Selves and Others in Japanese Anthropology

Selves and Others in Japanese Anthropology

Teruo SEKIMOTO

I. Introduction

One way to understand the general characteristics of, and long-term trends in, Japanese anthropology is to examine the geographical distribution of its anthropological research. This paper raises two initial questions. The first question is on which geographical areas Japanese anthropologists have been focusing in the last six decades. The second question is how its pattern of area focus has been changing over the years. A simple, practical way to answer these questions is a statistical survey of the articles published in Japanese anthropological journals.[1]

The Japanese Society of Ethnology, the national association of socio-cultural anthropologists in Japan, was founded in 1934. The inaugural number of its quarterly journal, *Minzokugaku kenkyu* (民族學研究), came out the next year. The journal was given the English title, the *Japanese journal of ethnology* (referred to as *JJE* below), some years later. The journal has been published for nearly seventy years up to the present. Although a couple of newer anthropological periodicals have appeared in Japan since the 1960s, the *JJE* remains the main publication for Japanese anthropologists, thus reflecting the general, long-term trends in Japanese anthropology. Between its start in 1935 and the year 1994, the *JJE* carried a total of 1,267 articles with a specific area focus, besides a few that were theoretical or comparative. The breakdown of the 1,267 articles, firstly by the different time periods of their publication, and secondly by their geographical focus, will enable us to grasp the changing pattern of the area focus in Japanese anthropology.

II. The classification of periods and areas

For the purpose of temporal classification, the sixty years during which the *JJE* has been published are divided into six consecutive periods, each covering about ten years, corresponding to ten volumes of the journal. The first period from 1935 to 1944 was the time of war and militarism, which benefited the first generation of modern Japanese anthropologists. The government and the military supported anthropological research in the colonies and the newly occupied territories in East and Southeast Asia, even though the support was only for a short duration. The second period covers the years from 1946, when the publication of the *JJE* resumed after two years of interruption, through 1956. It was a period of devastation immediately after the war, when the Japanese government and Japanese society were undergoing fundamental changes, and were striving to achieve economic survival and reconstruction. The third period, from 1957 to 1966, roughly

corresponds to the initial stage of Japan's high-speed economic growth, when an increasing number of Japanese began to enjoy a steadily rising standard of living but still considered themselves far behind the big powers in the West. Then, from 1966 on, came the fourth, fifth and sixth periods, during which Japan emerged as a major economic power. Japanese anthropologists during the second and third periods had little chance of travelling abroad. In the years immediately after the war, they had almost no funding resources. Even when the signs of economic recovery became apparent later, the government's highly restrictive policy on foreign exchange prevented them from going abroad. The situation changed drastically in the 1970s. Finally, they had far better chances of doing long-term overseas field research, thanks to generous research funding by the government and the rapidly rising value of the yen. As will be shown below, these changes over the last sixty years have deeply affected the way in which Japanese anthropologists have conducted their research.

The selection of geographical areas is directly related to the main point in this paper, which is concerned with the area focus of Japanese anthropological research. However, this issue is far more problematic than the temporal division discussed above. Since geographical boundaries are determined by political and cultural factors, they are inherently ambiguous and unstable. To ask to what extent Japanese anthropologists have conducted research in Japan rather than in foreign countries immediately raises the question: where does Japan's home territory end and where does that of foreign countries begin? There is no fixed answer to this question, for the political boundaries of Japan have moved back and forth since the formation of the modern state in the nineteenth century. The problem is not simply the chronological shifts in the definition of Japan in administrative and diplomatic terms, but involves diversified, and often contested, images of Japan as a bounded entity on the world map.[2]

The Japanese modern state in the pre-war and wartime years had its colonies. The definition of the term "colony," however, is far from being clear-cut. There is a unanimous consensus that Korea was a Japanese colony under modern Japanese colonial expansion. Present-day Japanese are accustomed to thinking that Japan surrendered all its former colonies in the San Francisco Peace Treaty of 1952. However, it must be remembered that Hokkaido and Okinawa, which are part of today's Japanese territory, were colonized by Japan through a long historical process in pre-modern times. The demarcation between Japan, the suzerain, and its colonies contains other ambiguities, too. The wartime cliche, "we, the one hundred million imperial subjects (一億臣民)" included people in the colonies and, on world atlases published in Japan, both Japan and its colonies were painted red. Nevertheless, there was a clear-cut dichotomy between the so-called "homeland" (*naichi*, 内地) and the "overseas areas" (*gaichi*, 外地). I remember from my boyhood days in Hokkaido in the 1950s that people there referred only to the lands beyond the Tsugaru Strait as *naichi*. The geographical location of borders has been changing all through Japanese modern history, but the Japanese have retained a belief in the existence of a border between the "homeland" and the "territories overseas," and the inherent homogeneity of the people living within the first area. The historical formation of this awareness of Japan as a bounded entity deeply influenced the formation and resultant shape of Japanese anthropology. As I shall argue in this paper, the move "beyond the border" has been one of its basic driving forces,

but without a serious contemplation of the problematics of Japanese border formation, both in political and social-psychological terms.

As shown in Table 1, I first divide the world into seventeen sub-areas. These sub-areas are so divided and arranged as to make concentric circles with the core area of Japan at the centre. Then, the sub-areas are grouped into five larger areas, each of which has historically held a different type of relation to the modern Japanese state.

Area I represents what I call "Core Japan," from which the formation of the modern Japanese state started in 1868. It roughly corresponds to the present territory of the Japanese state, but excludes Hokkaido, Okinawa, and Amami. Basically the *JJE* articles dealing with Area I are about ethnic Japanese. This area may well be called Yamato, one of the old names standing for Japan, but there is no consensus among present-day Japanese anthropologists

Table 1 The area distribution of the articles in the *Japanese journal of ethnology* from 1935 to 1994

Period	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Area	1935 -44	1946 -56	1957 -66	1966 -76	1976 -86	1986 -94	
Area I							
Japan (Core area)	95	63	53	48	41	27	327
Area II. Territories of Japan's early expansion							
Okinawa/Amami	9	23	23	12	13	14	94
Hokkaido	10	30	19	3	4	4	70
Subtotal	19	53	42	15	17	18	164
Area III. Colonized territories							
Sakhalin/Kuril	26	11	11	1	2	1	52
Korea	8	4	5	4	11	5	37
Taiwan	33	21	8	5	9	8	84
Micronesia	18	2	6	5	5	0	36
Subtotal	85	38	30	15	27	14	209
Area IV. Territories under Japanese military invasion before and during WWII							
China/Mongolia	41	33	23	14	9	14	134
Southeast Asia	18	4	28	14	37	27	128
Subtotal	59	37	51	28	46	41	262
Area V. Other areas							
Oceania (excluding Micronesia)	6	7	2	5	11	9	40
South Asia	3	5	9	13	12	22	64
Central Asia	2	3	2	1	0	0	8
Middle East	0	2	2	2	12	5	23
Africa	1	1	0	27	23	7	59
Europe	6	10	2	5	7	8	38
US/Canada	3	9	10	5	4	9	40
Latin America	1	6	5	7	10	4	33
Subtotal	22	43	32	65	79	64	305
Total	280	234	208	171	210	164	1,267

The figures indicate the number of articles that deal with each geographical area for every ten-year period. There are very few articles which are theoretical or cross-cultural without a specific area focus. They are excluded from the table.

about the proper choice of a word. It is just an unmarked category, lacking a well-established name.

Area II consists of Hokkaido and Okinawa-Amami. The former is the northernmost of the four major islands of Japan, while the latter is a long island chain extending between Kyushu and Taiwan, forming the southernmost territory of Japan today. It is in Area II that the modern Japanese state embarked on its first attempt at territorial expansion and colonization. When the Meiji government began its efforts to build the modern nation-state of Japan in the 1860s, the status of those areas was still ambiguous. Hokkaido, before the Meiji era, was called *Ezochi* (蝦夷地), the land of the *Ezo* (Ainu). It was not considered a part of Japan, but an outer territory inhabited by barbarians. The Meiji government gave it a new name, Hokkaido, which means "Northern Province," and started a major scheme to colonize with ethnic Japanese the then sparsely populated frontier. Hokkaido was soon fully incorporated into Japan's territory. The Ainu people were far outnumbered and marginalized by the new settlers.

Okinawa and Amami, however, have followed a different path of history from that of Hokkaido. The area used to form the domain of the small semi-autonomous Kingdom of the Ryukyus, which had long been a tributary of the Ming and Qing dynasties of China. The feudal lord of the Satsuma domain in southern Kyushu subjugated the Ryukyus in the seventeenth century, annexed Amami and, since that time, exploited the kingdom of the Ryukyus – now reduced to the territory to Okinawa – economically, but the Japanese overlords at Satsuma continued to respect its status as a tributary of Qing for the sake of their economic interests. Thus, the Ryukyus were mostly autonomous but in a double-tributary relationship to China and Satsuma. The Meiji government was determined to fully annex the Ryukyus as part of Japan. Of the many islands stretching over the ocean, the southern two-thirds became Okinawa Prefecture, while the northern part of the islands, Amami, were incorporated into Kagoshima Prefecture (the former domain of Satsuma). Instead of sending a large number of ethnic Japanese to colonize Okinawa, the Meiji government adopted an assimilation policy, to make faithful members of the Japanese nation out of the local people. For that purpose an intense cultural inculcation and strict discipline were imposed on them for a long time after the annexation of Okinawa.

At present, the two areas, Hokkaido and Okinawa-Amami, are fully incorporated into Japan. It is, however, in those areas that the notion of national homogeneity is most often betrayed by reality. In Hokkaido, the long marginalized Ainu are building up their ethnic awareness. In response to this movement, the government set up an advisory group on Ainu affairs, which proposed in 1996 that the Ainu be officially recognized as a minority ethnic group within the Japanese nation. This is remarkable, because after World War II the government had long stuck to the assumption of the mono-ethnic composition of the Japanese nation. Unlike the Ainu, who are a very small, scattered minority among the population of Hokkaido, Okinawans are the great majority in their home islands. They have suffered continuously from their marginal status in modern Japan: from one of the fiercest battles in World War II, with heavy civilian casualties; from the U.S. military occupation up to 1972; and from a heavy concentration of U.S. military bases until now. The shared experience of these sufferings, coupled with their own cultural heritage from the pre-modern

past, sometimes unites them against the mainland Japanese, at least in cultural terms.[3]

Area III includes Sakhalin Island, the Kuril Islands, Korea, Taiwan and the former mandated islands under Japanese rule in Micronesia. They are former Japanese colonies that gained independence or were incorporated into other nations after World War II. Area IV is China, Mongolia and Southeast Asia. Japan, in the process of imperialist expansion, once considered these areas to be strategically of vital importance. A puppet government was established in Manchuria in the 1930s, which later brought about the Japanese invasion of other parts of China. Next, Southeast Asia experienced a Japanese invasion and occupation as part of its all-out war against the Allied powers. Area III formed the outer territories of the Japanese Empire, while Area IV belonged to the "Great East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere." It should be noted, however, that Japanese imperialist involvement with China had a much deeper historical background than with Southeast Asia. Finally, Area V represents all other areas in the world.

III. Analysis

Figure I shows the proportion of the *JJE* articles dealing with the five areas for each of the ten-year periods. I thus make a five-fold classification of world areas in order to examine how Japanese anthropological research has been, and is, determined by the changing boundaries and foreign relations of the Japanese state. I, however, do not maintain that Japanese anthropological research has consistently and intentionally served the state's political interests. But, it is true that Japanese anthropology was implicitly involved with state policy, and sometimes even rather directly. ISHIDA Eiichirō writes on his wartime memory:

> In the wartime, some ethnologists persuaded the military to set up the National Institute of Ethnic Studies (国立民族研究所), and made the Japanese Society of Ethnology into its affiliated institution, thus demonstrating their eagerness to mobilize Japanese ethnology in service of the state's ethnic policies of the so-called Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. This attitude has left a long-lasting impression that ethnology is guilty of war crimes, which led Japan to its final catastrophe. [...] I had a lot of bad feelings against both the public and the private life of those senior ethnologists at the time who were proudly following the haughty high officers of the army.   (ISHIDA 1970: 17, 19)

Japanese anthropologists have not discussed publicly what this involvement by ethnologists in the war effort meant to their own discipline. Rather, the problem was treated as off-the-record stories and personal episodes. This attitude was, and still is, detrimental to the development of Japanese anthropology. It is irrelevant here to classify scientific disciplines into those who were guilty of war and those who were not. It is, however, also not necessary to defend those ethnologists with the plea that they could not but cooperate with the military in those days. What we should examine is not the particular attitude and behavior of particular anthropologists at a specific time, but the whole historical context of modern Japan within which Japanese anthropology has so far developed. The problem is what kind of historical formation of modern Japan has determined the shape of Japanese anthropology,

and how the way of conducting anthropology is related to Japan's modern history. The majority of Japanese anthropologists, in each epoch of modern history, passively took the geo-political environment of the modern Japanese state as a given factor without questioning it. In so doing, they pursued personal dreams while putting contemporary political problems in parentheses. Most anthropologists have not made any political commitments, but remained part of the apolitical mass of people who have just followed the trends of each historical period. What were the effects on Japanese anthropology that were caused by this tendency of climbing on the bandwagon? Here, I return to, and analyze, the statistics on the geographical focus of Japanese ethnographic research.

What patterns of change over the last sixty years emerge from Table I? Among the patterns of change, some clearly reflect the whole pattern of the national historical process over the past sixty years, that is, from the imperialistic expansion leading to the war, the defeat in World War II, the subsequent reduction of Japan's territory and foreign relations, and finally to Japan's re-emergence as a major economic power due to its rapid economic growth. On the other hand, some patterns of change are not directly related to that general process of history. This is particularly clear in Area I, or "Yamato." First, let us examine those patterns of change that reflect the national historical process.

First, we notice that the percentage of research in the countries in Area III was the highest in the first period when Japan still ruled them as overseas colonies, but that it has been declining fast since then. Secondly, the percentage of research for the countries of Area V was very low during the first three periods (1935-1966), but increased steeply after that, to the extent that it surpassed all the other areas. This is the result of Japan's rise as an economic power. Area IV shows no clear pattern of change. If, however, we look into figures for each sub-area in Area IV, Southeast Asia shares the same pattern of sudden increase as Area V. This is in strong contrast to China and Mongolia, whose percentage, like that of Area III, has been constantly declining from its height in the first period. The statistics thus reveal the marked priority that Japanese anthropologists have given to more remote countries over neighboring areas, once the rapid growth of the Japanese economy freed researchers from various obstacles to their research.

Japanese anthropologists before and during World War II focused their research heavily on people in the colonized and occupied territories. In that respect they followed a path similar to that of their colleagues in the West.[4] The percentage for Area III dropped abruptly after the war. The loss of its colonies, the anti-Japanese sentiment and policies in those areas, and economic hardship were the simple reasons for that. It is striking, however, that the percentage dropped further after 1966 and has remained low until now, even though external factors hindering research have been removed. The reason for this is not simple, if we take into consideration the differences among the sub-areas within Area III. The *JJE* articles dealing with Korea, for example, have been relatively small in number and show no meaningful pattern of change. The number was small even during the 1935-1944 period, when Korea was still Japan's largest and most important colony. For Japanese anthropologists then, with their strong orientation toward "primitive" societies, Korea might not have been a favorite site for research. The relative lack of interest in Area III in the periods after 1966, however, is attributable to the marked rise of research on Area V, which

we have noted above. Having benefited from Japan's rise as an economic power, Japanese anthropologists have gained newer and wider possibilities of research all over the globe. As is shown in Table 1, Africa in Periods IV-V, Southeast Asia in Periods V-VI, and South Asia in Period VI are conspicuous examples of their move toward new, more remote areas. These new areas attracted Japanese anthropologists much more than the former colonies, even though the latter have been more closely related with Japan, not only geographically and historically, but also in terms of accumulated scientific knowledge.

Japanese anthropology thus has a centrifugal tendency to move out of Japan and farther away. This trend is closely related to another tendency: to keep one's distance from the accumulated tradition of previous research. The centrifugal tendency is seen in Area II, as well, in which we found a different pattern of change from the other areas. The percentage for Area II was at its highest during the first two decades after the war (1946-1966) but very low before and after that. The contrast between the high and the low is striking. At the time when the colonies were lost and chances for overseas research were almost nil, the centrifugal tendency in Japanese anthropology could find its only niche in the study of Okinawa-Amami and the Ainu in Hokkaido.

In the last sixty years of its history, Japanese anthropology has been seeking people in the most remote areas, but they are the most remote only within a limited space that has been defined differently at various times by national and international politics. The centrifugal tendency of Japanese anthropologists is a search for the "maximally other." The colonized peoples (Area III) in Period I, the marginalized peoples (Area II) in Periods II-III, and the peoples in faraway countries (Area V and Southeast Asia) in Periods IV-VI have successively exemplified the "maximally other" to Japanese anthropologists. However, they have not so far seriously questioned the political space within which this otherness was defined, but have passively accepted it as a given fact. Political space has not just been an external factor limiting the centrifugal tendency of anthropologists. Rather, the latter has been a product of the former. Anthropologists create "others" not in opposition to the political space but, rather, out of it.

The changing pattern of anthropological research in Japan has thus closely reflected the changing position of the Japanese state in the world over the years. Area I, however, is an anomaly in this regard. The percentage of the *JJE* articles on ethnic Japanese (Area I) was very high in the first period (1935-1944) but has dropped since then, with the lowest point in the latest period (1986-1994). Unlike other areas, however, the changes in the percentage we find for Area I over the periods does not clearly reflect Japan's changing position in the world. Unlike Area II, its share did not rise, but decreased during the first and second periods. Also unlike Area II and III, the percentage for Area I did not decrease during the third and fourth periods. The percentage stayed very high for the first thirty years after the war. The long-term trends of decline only became clear after 1976. Area I thus seems less affected by the short-term changes Japan has experienced over the years than the other areas.

A closer look at the articles for Area I will reveal the reasons for its distinctiveness. Of the *JJE* contributors in the first period, those who focused on the ethnic Japanese stand out because of the diversity of their disciplinary backgrounds. Included are such fields as folklore, rural and urban sociology, linguistics, mythology, history of religion, and Japanese

archaeology among others. Folklorists contributed many articles to the *JJE*, including four by HAYAKAWA Kōtarō (早川孝太郎) and two by MIYAMOTO Tsuneichi (宮本常一). Rural sociologists such as SUZUKI Eitarō (鈴木榮太郎) were another group of outstanding contributors. Also appearing in the *JJE* in the first period were articles by such famous scholars as HARADA Toshiaki (原田敏明), TAKEDA Hisakichi (武田久吉), SEKI Keigo (關敬吾), MATSUMURA Takeo (松村武雄) and KON Wajirō (今和次郎). The *JJE*, in its first period, was not so much a journal of a well-established discipline as that of a small circle of independent scholars gathering around SHIBUSAWA Keizō (澁澤敬三) as their patron and mentor. Pre-war and wartime anthropologists did not have positions in Japanese universities, with the exceptions of Keijō Imperial University and Taihoku Imperial University in the colonies. For these independent scholars who were connected among others by personal ties, the broad variety of contributions in the *JJE* might not have been strange in any sense. Under the generic title of Japanese ethnology, the cooperation across disciplines persisted till the 1970s. Their common interest was a search for the socio-cultural distinctiveness of the Japanese, and the scholars with different backgrounds gathered around the *JJE* to discuss the theme across disciplinary boundaries. That was possible because the Japanese Society of Ethnology, which publishes the *JJE*, was a congregation of independent scholars without positions in universities and research institutions.[5] The present-day Japanese anthropologists, especially the younger generation among them, however, could not imagine their historical descent from this congregation of scholars of various interests. Professional training of anthropologists in higher educational institutions only began after the 1950s. What eventually resulted was a discipline of anthropology that was based on the methods and theories of Durkheim, Malinowski, Evans-Pritchard and other notable Western scholars, adopting fieldwork in different cultures as the core method.

The high percentage of research in Area I, in the first period, reflected the role of the *JJE* during that time as a trans-disciplinary medium for free-spirited (and scientifically non-rigorous) ethnological search into the origins and distinctive character of the Japanese. This tradition of scientific boundary crossing persisted long after the end of the war, most prominently among the researchers in the field of ethnic Japanese studies and, secondly, among researchers working on the marginalized people in Area II. This is the reason why the proportion of the articles on Area I did not decline up to the 1970s. In contrast, the *JJE* articles focusing on outer areas (Areas III to V) were mostly written by more discipline-oriented anthropologists, even in the early period. The proportion of the articles on Area I dropped rather sharply in the periods after 1976 because anthropology had become more institutionalized, and the scientific boundary crossing in search of the origins and distinctiveness of the ethnic Japanese has lost its popularity among the younger generation of scholars. Also lost were the personal ties that united the independent scholars. Because scholars with different disciplinary orientations such as folklorists, rural sociologists and Japanese archaeologists were now contributing to journals of their own, the *JJE* became a journal for fully specialized anthropology. Without the habit of disciplinary border crossing, anthropology per se is now dominated by the aforementioned centrifugal tendency of moving away from Japan. That has been the way Japanese anthropology has developed after World War II.

Because anthropology was fashioned as the study of Native Americans in the U.S.A., and as African and Australian studies in Britain, anthropology has colonial studies as its origin. Contrary to this, Japanese anthropology, in its formative years, showed much interest in the Japanese people and culture. As we have seen above, however, the institutionalization of post-war Japanese anthropology, with its securing of teaching positions in universities, led to the centrifugal tendency to move away from Japan.

Even today, some Japanese anthropologists are working on Japan proper, or "Yamato," but most of their research is case studies done in a haphazard way, trying to apply anthropological theories, concepts and methods to arbitrary cases within the national border. What is lacking is a systematic program for Japanese studies by anthropologists. In quantitative terms, fieldworks conducted in Japan are relatively scarce without the systematic accumulation of results, thus not forming an established field of study. Once, for a decade or two just after World War II, a sizable number of researchers worked on Okinawa and the Ainu in Hokkaido on the fringe of the national territory, but this small boom was a story of the past within Japanese anthropology. Whereas groups of specialists are formed and research results are accumulated in the anthropological research of Asia, Oceania, Africa and Latin America, Japanese studies lack such a concentration and accumulation. Japanese anthropology has no firm platform of discussion in the field of Japanese studies.

Some Japanese anthropologists became extremely popular outside academia on account of their theories of the Japanese in comparative perspective. Two best-selling books, UMESAO Tadao's *Bunmei no seitai shikan* (UMESAO 1967) and NAKANE Chie's *Tate shakai no ningen kankei* (NAKANE 1967), had a tremendous impact and contributed to the popularizing of anthropology among the general reading public in Japan. At the time of publication, both these authors were already well established as leading anthropologists on account of their work abroad. Their theories on the Japanese, however, are based on personal intuition and imagination, lacking a clearly defined method that can be transmitted to students by professional training. In the current system of high education in Japan, graduate students of anthropology are trained in long-term field research in small communities abroad. Then, they develop their own style of research through direct and indirect dialogue with the local people of their fields.

Looking back from the current state of affairs, the centrifugal tendency in Japanese anthropology was determined by the logic of disciplinary institutionalization. In the early decades, Japanese anthropology was a loosely defined discipline, shared by free-spirited independent scholars. After it secured positions in universities with its own professional training system, it needed its own subject matter and methods of research to clearly set itself apart from other competing disciplines that had since long well-established. Then, anthropologists found their subject matter in tribal and peasant societies in the Third World, and their method in long-term, intensive research. Together with these developments toward institutionalization, the training was routinized for graduate students of anthropology to become professionals by conducting field research abroad and publishing the results in anthropological journals. This process of change was a gradual one, taking place between the 1950s and 1970s. First, a few university positions were opened to anthropologists. Then, established anthropological theories and methods were brought in from Western Europe and

North America. Finally, chances for overseas field research were opened to more and more anthropologists. During this long process of change, the loosely defined interest in the Japanese and their way of life in general, which early anthropologists shared with YANAGITA Kunio (柳田國男), SHIBUSAWA Keizō, MIYAMOTO Tsuneichi and others, receded into the background. So long as "Japan and the Japanese" had been the main subject of research, it would have been hard for anthropologists to demonstrate a disciplinary uniqueness of their own. In order to insist that anthropology had its own subject and method, field research in the Third World was the best choice for them.

Explaining the centrifugal tendency of Japanese anthropology by the logic of its disciplinary institutionalization, however, is no more than an *a posteriori* reasoning, since gradual development was apparently a smooth process without much overt tension or debate. Anthropologists did not ask themselves why they moved their focus from Japan to the Third World. Serious self-reflection about the methodology of Japanese anthropology was lacking. Moreover, they shared an implicit and personal desire to be away from Japan without the effort of building a new methodology by turning their desire into a clear logic.

By the mid-1930s, pioneers of Japanese anthropology such as OKA Masao (岡正雄) parted with the group of Japanese folklorists led by YANAGITA. Instead of following YANAGITA's insistence to limit their research only to the Japanese themselves, they sought wider comparative studies of different peoples, or ethnology. Several recollections and research exist about how this early stage of Japanese anthropology took place, though mostly in an anecdotic way (MIYAMOTO 1972; KAMISHIMA 1973). The fact that a high percentage of the *JJE* articles were devoted to studies of ethnic Japanese until the mid-1970s might seem counter to the argument of the centrifugal tendency of Japanese anthropological research discussed above. However, the tendency was already strong among the early leaders of Japanese anthropology, and eventually resulted in its institutionalization. Since many *JJE* contributors in the field of ethnic Japanese studies had disciplinary backgrounds other than anthropology, they had no need to institutionalize it as a separate discipline. On the other hand, the early leaders of Japanese anthropology strove hard for the recognition and institutionalization of anthropology. In its early years, Japanese anthropology was formed and developed around a loosely defined interest in the Japanese. However, so long as its object of research was the Japanese, it had difficulty in establishing its own subject matter and methods of research in competition with older, better-established disciplines. The hidden tension between its original interest in the Japanese and its centrifugal tendency was eventually resolved in favor of the latter. As Japanese anthropology gradually transformed itself from a congregation of independent scholars outside academia to a university-based discipline, anthropologists shifted their focus more and more exclusively to tribal and peasant societies in the Third World. This was also a transition from the period of self-made anthropologists to that of anthropological training in universities, and the method of intensive fieldwork.

This transformation, which took place gradually from the late 1950s through the 1970s, was apparently a smooth process without much tension or debate. It was smooth because Japanese anthropologists could find ready-made models in British and American anthropology. Moreover, the transformation coincided with Japan's rise as an economic

power. In the 1970s and 1980s, many universities and research institutions opened new positions for anthropologists. Funding resources were expanded for anthropological research. Since that time, Japanese anthropologists have been conducting field research all over the world.

In retrospect, though, some critical questions were left unexamined in this seemingly prosperous state of Japanese anthropology. One of them is that of the centrifugal tendency. Why do so many Japanese anthropologists prefer foreign countries for their research, and more remote countries for that matter? The typical answers given to this question say that anthropology is the comparative study of different human groups instead of a narrowly egocentric study of one's own group; that it can relativize itself in juxtaposition to others; that one can better understand oneself by knowing others, and so on. Despite their merits as moral admonitions, these answers present a difficulty in that they are given without the historical context. The centrifugal tendency has led Japanese anthropologists to go in search of "others" as a category opposite to that of themselves. As has been shown above, however, the Japanese state and the larger political circumstances surrounding it basically determine who the "others" are. In Japanese anthropology, both the centrifugal tendency and the romanticized search for the ethnic Japanese have accepted this political space as a given fact, and worked in ways complementary to each other, one from without and the other from within. To ask why anthropologists study "others" may seem an unfruitful question, but one can ask how "selves" and "others" for the Japanese have been constructed in the process of state formation and nation-building, and how the shape of Japanese anthropology has been determined by that process.

Notes

1) In Japan, physical anthropologists have a much older organization of their own, from which socio-cultural anthropologists, as newcomers to Japanese academia, have been institutionally separated. The terms "anthropology" and "anthropologists" are used in this paper as shorthand for socio-cultural anthropology and socio-cultural anthropologists.

2) In Anderson's words it is "a detachable piece of a jigsaw puzzle" or "the map-as-logo." (Anderson 1991: 175)

3) The twenty-six years of the American occupation brought about a peculiar twist to the Okinawan's sense of regional autonomy. During that period "Return Okinawa to the Fatherland" became the dominant slogan among them, and the "Fatherland" meant Japan. Now, twenty-four years after its reunification with Japan, voices for Okinawa's cultural autonomy are again gaining strength.

4) There was, however, a significant difference between the Japanese and Western anthropologists at the time. Figure 1 indicates that "anthropology at home" was as important for the Japanese anthropologists as "colonial anthropology," seeing that the percentage of the *JJE* articles devoted to Area I (the ethnic Japanese) in the first period was even higher than for Area III (colonized territories). I will return to this later.

5) A couple of universities began offering positions to socio-cultural anthropologists in the 1950s, but it is only since the 1970s that the positions multiplied and programs for anthropology began to flourish in Japanese universities.

References

Anderson, Benedict

    1991   *Imagined communities*. 2nd edition. London: Verso.

ISHIDA Eiichirō (石田英一郎)

    1970   「人間を求めて——文化人類学三〇年」『石田英一郎全集』第 4 巻, 東京：筑摩書房. (In search of humankind: Thirty years in cultural anthropology. In *The collected works of ISHIDA Eiichirō*, vol. 4. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.)

MIYAMOTO Keitarō (宮本馨太郎)

    1972   「古野先生と日本における民族学の成立時期」古野清人教授古稀記念会編『現代諸民族の宗教と文化：社会人類学的研究——古野清人教授古稀記念論文集』東京：社会思想社. (Professor FURUNO Kiyoto and the time when ethnology was created in Japan. In *Religion and culture among contemporary peoples: Social anthropological essays dedicated to Professor FURUNO Kiyoto in commemoration of his seventieth anniversary* (ed.) Commemoration Committee. Tokyo: Shakai Shisō-sha.)

NAKANE Chie (中根千枝)

    1967   『タテ社会の人間関係』東京：講談社. (*Human relations in a vertical society*. Tokyo: Kōdan-sha.)

UMESAO Tadao (梅棹忠夫)

    1967   『文明の生態史観』東京：中央公論社. (*A theory of the ecological history of civilizations*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron-sha.)