 1934 report on *minzoku* and the problem of nationality. As a young sociologist, NAKANO read the report carefully and cited it, along with TAKATA, YANAIHARA Tadao and various European (especially German) theorists on the problem of nation and nationality. After the publication of the Sociology Association's 1934 report, NAKANO begun publishing a flurry of articles on *minzoku* and nationality, mainly in Otaru Higher School of Commerce's in-house journal *Shōgaku Tōkyū* (商學討究). These writings provided the foundation for his ideas about ethnicity and nationality that would inform his later proposal on how to solve the *minzoku no mondai* (民族の問題, problem of nationality) in wartime Imperial Japan. In order to understand his contribution to colonial ethnic theory in wartime Japan, it is necessary to see first how his sociological approach, and especially how his thinking on ethnic nationality, provided an important theoretical justification for legitimating *minzoku* as a contingent, cultural apprehension of social identity.

NAKANO's first intervention in the discourse on *minzoku* built on an earlier liberal discourse on ethnic nationality. In his 1934 *Minzoku to Heiwa*, YANAIHARA Tadao tried to clarify the meaning of *minzoku*, arguing that a misunderstanding of what nationality was had led to a reluctance among liberals and leftists to continue using the concept of *minzoku* (Doak 1995). This insistence on a proper grasp of the meaning of the term *minzoku* was of course an indication of the contested nature of the concept at the time. But beyond the mere indication of the contested nature of what *minzoku* signified, one senses that NAKANO was participating in a broader, discursive shift that was moving from a racial understanding of *minzoku* towards a social, cultural and national signification. Sociology in particular had an important contribution to the understanding of nationality since NAKANO felt the problem of nationality, as a kind of group theory, was deeply connected to the very origins of the discipline of sociology.

In an early article published in 1935, NAKANO drew from this liberal approach to national identity as a subjective phenomenon to criticize Nazi *jinshu*shugi (人種主義, racism), Italian fascism and even Japanese *kokumin seishinshugi* (國民精神主義, national spiritualism) for trying to base their sense of national identity on a kind of racial objectivism. Against those racialist interpretations, NAKANO emphasized the Austro-Marxist Otto Bauer's subjectivist theory that a nation (*minzoku*) is a community of fate (*Schicksalsgemeinshaft*) (NAKANO 1935: 92). NAKANO explicitly positioned this sense of nationality (here, consistently used in the ethnic sense as *minzoku*, not *kokumin*) as a community of fate against the biological determinist view of nationality based on race, arguing that Bauer's concept allows for a more dynamic understanding of ethnic nationality as an always incomplete group identity (*minzoku o taezu seisei shitsutsu aru shūdan*, 民族を絶えず生成しつつある集団) (NAKANO 1935: 117). Yet, NAKANO criticized Bauer for not sufficiently grasping the subjective conditions of national identity as a form of social consciousness. Bauer's marxist reduction of consciousness to a materialist base led him to attribute the consciousness of being a community of fate to the existence of the community itself. NAKANO countered that national consciousness was even more subjective than Bauer allowed, and that national identity ultimately existed not "in reality" but only as an abstract ideal (NAKANO 1935: 117-9). Moreover, NAKANO argued that Bauer's theory could not adequately explain why a

community of fate had to take on a specifically national scope and why communities of fate in premodern times were not considered nations. In conclusion, NAKANO recognized the advantages of Bauer's approach to nationality that stemmed from his attempt to offer an alternative to French theories of nationality that emphasized the state, legal and political orders at the expense of ethnicity. But NAKANO suggested that a reconsideration of certain aspects of the French approach to nationality, especially as it related to the problem of modernity, was necessary to fully explain what made a nation a nation.

NAKANO's next major intervention in the growing discourse on ethnicity returned to Bauer to focus more closely on the problem of class and its relationship to nationality. NAKANO was not the first Japanese social theorist to deal with the problem of ethnic nationality and class, and in fact his approach may be best understood as an attempt to offer a new understanding of the relationship between these two important sociological concepts. Perhaps the earliest and most important Japanese social theorist to offer a definition of the relationship between nationality and class was ŌYAMA Ikuo in his 1923 *The social foundations of politics*. In that book ŌYAMA introduced Bauer's theories on nationality to suggest a marxian use of *minzoku* as a form of resistance against the capitalist state (ŌYAMA 1923: 218-37). Ten years later, with the rise of national socialism in Germany, the debate on class and nationality had reached an impasse, with marxists like Bauer upholding ethnic nationality as a kind of proletarian nationalism and Nazi theorists like Koellreuter rejecting the concept of class in favor of the homogeneous ethnic nation. NAKANO pointed out that both sides, the Marxists and the Nazis, shared an ethnic or *volkisch* understanding of nationality and that both groups approached the problem of ethnic nationality from a political rather than a cultural perspective. Against such political determinism, NAKANO explored YANAIHARA Tadao's concept of ethnic nationality as a "cultural community" and "class as a composite element of the ethnic nation, not as a force for the disintegration of the ethnic nation." (YANAIHARA, cited in NAKANO 1937a: 110). Class was subordinated to culture, and class struggle was seen as an internecine struggle among members of the same cultural community. Quoting his mentor TAKATA Yasuma, NAKANO noted that "the reason one finds a tendency towards unity among the proletariat of various countries today stems mainly from the class struggles within their own countries. The day after this struggle is over, they will lose their strong motive for forming associations with foreigners" (TAKATA, cited in NAKANO 1937a: 127). In short, NAKANO accepted much of the evidence Bauer presented for the priority of national consciousness over class consciousness, but he found little reason to characterize this national consciousness through the rhetoric of class struggle. Ethnic nationality remained a mode of social consciousness, and as such was amenable to all sorts of practical uses.

The key point in terms of the relationship of this cultural sense of nationality to politics was the difference between ethnic nationality and other social groups like the state. Ethnic nationality had to be sharply distinguished from the state since, unlike the state, it lacked an existing organizational structure, even though it certainly had the potential for creating one (NAKANO 1937a: 119). Consequently, NAKANO approached ethnic nationality from a cultural perspective, emphasizing the nation as a subjective, volunteerist phenomenon that resulted from the sentiments of those who felt a common affiliation as an ethnic group. Drawing on

TAKATA, NAKANO concluded that differences in the kind of subjective consciousness led to differences in the modernity of ethnic nationality: ethnic groups conceived in the narrow sense (*kyōgi no minzoku gainen*, 狭義の民族概念) were merely groups with a common sentiment (*kanjō shūdan*, 感情集團); whereas the concept of the ethnic nation in the broader sense (*kōgi no minzoku gainen*, 広義の民族概念) was a true modern ethnic nation (*kindai minzoku*, 近代民族) that was a group possessed of a common purpose (*ishi shūdan sunawachi kindai minzoku*, 意思集団即ち近代民族) (NAKANO 1937a: 120). It is important to recognize that NAKANO's understanding of modernity here was sociological and not historical in nature. He made no argument against the possibility that "modern ethnic nations" and sentimental ethnic nations could coexist simultaneously in different places. NAKANO was working his way towards a theory of social typologies, not suggesting some historical break in patterns of human development, and while there certainly was a modernist bias to his theory, he did not fully subscribe to a universalist model of developmental patterns. The determination of whether a nation became a "modern ethnic nation" remained a subjective decision by members of a specific ethnic group.

NAKANO's next move was to explore the role of tradition in establishing this difference between the concept of the modern ethnic nation and the concept of *Volk* in the narrow sense. It is worth exploring this problem in more depth, since this distinction would prove crucial in NAKANO's later theories for ethnology in wartime Imperial Japan. Moreover, it is interesting to note that NAKANO himself offered this essay in the belief that it would provide an important theoretical challenge to the vulgar theories of ethnicity that were taking over public discourse by May of 1937 when he wrote the essay (NAKANO 1937b: 28). NAKANO set out to contest the vulgar belief that national identity was best understood as a continuation of tradition as embodied in ethnic identity. Instead, he argued that the relationship of tradition to ethnicity was not a simple equation, but a theoretical question that itself was informed by three stages in the development of the concept of ethnic nationality. The first stage merely clarifies the nature of the group that is called "ethnic" and gives priority to the ethnic group over all other concepts of collective identity, while pointing out the differences between the ethnic group and other subordinate collective identities. The second stage looks at ethnicity theoretically and scrutinizes those marks of identity that distinguish groups at this level, especially ethnic groups. The third stage is the exploration of the broadest use of the term *minzoku*, especially to clarify the circumstances that lead to a distinction between those groups called *minzoku* that correspond to a *Volk* and others called *kindai minzoku* or *kokumin* that correspond to a nation. Much of the current confusion over the meaning of *minzoku*, NAKANO concluded, was due to the failure of most commentators to reach the third level of theoretical understanding, that is to say, to understand that the problem of *minzoku* was essentially a problem of national identity. (NAKANO 1937b: 4-5). Once the problem of *minzoku* is properly understood as a conceptual question of national identity, then the relationship of tradition to *minzoku* can be addressed. Here, NAKANO drew from F. Hertz's sociology of the nation to argue that, while ethnicity itself is not determined directly by tradition (or blood), the concept of *Volk* as a social union (*ketsugō*, 結合) is always premised on a belief in "traditionality" (*dentōsei*, 伝統性). By drawing attention to the way that modernity always mediates tradition, NAKANO argued that a mediated tradition gives rise to a

broader sense of ethnicity in the modern nation (*kindai minzoku; kokumin*). NAKANO had done more than simply refute popular beliefs that ethnic nationality presupposed the authenticity of tradition. He had subjected tradition itself to a rigorous theoretical critique that revealed the modern nature of tradition as a theory not only of the past but of the present and future as well (NAKANO 1937b: 26-7). His conclusion, that different approximations of tradition would lead to different understandings of *minzoku* and nationality, would play a significant role in subordinating ethnic research to the goals of imperialism in the years ahead.

In the following years, NAKANO addressed the problem of *minzoku* through its role in social differentiation and unification, emphasizing the contingency and unsettled nature of ethnic identity. His conclusion that ethnic national opposition is not a realistic endpoint, but merely an ideal extreme principle through which some chose to see the world (NAKANO 1937c: 30-2) foreshadowed his later contribution towards an ethnic national policy that would be premised on regional unity rather than accepting ethnicity as the basis of national differentiation and conflict in East Asia. Throughout he insisted on the plasticity of ethnicity as a form of social group identity, and he reminded his readers that ethnicity as a form of nationalism is a modern, mediated social identity. His writings were as concerned with the conditions of modern social unity as they were with national identity, and ethnicity remained for him the key to understanding all forms of modern group identity.

NAKANO's final statement on a theory of national identity during this formative period at Otaru Higher School of Commerce returned to the 1934 annals of the Japan Sociological Association. In the annals, USUI Jishō had published the lead article on "The Concept of Nation" (*kokumin no gainen* 國民の概念) in which he offered a distinction between the *Staatsnation* and the *Kulturnation*. NAKANO admitted that USUI's translation of these concepts as *kokka minzoku* (國家民族) and *bunka minzoku* (文化民族) were technically accurate, but he noted that the Japanese words were rife with polysemy and therefore he chose to retain the original German words in his own essay (NAKANO 1938: 1). In short, NAKANO was finally making his promised return to the "French" theory of nationality that rested in the political state while considering this theory of nationality in the context of his previous work on ethnicity. But NAKANO's argument did not employ a simple dichotomy between a French republican nationalism and a German ethnic nationalism – a common approach to the theory of nationality but one which often merely nationalizes the difference between ethnic and political nationalism (Brubaker 1992). Instead, NAKANO kept his argument at the level of representation, demonstrating how the distinction between a cultural nation and the political state (which historically stemmed from Fichte) had been revived during the twentieth century. NAKANO refuted Kirchhoff's argument that the essence of ethnicity was found only in a common state by pointing to Ireland and Poland as examples of ethnic groups that have either not achieved or have not consistently maintained a stable mono-ethnic state. Yet NAKANO was not willing to conclude that this distinction, even if it were only a theoretical one, lacked significance. NAKANO rejected the historicism that underlay Kjellen's ethnic determinism (the nation is "*eine ethnisches Individuum*"), Hartmann's evolutionary reduction of the distinction to different stages of the same organic unity, and Wieser's belief that the political nation is the completion of the ethnic identity,

arguing that all three ignored the real impact that this conceptual distinction between the sense of cultural nationality and political nationality has had on the formation of social identity (NAKANO 1938b: 3-10). In refuting these evolutionary theories, NAKANO's own form of modernism is most clearly visible. NAKANO's modernism disallowed the notion that nations like France or Germany have intrinsic nationalist styles that rested on some putatively unmediated sense of national tradition. But it also rejected the homogenizing schema that underlay historical determinism (whether of the ethnic or evolutionary kind) that allowed for only one authentic form of nationalism (whether ethnic or political) in the modern world. In contrast, NAKANO's modernism was a mediated, pluralist modernism that accepted the distinction between the *Kulturnation* and the *Staatsnation*, while providing a theoretical explanation for the conditions that led to the co-existence of both within modern society.

To summarize, the time NAKANO spent at Otaru Higher School of Commerce, roughly the entire decade of the 1930s, coincided with the rise of *minzoku* consciousness to the forefront of Japanese public discourse. NAKANO was very much influenced by that discourse, even as he sought to intervene in it and make his own original contribution to understanding the problem of *minzoku*. He came to the problem well-prepared from his training in sociology under TAKATA Yasuma, which predisposed him to see ethnicity in relation to other theories of social group formation. NAKANO saw the concept of *minzoku* as fundamental to modern social theory, noting its differentiation into a tradition-informed sense of *Volk* and a more mediated concept of modern national identity found at the level of social consciousness rather than the political state. This social sense of national identity was expressed in two distinctive modes of ethnic identity: a sense of the broader *minzoku* that was expressed as a modern ethnic nation or simply as "nationality" and a narrow concept of *minzoku* that reflected a more traditional sense of ethnic identity as *Volk*. NAKANO's modernist approach to ethnic identity began from a realization that both forms of ethnic identity, like all forms of group identity, rested on representational strategies that were open-ended and always subject to change. This sense of ethnicity as a contingent form of social group identity, rather than an expression of ethnic primordialism, defined NAKANO's modernist approach to national theory and provided him with a particularly useful means of responding to the problem of national identity in the newly formed state of Manshūkoku.

II. Manchuria as a Laboratory for Social Reform

The next stage in the development of NAKANO's contribution to wartime ethnic studies began with his acceptance of a position as an assistant professor at Manshūkoku Foundation University in April 1939. One can only speculate on the reasons for NAKANO's decision to move to Foundation University. It is impossible to rule out various kinds of informal pressures on NAKANO to take a position at Foundation University, as evidence suggests many other scholars in Japan felt pressured to respond to the demand for Japanese scholars in Manshūkoku (TSUKASE 1998: 121). Yet, we need not view NAKANO's decision to leave Hokkaido as an entirely reluctant one. Japanese academics who took positions on the faculty of Foundation University generally were attracted by higher salaries, research funds and

other perks of working at a premier research institute (MIYAZAWA 1997: 105-6). MINAMI Hiroko (南裕子) believes that NAKANO's decision to move to Foundation University stemmed from his desire "to throw himself into the reality of a multi-ethnic Manchuria" (MINAMI 1998: 575). Certainly NAKANO welcomed the opportunity to take what had been to that point mainly an academic concern with nationality and apply his ideas to the exciting world of Manshūkoku, where the issue of ethnicity was intricately involved in the founding principles of the state, a "moral paradise" based on cooperation among ethnically defined groups (*minzoku kyōwa*, 民族協和).

Whatever his reasons for going to Foundation University, NAKANO was affected by his exposure to the multi-ethnic world of Manshūkoku. By training and inclination, NAKANO may well be regarded as a "metropolitan anthropologist," but once in Manshūkoku he came into close contact with those whom SHIMIZU has called "amateur ethnographers" (SHIMIZU 1999: 117). This new experience precipitated a shift in NAKANO's approach to the problem of ethnicity, a move from focussing on basic research on nationality and ethnicity based largely on European sources to applied work on ethnicity and nationality in East Asia. At the same time, NAKANO was participating in a broader ideological project, especially favored by reform bureaucrats and elements in the Kwantung Army, who conceived of Manshūkoku as a laboratory state where they would experiment with concepts of planning and national formation that could never be carried out in Japan (YAMAMURO 1993: 267-71). In this sense, the short time NAKANO spent in Manshūkoku was extremely important in transforming him from an academic sociologist interested in theoretical issues to an active ideologue who participated in attempts at social and political reform.

Foundation University was an ideal base for NAKANO and his use of theories on ethnicity for social engineering. At Foundation University, sociology was taught in the department of ethnology, and ethnologists there had often trained originally as sociologists. NAKANO's colleague ŌYAMA Hikoichi was trained as a sociologist, but was an active ethnologist, lecturing on ethnology at the University and organizing the Manchuria Ethnological Association in 1941 (NAKAO 1994: 136). Indeed, it may have been ŌYAMA who recruited NAKANO to join Manchuria Foundation University, as ŌYAMA had also been a student of TAKATA Yasuma. In any event, NAKANO found a very different atmosphere in Manchuria for his studies, an atmosphere shaped by military and colonial officers for whom the questions of ethnicity and nationality were immediate everyday concerns. One of the most important forces behind the establishment of Foundation University was ISHIWARA Kanji (石原莞爾), who hoped the university would serve as a policy institute for addressing ethnic harmony while constructing a sense of Manshūkoku nationality. ISHIWARA's proposal was not completely realized, but the university and its faculty reflected in part ISHIWARA's belief that they had an unprecedented role to play in reshaping national identity for Manshūkoku (MIYAZAWA 1997). Sociologists, particularly those like ŌYAMA and NAKANO who had studied under TAKATA Yasuma, were strongly inclined by their professional training to see Manshūkoku as a laboratory for engineering a new sense of national identity through their ethnological theories. It is not surprising that after moving to Manshūkoku, NAKANO's writings immediately took a more pragmatic, polity oriented approach to the problem of ethnic identity in Asia.

The first evidence of NAKANO's new policy-oriented approach to ethnic studies is a lengthy essay he wrote on "The requirements for a policy on ethnic nationality for Manshūkoku" which was intended as the first part of a broader theory on ethnic national policy in Manshūkoku. The essay was published in the first volume of the *Research reports of the Research Institute of Foundation University* in 1941, the same year that NAKANO was promoted to full professor. NAKANO argued for a revision of existing policies on ethnicity in order to accommodate the new geopolitical realities unfolding in the early 1940s. Current policies were largely subsumed under two approaches: the Wilsonian goal of ethnic national self-determination which was too idealistic and Czarist Russia's nationality policies which were not idealistic enough (i.e., were too oppressive of ethnic minorities). NAKANO argued that it was time for an ethnic national policy that struck a more equal balance between ideals and the realities of power politics. By a more idealistic ethnic national policy, he meant that Japan's *minzoku seisaku* (民族政策, ethnic national policies) could no longer be framed from the perspective of dominance over other ethnic nationalities.

Perhaps most innovative was NAKANO's unpacking of what "reality" meant in the context of setting ethnic national policies. His earlier work on the sociological theories of nationality led him to appreciate national identity as a conceptual effect rather than an enduring primordial reality. Consequently, NAKANO argued that "reality" was not a mere reflection of existing group identities, but that in fact there were various levels and kinds of realities at work in the production of ethnic and national identity. A satisfactory nationality policy for Manshūkoku therefore would have to consider at least three "realities": a global geopolitical reality, the reality of neighboring states, and the reality of various ethnic groups within Manshūkoku. NAKANO admitted the complexity of the problem, promising to take up the latter two themes in subsequent installments of his overall theory on ethnic national policy for Manshūkoku (NAKANO 1941: 19-26). Yet, even from the outset it was clear that NAKANO's policy sought to encompass and transcend more narrow ethnological studies that merely described aspects of existing ethnic national identities in the region. NAKANO's policy was informed by his theoretical interests, even as his theories reflected a more intimate concern with the realities of power in the region.

The core of NAKANO's policy paper on ethnic nationality policy for Manshūkoku rested on geopolitical reality as a factor in the formation of national identity. Consistent with his early theoretical work, NAKANO argued that national identity is not rooted in some primordial fixed identity, but is a sociological construct formed in light of a host of shifting conditions. The most significant condition for the problem of national identity during the early 1940s was region, as the world increasingly was being structured into *kōikidan* (広域圏, broad regional blocks). He recognized some degree of truth in the argument that a common experience of exploitation by the white race provided the yellow race with a sense of common fate that, along with shared race, culture and history, yielded a single national identity as a *tōa minzoku* (東亞民族, East Asian ethnic nation). But he cautioned that these economic grounds alone were not sufficient to form a single new national identity in East Asia (NAKANO 1941: 37). Economic realities had to be considered in the context of political realities, in which regional experiences were mediated by membership in political states.

The problem political states created for regional stability was that each vied for

dominance over the others. Therefore, "the structure which regional blocks must establish is one in which an appropriate framework for a leadership relationship among the states will be built without encroaching on the equal sovereignty of the states" (NAKANO 1941: 43). This was no small task. NAKANO recognized that the ideal of absolute state sovereignty was a universal feature of modern political life, but he also noted that actual power politics often left that ideal unrealized in reality, as states inevitably establish real power relations on a hierarchical model. He rejected international organizations like the League of Nations (not surprisingly, given the League's refusal to recognize the Manshūkoku state) and suggested that broad regional blocks were the best geopolitical and realistic framework for ensuring the expression of every state's ideal right to sovereignty. It was the problem of how to regulate relationships among ethnic groups within these broad regional units that most concerned NAKANO as a sociologist, and now amateur ethnologist, of everyday life.

Against those who insisted on homogeneous race as the key characteristic of these broad regional blocks, NAKANO maintained that every regional block is actually composed of multiple ethnic groups. Here, he drew a parallel from his analysis of state relations to argue that just as there is an ideal equality among ethnic groups in the sense that they all have an equal claim to recognition of their ethnic identity, nonetheless not all ethnic groups are equal in terms of their development towards achieving their own political state. Specifically, NAKANO listed three types of *minzoku* (ethnic groups) in the East Asian regional block. The first type was those ethnic groups that belong to one of the region's states but which have achieved a developmental stage that puts them in a leading role. "Needless to say," NAKANO said, "the Japanese ethnic nation belongs to this first type" (NAKANO 1941: 48). The second type was those ethnic groups that also belonged to a regional state but whose developmental stage left them under circumstances that required leadership from a true ethnic nation. And the third type was ethnic groups that did not belong to any state nor that possessed their own state but which were scattered across various states in the region. NAKANO placed most of the ethnic groups in the South Pacific territories (other than the Tai ethnic group) in this category. Previous attempts at constructing a policy for incorporating ethnic nations into a regional order had failed because they had ignored the reality that not all ethnic groups were at the same level of political development (NAKANO 1941: 48-9).

Based on these three types of ethnic groups, NAKANO developed a policy for nationality in the East Asian region that sought to account simultaneously for regional identification and ethnic differentiation. In keeping with the dominant strains of imperial ideology in NAKANO emphasized the different roles that those in these three different types of ethnic groups must play. But in the process of outlining this policy, NAKANO offered some surprising features of this policy. First, while NAKANO predictably argued that it was the Japanese nation's obligation to take the lead in developing other ethnic groups towards a modern sense of national identity, he did not argue that *kokumin* (national identity) must reflect *minzoku* (ethnic identity). This is particularly noteworthy, since NAKANO was living in Manshūkoku, a state whose very rationale for existence rested in great measure on claims for an ethnic homeland for the Manchu ethnic people. NAKANO's modernism rejected the sense that ethnicity alone was a sufficient principle of political life, and he emphasized instead the principle of *minzoku kyōwa* (harmony among the ethnic groups) of Manchuria as the

foundation for the construction of a more inclusive, multi-ethnic political sense of Manshūkoku national identity. It was the duty of the Japanese nation to lead the various ethnic groups in Manshūkoku to this common sense of *kokumin* (political nationality) that NAKANO felt underwrote any truly modern national state (NAKANO 1941: 50-1). In return, it was the obligation of members of the Manshū *kokumin* to set aside ethnic prejudice and accept Japanese guidance as a necessary condition in the construction of their own political nationality.

A provocative feature of this policy was a challenge to the assumption that a common political nationality is a sufficient condition for political independence. While NAKANO's approach was informed by modernist attitudes, he did not argue for a universal pattern of development from ethnic identity to political nation to independent state. Even while maintaining that the Japanese nation must lead the Manshū nation towards a more multiethnic sense of national identity as a single *kokumin*, this political nationality also did not guarantee the absolute independence of Manshūkoku from Japanese influence. Regional considerations overrode national interests in determining which nations could have independent states and which nations could not. In contrast to Manshūkoku, where the Japanese policy should be the encouragement of a multiethnic political nationality without a fully independent state, the South Pacific territories required a different policy on nationality that reflected the different situation in that area. Here, NAKANO argued that nationality policy should reflect the need to liberate the various ethnic groups from the control of states foreign to the region. The best means of achieving this regional integration was Japanese support for full independence. He rejected KADA Tetsuji's position that most of the ethnic groups in the South Pacific were too small to qualify as viable independent nations as merely a rehashing of the old objectivist determination of nationality. Instead, he suggested that these groups should either be incorporated as equal members of a *kokumin* of already existing states of the region or else be provided with their own political independence (NAKANO 1941: 53-4). Either method was equally suitable, which is to say that nationalism was not premised on an ethnic national right to self-determination. In the final analysis, the determination of what kind of nation would be formed, which nation specific ethnic groups would join, and whether even large ethnic groups like the Manchu would have their own independent state were all matters to be decided on the basis of the particular circumstances of individual groups and how they would affect the interests of regional stability (NAKANO 1941: 54). Of course, for NAKANO, there was no question that Japan, as the leading nation of the region, was to decide ultimately what those regional interests were.

But one of the most startling aspects of this nationality policy was the emphasis on creating various political, multi-ethnic *kokumin* (national identities) throughout the region as the ultimate objective of Japanese nationality policy. NAKANO's modernism, as we have seen, emphasized the eventual need for a sense of nationality that went beyond ethnic identity to incorporate the multiple ethnic groups of a territory into a broader national community that would in turn provide the foundations for a political state. His view was neither that of an ethnic nationalist nor that of a statist. In fact, NAKANO's nationality policy for Manshūkoku – and by extension for East Asia – drew from his early sociological interest in the formation of a contingent and constructed national identity that, while supportive of a multiethnic state,

remained distinct from and more fundamental to social identity than to membership in a political state. It was precisely because of its close proximity to the conceptual boundaries of "society" and because of its malleable and constructed nature that NAKANO found this concept of the nation as a *kokumin* more appealing than either ethnicity itself or the political state.

Although his policy emphasized the development of an ethnically integrated sense of political national identity, NAKANO's policy held that it was neither necessary nor sufficient merely to discard the sense of *minzoku* (ethnic nationality). Consistent with his constructivist view of social reality, he suggested it simply could be re-invented to serve new purposes. Having already rejected the objectivist, biologically driven models of ethnic nationality based solely on blood in favor of a subjectivist model that combined common fate, culture and history, and now concerned with enhancing regional bonds within East Asia, NAKANO found it only a short step to suggest a regional sense of ethnic nationality (*tōa minzoku*) as the basis for a common East Asian regional identity (NAKANO 1941: 61). This sense of a broader identity as membership in a single East Asian "ethnic nation" promised several solutions to the dilemma of nationality and regional interest. It avoided the errors of linking ethnic identity and the modern state (which NAKANO had already demonstrated was untenable) or of disconnecting the problem of *minzoku* (ethnicity) from that of *minzokushugi* (民族主義, ethnic nationalism). From the perspective of regional interests, NAKANO argued it was necessary to return to the connection between ethnicity and ethnic nationalism but relocate ethnic nationalism from national identity to that of regional identity (NAKANO 1941: 62-3). His main insight was that ethnic nationalism had proven more useful as a mechanism for creating social identity than for establishing stable political states.

But ethnic nationalism also had been a useful mechanism for drawing attention to the oppression by powers from outside East Asia over weaker members of the region. By encouraging a sense of common identity as members of a single East Asian ethnic nation, NAKANO proposed strengthening the sense of cultural identity as East Asians in relationship to a specific historical legacy of political opposition to outside interference. In this sense, he could claim that his proposal for relocating ethnic identity from the national to the regional level was not abandoning the principle of ethnicity but a new departure for the principle of ethnicity (*minzoku genri no sai-shuppatsu*, 民族原理の再出發) (NAKANO 1941: 75). He concluded his policy on ethnic nationality for Manshūkoku by reinforcing the point that a nationality policy in Manshūkoku must be but one element in a broader attempt to establish an East Asian, mutually dependent kind of ethnic nationalism (*tōa-teki na sōkan-teki na minzokushugi*, 東亞的な相關的な民族主義) (NAKANO 1941: 77). In the end, NAKANO had inverted the usual relationship of colonial ethnographers to metropolitan anthropologists. Writing from the colonies and on the issue of ethnicity, he suggested that ethnicity and ethnography must be returned to a metropolitan perspective in which the interests of the entire region are expressed through ethnology while the problems of national identity in the colonies must find expression not through ethnicity but through metropolitan principles of multiethnic, regional political structures.

Shortly after NAKANO's outline of a policy on ethnic nationality in Manshūkoku was published, work began on establishing an Ethnic Research Institute in Tokyo that would

serve as the metropolitan center of a network of ethnology institutes that spanned the empire. The Institute was the product of a sustained effort over several years by OKA Masao and other members of the Japanese Society of Ethnology who sought a more politically relevant approach to ethnic studies. There was probably some tension between OKA, an ethnologist who played an important role in conceiving and lobbying for the Institute, and TAKATA Yasuma, a sociologist who was appointed the director of the Institute instead of OKA. Yet, both shared a conviction that the study of ethnicity must be conducted in a more pragmatic way, with a close eye on public policy and the usefulness of ethnic theories for the new imperial order unfolding throughout East Asia. TAKATA's pragmatic approach is best seen through his influence on his student NAKANO, but OKA also argued for a more policy-oriented approach in a paper he read on "The agenda of contemporary ethnos-studies" at the first seminar of the Ethnological Foundation on October 8, 1942 at the Gakushi Hall in Tokyo. Significantly, OKA himself traced the influence of this pragmatic approach to ethnic studies to Wilhelm H. Riehl's sociological study of the German *Volk* (SHIMIZU 1999: 151-2, 165). The decision to appoint TAKATA, instead of OKA, as the first director of the Institute appears to have been a reflection not only of TAKATA's national reputation as the author of several influential books on the problem of ethnicity but a belief that his sociological approach to ethnic studies would ensure a close relationship between ethnic studies and socially constructive purposes throughout the empire.

TAKATA's sociological approach to ethnic nationality, and especially his provocative imagination of a new, single East Asian ethnic nationality, provided a clear guideline for the Institute's activities and is reflected in the first volume of *The Bulletin of the Ethnic Research Institute*, published in March 1944. The Bulletin carried specialized studies by EGAMI Namio (江上波夫) on the Hsiung-nu and Huns, IWAMURA Shinobu (岩村忍) on Muslims in Gansu, SUGIURA Ken'ichi (杉浦健一) on the land system of South Pacific islanders, and WATANABE Shōkō (渡邊照宏) on Rama Krishna's life and religious movement. But the more important articles were the lead essays by TAKATA and NAKANO. TAKATA's modernist proclivities led him to define ethnic national policy as an attempt by modern nations to deal with *kōshin minzoku* (後進民族) or "backward *Volk*". But TAKATA rejected what he called the Anglo-Dutch *kyori seisaku* (距離政策, distance policy) as a liberalism that was too unconcerned with the fate of backward *Volk*. Instead, he promoted a *sekkin seisaku* (接近政策, policy of proximity) as the basis for Japan's more modern ethnic national policy, a policy that encouraged recognition of commonality between Japan and the backward *Volk* of Asia as a means of working toward the goal of constructing an East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. TAKATA recognized fears that too much proximity could lead to complete cultural assimilation of Japan within Asia, thereby erasing the distinctiveness that gave Japan the right to its position of leadership, so he offered pragmatic limitations to proximity:

> [W]hat I call proximity policy does not mean complete proximity and assimilation, just as it does not mean equalization of positions and functions. [...] Fundamentally, it has as its inevitable conclusion the unification of East Asia in one body and a division of labor for mutual aid. To accomplish the mission of East Asia's liberation and independence requires a clear organization and someone to take charge of the functions within this organization. On this point, the fact that there are limits to this proximity policy is self-evident.
>
> (TAKATA 1944: 17-8)

And indeed there were. Even while TAKATA called for a new, "broader ethnic nation" that would encompass all of East Asia, he remained opposed to complete assimilation of ethnic national identities within this single East Asian identity. Ethnic identity cut both ways. It provided a prospectus for social change by shifting from the natural constraints of race toward the sense that ethnic nations were constructed through a consciousness of identity. Yet, if culture provided the grounds for social adaptability it also made claims on social identity, and TAKATA saw no reason for social groups to surrender their own particular cultural forms they had built up over time. Social differentiation occurred within the East Asian cultural order, just as it did in other societies, but in this case social differentiation was raised to the level of a differentiation among ethnic groups that brought with it a hierarchy of functions (YASUDA 1997: 292).

As TAKATA's former student and now colleague in the Institute, NAKANO followed TAKATA with his own essay, "An unfolding of the ethnic nationality principle in East Asia." NAKANO began by clarifying the problem, defining the object of his inquiry, *minzoku genri* (民族原理), as a close approximation of the German concept of *Nationalitätsprinzip*. NAKANO conceded that *minzoku genri* was related to the German concept in order to stress the difference between *minzoku,* a socially constructed group identity, and race, a natural category based on biology and blood. But after the outbreak of the Pacific War and the growing pan-Asianist sentiment in Japan, NAKANO began to emphasize differences between his theories and European social theories. "*Minzoku genri,*" he argued, may have stemmed from German theories about nationality, but it now signified something else that transcended Western ideas about national and ethnic identity. This attempt to transcend the West marks a major shift in NAKANO's approach to nationality and therefore deserves closer attention.

NAKANO's first step towards overcoming Western theories of nationality began with an overview of prevailing European theories on nationality, which he separated into three traditions: (1) the Western European principle of *ichi minzoku ichi kokka* (一民族一國家, one ethnic nation in each state), anchored by an implicit *minzokushugi* (ethnic nationalism); (2) the central and eastern European principle of *minzoku jiritsu* (民族自立, ethnic autonomy) which recognized inherent difficulties with ethnic nationalism and instead advocated multi-ethnic states in which political affairs would be handled by the state while culture could safely be left to ethnic self-rule; and (3) the Soviet principle of *minzoku jiketsu* (民族自決, ethnic national self-determination). The first theory of ethnic nationalism had been shown to be impractical (given the multi-ethnic nature of modern societies) and unnecessary (given the fact that ethnicity is a malleable social reality rather than a natural constraint). So NAKANO returned once again to Otto Bauer, whose theories of ethnic nationality had played such a large role in his earlier work, as discussed above. With Japanese Marxists like ŌYAMA Ikuo who had been influenced by Bauer now either in prison or in exile, NAKANO no longer saw Bauer as a Marxist but as offering the most compelling of Western liberal theories that served to suppress ethnic national liberation. Bauer's ethnic autonomy was merely a return to the old distinction between the "political state" and the "cultural nation" which failed to provide a mechanism by which ethnic autonomy would be translated into ethnic national self-determination (NAKANO 1944: 34-42). NAKANO rejected Bauer's theories, not only for

failing to address subjective desires for ethnic national independence, but also for a concept of ethnicity that, even if transferred from politics to the level of culture, nonetheless retaining significant degrees of essentialized properties.

Under Stalin's influence, Marxists had been performing a delicate balancing act of promoting a politically determined ethnic nationalism while trying to distance themselves from ethnic determinism. This third approach to ethnic nationalism was overly political, defining as legitimate only those nationalist movements against Western capitalism, not against the Soviet Union itself. If Bauer's theory was politically naive, Stalin's theory was culturally and sociologically impoverished. NAKANO concluded that neither Bauer's ethnic autonomy nor Stalin's ethnic national self-determination went beyond a European dualistic approach to the problem of nationality that created more international conflict by setting nations against each other, or else merely transferred ethnic conflict to an intra-national level by separating the political state from the cultural nation. Nor had the Wilsonian principle of (ethnic) national self-determination done more than fan the flames of social chaos and political instability in central and eastern Europe. NAKANO suggested the time was ripe to overcome the West's oppositional understanding of nationality with a more comprehensive approach that took more seriously the role of a common regional identity.

The solution was to understand ethnic nationality not as an end in itself, but as a supplementary element within a broader concept of nationality. NAKANO drew on TAKATA's concept of a *kō minzoku* (広民族, broader ethnic nation) embodied in a single *tōa minzoku* (東亞民族, East Asian ethnic nation) as the key (YASUDA 1997: 293). NAKANO admitted "petty differences" among the various ethnic nationalities of East Asia, but stressed that these petty differences should not be emphasized to the detriment of the "greater similarities" that existed among East Asians. Yet, other than pointing to a culture shaped by agriculture and a general attitude of resignation, NAKANO was unable to define these "greater similarities" among East Asian peoples. The important thing was not to quibble over details, but to join in the effort to support this consciousness of common membership in an East Asian ethnic nation. Competition among members of the East Asian ethnic nation would continue, to be sure, but as a *kōmei naru kyōsō* (公明なる競争, open competition) regulated by what OKA Masao had termed a "*minzoku chitsujo*" (民族秩序, ethnic national hierarchy) in which everyone knows each others' rights and responsibilities (NAKANO 1944: 64; Doak 2001: 28–30). "Taking one's place" meant both establishing an East Asian regional identity and an acceptance by each member of the East Asian ethnic nation of their specific supplemental roles within it. In short, the ideology of taking one's place as an ethnic group built on sociological theories of social differentiation and transferred those principles from the realm of society to the realm of the East Asian region. Reconceiving the region as a single "ethnic nation" rather than a realm composed of independent political states helped encourage the use of sociological concepts, since the concept of ethnic nationality had emerged among Japanese social scientists as one means of capturing the sense of social cohesion that remained outside of the Meiji state and its process of political nation building (*kokumin keisei*, 國民形成). At the same time, the concept of East Asia as a single ethnic nation drew on the appeal of national liberation from Western imperialism while transferring social distinctiveness from the national society to that of the region itself. This aspect of

NAKANO's theory of national identity was new, and it was clearly a response to the new emphasis on the war, after 1941, as a war for the liberation of East Asia from the West.

Conclusion: Nakano's Role in Wartime Japanese Anthropology

Recent studies have drawn attention to the central role of the Ethnic Research Institute in coordinating, directing and funding ethnic studies in wartime Japan (ASANO 2000; van Bremen and SHIMIZU, 1999; NAKAO 1997; YASUDA 1997). A shared concern for members of the Institute, whether trained as ethnologists or sociologists, was the problem of ethnicity and national identity in Asia and Oceania and the value of ethnic identity within a new logic of regional identity that would incorporate the growing claims of ethnic distinctiveness in the region. In evaluating the role of the Institute and particularly NAKANO's contribution to it, it is important not to insist on a narrow approach when evaluating disciplines, personal influence or the ways in which *minzoku* was understood by ethnologists and others who participated in the Institute's activities. Rather, the Institute was by design a comprehensive, interdisciplinary center where scholars of various backgrounds and interests could benefit from ideas and research on ethnicity, broadly conceived. Yet, there was a structure to this wide ranging and ambitious project that reflected two overarching concerns. First, the Institute was primarily concerned with the problem of ethnicity within Asia and Oceania rather than ethnicity as a purely global or Western phenomenon. Second, the Institute from its inception was designed to develop a more policy-oriented framework within which basic ethnological research and fieldwork would gain its new significance.

When OKA announced the Foundation's position on the need for the new wartime ethnic studies to proceed with a practical approach to the problem of ethnic identity, NAKANO was well positioned to respond. NAKANO brought to the Institute two distinct contributions. During the 1930s, he had developed a wide-ranging study on theories of nationality that built on Western sociological approaches and which emphasized the contingency of ethnic, national and other social identities. He was able to write with authority on how leading theorists in the West understood ethnicity and nationality and also about the limitations of their theories. But by the time the Institute was established, NAKANO also brought to these theories the kind of personal experience in the field that anthropologists frequently invoke to support the authority of their claims to have understood different cultures and ethnic groups. Manshūkoku was a particularly useful base for making these claims to authority, since there were few places in the world where ethnic relations and the problems of national independence had been as central to the very formation of a new national state.

In this sense, one can see NAKANO as bridging the gap between pure, metropolitan theorists like TAKATA and the more fieldwork-based scholarship of ethnologists like SUGIURA Ken'ichi. In the end, NAKANO's approach was closer to that of the metropolitian theorists, even if his residence in Manshūkoku provided him with ethnological cover. In spite of NAKANO's residence in Manshūkoku, he participated fully in the metropolitan scholars' attempt to build a field of ethnic studies that would provide a broad, new theoretical context for the study of ethnicity. What makes NAKANO so important in that attempt was his combination of a sociological approach to ethnicity, learned from his mentor TAKATA

Yasuma, and his own lived experience that led him to connect sociological theories with the social realities of the multi-ethnic Manshūkoku. There were theorists of ethnicity who had not lived outside of Japan for any length of time, and there were ethnologists with substantial fieldwork experience, but few had connected experience and theory as powerfully as NAKANO did. Undoubtedly, both his theoretical insight and the fact that he wrote as a professor at Foundation University made his work invaluable to the Institute for Ethnic Research.

There is little evidence that colonial ethnologists explicitly cited NAKANO's theories in their own fieldwork. Nonetheless, that is not the only, or even the best, way to assess his influence. Arguably, the Institute and NAKANO were less interested in their influence on professional ethnology than in incorporating ethnology within a broader policy on ethnicity for the multi-ethnic Japanese Empire. This shift might also be understood as one from ethnological research to "national studies," so long as it is clear that this definition of "nation" was a thoroughly ethnic one. It was precisely because of this attempt to shift attention from ethnology per se to the broader field of ethnic (national) studies that the sociological theories of TAKATA Yasuma and NAKANO Seiichi were consistently highlighted in the publications of the Institute. What NAKANO and his mentor provided was an overall framework for a policy that justified continued research on ethnicity in an empire where ethnicity, if not carefully controlled, could erupt at any minute into ethnic nationalist movements for independence. Furthermore, NAKANO's work not only justified the continuation of ethnic studies under a multi-ethnic Japanese empire, but provided an outline for how ethnic studies could contribute to the strengthening of regional stability under Japanese imperial rule. NAKANO provided a regional framework in which research on ethnic groups in East Asia (especially those deemed "backward *Volk*") was more than merely tolerated: it was essential to intra-regional stability.

Ethnic research was part of a broader structure in which it was the obligation of the advanced modern Japanese "ethnic nation" to lead other less developed ethnic groups towards eventual national expression. Inherent in this argument was NAKANO's sociological approach that grasped ethnic identity as an expression of subjective consciousness and therefore as malleable. Because ethnicity was not grounded in nature like race, ethnic identity could be shaped in infinite ways. Moreover, by introducing the distinction between ethnic and civic forms of nationality and by insisting on the necessity of mediating relationships between ethnicity and the political state, NAKANO provided a theory for ethnic research that legitimated and even mandated the participation of Japanese scholars and officials in the shaping of ethnic and national identities in the Asian region. Yet, the ultimate emphasis was not on ethnicity. NAKANO's policy on ethnicity legitimated research on ethnic studies, but only insofar as the broader framework remained a multi-ethnic, political sense of nationality that all groups eventually would reach as they modernized. At present, he argued, that stage was only realized by the Japanese nation, and therefore if ethnic strife were to be avoided in the region, the Japanese state was the only force capable of preventing it.

Perhaps NAKANO's greatest contribution to the debates on ethnicity during the 1930s and early 1940s was his attempt to reconcile ethnic identity with the obvious multi-ethnic realities of modern social life. While his conceptualization was not entirely original (he drew

much of it from TAKATA), he added a more regional and pragmatic focus to these attempts to reshape ethnic nationality. Moreover, close attention to NAKANO's theories on ethnic nationality reveals how even a liberalism premised on promoting multi-ethnic societies joined forces with less liberal theories derived from Nazi concepts of the *Volk* in the *minzoku* maelstrom of imperial Japan. There is undoubtedly much to learn from NAKANO about Japanese imperialism, wartime Japanese anthropology, and even about the problem of ethnicity for present-day ethnologists and anthropologists around the world. Certainly, the lessons of NAKANO's ethnic studies are not limited to anthropologists or to Japan. They are timely lessons for any state or transnational organization that attempts to engage in ethnic intervention in the hopes of engineering more multi-ethnic political bodies.

Acknowledgements

References

ASANO, Toyomi (浅野豊美)
    2000   「日本の文化人類学と太平洋問題調査——民族研究所設立（1943）とアジアの脱植民地化をめぐって」『渋沢研究』10, 45-63. (The missing link: Japanese anthropology and Institute of Pacific Relations before and during World War II. *SHIBUSAWA kenkyū* 10, 45-63.)

Barshay, Andrew E.
    1996   Toward a history of the social sciences in Japan. *Positions* 4(2), 217-51.

Brubaker, Rogers
    1992   *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Doak, Kevin M.
    1995   Colonialism and ethnic nationalism in the political thought of YANAIHARA Tadao (1893-1961). *East Asian history* 10, 79-98.
    1998   Culture, ethnicity and the state in early Twentieth Century Japan. In *Japan's competing modernities: Issues in culture and democracy* 1900-1930 (ed.) Sharon Minichiello. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
    2001   Building national identity through ethnicity. *The journal of Japanese studies* 27, 1-39.

Greenfeld, Liah
    1996   Nationalism and modernity. *Social research* 63(1), 3-40.

ISHIDA Takeshi (石田雄)
    1984   『日本の社会科学』東京：東京大学出版会. (*Japanese social science.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.)

MARUYAMA Masao (丸山眞男)
    1957 (1996)   「思想のあり方について」『丸山眞男集』第 7 巻, 東京：岩波書店. (On the status of

thought. Reprinted in *Collected works of MARUYAMA Masao*, vol. 7, pp. 151-74. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.)

MINAMI Hiroko (南裕子)

  1998   「中野清一」川合隆男・竹村英樹編『近代日本社会学者小伝――書誌的考察』東京：勁草
          書房. (NAKANO Seiichi. In *A biographical sketch of modern Japanese sociologists: A bibliographic study* (eds) KAWAI Takao and TAKEMURA Hideki. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō.)

MIYAZAWA Eriko (宮沢恵理子)

  1997   『建国大学と民族協和』東京：風間書房. (*Foundation University and ethnic harmony.* Tokyo: Fūma Shobō.)

NAKANO Seiichi (中野清一)

  1935   「民族＝運命共同體説の吟味」『商學討究』10 月号, 91-122. (A close examination of the nation as community of fate theory. *Shōgaku tōkyū* (October), 91-122.)

  1937a   「社會と階級」尾高邦雄編『社會科學――日本社會科學者年報』5, 109-31. (Society and class. *Social science: Annals of the Japanese Social Scientists* (ed. ODAKA Kunio) 5, 109-31. Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten.)

  1937b   「民族と伝統」『商學討究』6 月号, 1-28. (Nation and tradition. *Shōgaku tōkyū* (June), 1-28.)

  1937c   「民族と社會的文化の傾向」『商學討究』12 月号, 1-32. (Nation and social cultural tendencies. *Shōgaku tōkyū* (December), 1-32.)

  1938a   「民族集團に於ける統一の概念」『商學討究』6 月号. 86-112. (The concept of unity in the ethnic group. *Shōgaku tōkyū* (June), 86-112.)

  1938b   「Staatsnation と Kulturnation」『商學討究』12 月号, 1-30. (*Staatsnation and Kulturnation. Shōgaku tōkyū* (December), 1-30.)

  1941   「滿洲國民族政策への諸要請――滿洲國民族政策論, 第一部」『研究紀要』1, 15-77, 建國大學研究院. (The requirements for a policy on nationality for Manshūkoku: The outline of the nationality policy for Manshūkoku, part 1. *Research reports of the Research Institute of Foundation University* 1, 15-77. Graduate School, Foundation University.)

  1944   「東亞に於ける民族原理の開顯」『民族研究所紀要』1, 19-6. 東京：民族研究所. (An unfolding of the principle of nationality in East Asia. *Bulletin of the Ethnic Research Institute* 1, 19-69. Tokyo: Ethnic Research Institute.)

NAKAO Katsumi (中生勝美)

  1994   「植民地の民族學――滿州民族学会の活動」『へるめす』52, 135-43, 東京：岩波書店. (Colonial ethnology: The activities of the Manshū Ethnological Association. *Hermes* 52, 135-43. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.)

  1997   「民族研究所の組織と活動――戦争中の日本民族学」『民族學研究』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.)

ODAKA Kunio (ed.) (尾高邦雄編)

  1934   『社會科學――日本社會科學者年報』2, 東京：岩波書店. (*Social science: Annals of the Japanese Social Scientists* 5. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.)

ŌYAMA Ikuo (大山郁夫)

  1923 (1947) 「政治の社會的基礎――國家権力を中心とする社會闘爭の政治學的考察」『大山郁夫全集』第 1 巻, 東京：中央公論社. (The social foundation of politics: Political scientific

reflections on social struggles over state policy. Reprinted in *Collected works of ŌYAMA Ikuo*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron-sha.)

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. London: Curzon Press.

Stocking, George W., Jr.

    1993   The turn-of-the-century concept of race. *Modernism\modernity* 1, 4-16.

TAKATA Yasuma (高田保馬)

    1944   「民族政策の基調」『民族研究所紀要』1, 2-18. 東京：民族研究所. (Basic issues for a nationality policy. *Bulletin of the Ethnic Research Institute* 1, 2-18. Tokyo: Ethnic Research Institute.)

TSUKASE Susumu (塚瀬進)

    1998   『満洲国——「民族協和」の実像』東京：吉川弘文館. (*Manshukoku: The true face of 'Ethnic harmony'*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa-kōbunkan.)