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Introduction

In 1908, the medical doctor and amateur archaeologist Neil Gordon Munro (1863-1942) argued in his Prehistoric Japan that the Ainu were the indigenes of Japan, a people which had once populated the main islands of the archipelago but had been pushed northwards in the face of the “alien Yamato” (Munro, 1908/1911: 661). In addition to the Ainu and Yamato, Munro also mentions a third people, the Koro-pok-guru (romanised by Munro as Koropok-guru), and pays due respect to their main champion, one of the founding fathers of Japanese anthropology, Tsuboi Shōgorō (1863-1913). However, he is sceptical of their existence. “Neither in Honshu, nor in any other part of Japan, have the bones of a [Neolithic] race distinctly alien to the Ainu been unearthed from the shell-mounds [of Japan],” he states, determining the Koro-pok-guru to be the product of “myth” (Munro 1908/1911: 670, 85). Munro is far less sceptical about other peoples. Indeed, the “alien Yamato” should be viewed as a mixed nation, “a mixture of several distinct stocks,” the product of a blend of “Negrito, Mongolian, Palasiatic and Caucasian features” (Munro 1908/1911: 676).

1 This paper builds upon AskeW (2002) and AskeW (forthcoming). I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the support and encouragement of, together with comments from, Jerry Eades, Anne Geddes, and Peter Kirby.
2 I have seen TsuBoi’s given name as Masagorō, but will use the more common Shōgorō here. For Masagorō as a reading, see Torii (1927/1975: 459).
3 In discussing the "racial" composition of Great Britain, the leading British anthropologist John Beddoe (1826-1911), for instance, wrote in 1905 that while “the natives of the east of Ireland, the descendants of the later invaders, the upper classes, the people with English or Scottish surnames, tend to fairness,” those “natives of the west, the indigene, the labourers and peasants, the people with Keltic [sic] surnames, are darker, at least in hair colour,” and later stated that he regretted “the diminution of the old blond lympho-sanguine stock, which has hitherto served England well in many ways, but is apparently doomed to give way to a darker and more mobile type, largely the offspring of the proletariat” (Beddoe, 1905: 236, 237).
As was the case with many other contemporary Western anthropologists, MUNRO also assumed that race determined class,³ and therefore that the modern history of the Western conquest of the non-West could be viewed through the prism of race and projected back onto Japan’s past. For instance, MUNRO wrote as follows.

The leaders, if we may judge from the Caucasian and often Semitic physiognomy seen in the aristocratic type of Japanese, were partly of Caucasian, perhaps Iranian, origin. Some support of this proposition is found in the Haniwa, which not seldom exhibit features inclined to the Caucasian ... type .... These were the warriors, the conquerors of Japan, and afterwards the aristocracy, modified to some extent by mingling with a Mongoloid rank and file and by a considerable addition of Ainu, that is to say, of Palasiatic (proto-Caucasian?), blood (MUNRO 1908/1911: 679).

In other words, the contemporary domination of the world by the “Caucasian ... type” was not merely a modern phenomenon, but universal in terms of both time and geography. Indeed, the notion of a Caucasian ruling class and a darker working class (as remarked on by BEDDOE) is frequently seen in the Western discourse on the Japanese as well. Thus, for instance, at a much earlier time, S. B. KEMISH (1860: 138) wrote that the Japanese ruling class frequently boasted “complexions as fair and cheeks as ruddy as those of Europeans,” while “vagabonds on the highways ... have a skin of a colour between copper and a brown earthy hue.”⁴ Needless to say, the Social Darwinist notion of strength and power being equivalent to virtue can be readily read from these texts.

At almost the exact same time as MUNRO’s heavy tome was launched onto an unsuspecting public, From the Origins to the Arrival of the Portuguese in 1542 A.D., the first volume of A History of Japan by James MURDOCH (1856-1921), another Scotsman, was published.⁵ Here, MURDOCH (1910/1996: 47) stated that the literature seemed to agree “that the earliest inhabitants of these islands [of Japan] were the Ainu — or the Yemishi [Emishi], as they are called in the oldest Japanese annals.” The Ainu indigenes had been challenged for and deprived of their land by (Chinese) migrants who arrived via the Korean peninsula and settled in and around “Idzumo” (MURDOCH 1910/1996: 48). MURDOCH also argues for a pre-historic melting pot. Just as England had its Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, ancient Japan too could boast of a number of tribes: in addition to the migrants from the continent, others arrived from the south, and were “known at first as Kumaso and later as Hayato” (MURDOCH 1910/1996: 50).⁶ Again, as did MUNRO, MURDOCH claims that the early Japanese nation was a product of

---

³ Also see MACFARLANE (1852: 141) (“Many of the Upper classes, or members of the old families, are tall [,] exceedingly handsome in figure and countenance, and are far more like Europeans than Asiaties,” KEMISH (1860: 138), where the sentence is almost exactly the same, and STEINMETZ (1860: 347) where the sentence is corrected and repeated word for word. For the argument that the Japanese were a Caucasian people, see ASKEW (2002) and OGUMA (2002: chapter 10).

⁴ Note that MURDOCH’s second volume, During the Century of Early Foreign Intercourse (1542-1651), was published first. See MURDOCH (1903/1996).
misccegenation, and indeed that, according to legend, the mix of blood was seen in "the first earthly generation of the Imperial line." Moreover, this new, masculine and aggressive people conquered Japan in MURDOCH's book as well. "The combination of this branch of the [southern] Kumaso and the [continental or northern] Idzumo men proved irresistible; they pushed their conquests eastward along both shores of the Inland Sea, and ultimately established a strong central State in Yamato, at the expense of the aboriginal Ainu" (MURDOCH 1910/1996: 51).

Thus the narratives of both MUNRO and MURDOCH are based on the assumption of an ancient melting pot that produced the Japanese nation, and on a hypothetical (pre)history of displacement, where an earlier indigenous people was vanquished by later migrants. Both authors published their works in the last years of the Meiji period, immediately before the death of TSUBOI Shōgorō in 1913 which marked the end of an era in Japanese anthropology, and towards the end of the period of the professionalisation of anthropology as an academic discipline in the United States and Great Britain. Although the early Meiji era discourse was heavily influenced by amateur Western anthropologists active in Japan, MUNRO and MURDOCH published at a time when the Japanese debate had moved far ahead of that in any other language. In a very real sense, MUNRO's work in particular marked not only the high-tide of Western works on the origins of the Japanese, but also the end of the domination of the amateur Western anthropologist in Japan.

In a previous paper, I examined the debate on the Japanese race in Meiji Japan that produced some of the common assumptions seen in MUNRO and MURDOCH by the 1910s. Here, I will examine the writings of TORII Ryūzō (1870-1953), a leading anthropologist of pre-war Japan, and argue that the views of Japanese anthropologists such as TORII are echoed by both MUNRO and MURDOCH — or in other words that TORII and others had succeeded in establishing a view of the ancient Japanese that became accepted as the prevailing orthodoxy by the late Meiji era. With TORII, in other words, the era in which Japanese authors followed in the footsteps of earlier Western authors who had introduced the language and methodologies of

---

6 A number of tribes are mentioned in the Kojiki (The Record of Ancient Matters, compiled in 712) and Nihon Shoki (The Chronicles of Japan, compiled in 720), including the Emishi, Hayato, Izumo, Kumaso, and Tsuchigumo. The pre-war literature frequently assumed that these tribes should be differentiated in terms of ethnicity — "race" in the terminology of the times — rather than culture, language or geography, but, with the exception of the Emishi, a people (mistakenly) assumed to be the Ainu, often disagreed about what race(s) they represented.

7 Here, MURDOCH recognises clearly the debate in Japan on national origins, in which some looked to the north and others to the south in an attempt to determine where the original Japanese came from.

8 Although falling outside the bounds of this paper, it is useful to note that these common assumptions remained more or less unchanged throughout the pre-war era. Thus, for instance, Kalidas NAG's Prehistoric Japan mentions the Ainu or proto-Ainu as indigenes, and states "[t]he ethnic type which finally emerges as the Yamato or Japanese proper is ... a mixture of several distinct stocks" (NAG, 1941: 28).

9 This is not of course to deny that the prevailing orthodoxy continued to develop. For an introduction to the issues dealt with here, see especially ASKEW (2001; 2002; forthcoming), KIYONO (1944), KUDŌ (1979), OGUMA (2002), TERADA (1975), and finally YAMASHITA (forthcoming). For histories of anthropology in general, see DARNELL (1977), FAUBION (1993), and VERMEULEN and ROLDÁN eds. (1995), in addition to STOCKING's many works, including STOCKING (1968/1982, 1987, 1992).
modern Western science to Japan came to an end in the field of anthropology.

Before I discuss Torii himself, however, Japanese anthropology and the impact of empire will be briefly introduced in order to contextualise the major points made in this paper.10

Colonialism and Orientalism, or Anthropologists in Japan and Japanese Anthropologists

Residents of the large metropolitan areas of the Great Japanese Empire consumed the products of, and basked in the increased prestige they had gained from, their empire. In addition to the economic, political, and military aspects of Japanese imperialism, a cultural aspect existed whereby empire, colonialism, and interaction with the colonised internal Other became a significant constitutive element in the construction of a modern Japanese national identity. Any examination of the works of the first professional Japanese anthropologists such as Torii will demonstrate that the racial self-identity of the Japanese was constantly negotiated and renegotiated through interaction with Japan’s major Others. This took place on and through Japan’s expanding frontier, a place that was more than a geographical border demarcating the boundaries of the Great Japanese Empire at any particular time. Rather, as recent research in other areas and times has demonstrated, the frontier was a flexible and ambiguous place of interaction between the peoples of the empire, and specifically a place where Self negotiated identity through interaction with the alien and subordinate Other.11

Anthropologists, among others, used this ambivalent space in which to forge a national identity. The Japanese defined themselves by and through a definition of the ancient inhabitants of the archipelago, of the peoples of their present empire, and with an awareness of the homogenised “Westerner” lurking in the background.12

The major Others of the Japanese empire can be divided into two groups: the ancient Others, the Stone Age inhabitants of the archipelago, and the contemporary Others. The second group consisted of the hisabetsu burakumin (Japanese untouchables), a political and economic underclass frequently seen as an alien race, the Ainu, the peoples of Okinawa and Taiwan, and the Koreans in an expanding Japan, together with the various peoples of Japan’s

10 For the life and thought of Torii, see the short bibliography in his Complete Works (Torii Ryūjirō [1975]). Also see Nakazono (1995), Sasaki ed. (1993), Suenari (1988; 1991), Tabata (1997), and Tōkyō Daigaku Sōgō Kenkyū Shiryōkan Tōkubetsu Tenjī Jikkō Iinkai ed. (1991). Torii’s own works are readily available in his Complete Works (see Torii [1975-77]). In English, see Torii (1937) and the bilingual Torii Ryuzo Photographic Record Society ed. (1990).
12 The Others of the Japanese empire also took part in this debate. Despite the inherent interest of what these Others had to say – and perhaps in particular those who were subordinate in the metropolitan centers of the empire but dominant on the peripheries, such as the Taiwanese and Korean entrepreneurs and soldiers in Japan’s colonies and areas such as Manchukuo dominated by Japan – space does not permit me to examine this theme here.
colonies and the Japanese puppet-state of Manchukuo. Ancient and contemporary Others were
defined and classified, racialised and hierarchised, a process in which the identity of the
dominant Self was forged in relation to and in contrast with the subordinate Other. The
language and biases of the West were imported into Japan, intertwined with the modern
Western sciences the Japanese endeavoured to master. Thus, for instance, the notion of “race”
entered the Japanese vocabulary, as did the idea of Social Darwinism. Moreover, it could even
be argued that the Western and in particular the English bias against the north — the north
was viewed as the periphery, the end of the world, from whence came barbarians and
destruction — was replicated and echoed in the Japanese views of their own north, Hokkaidō
and the Kurile Islands.

The imperial ideology of the Japanese race changed dramatically over the course of the
history of the empire. A history of anthropology and race in Japan which covered the Meiji,
Taishō, and early Shōwa periods would plot a change whereby the Japanese, who had initially
seen themselves as an inferior race, and whose self-definition had been constructed vis-à-vis
the peoples of the West (who were seen as superior), became more and more willing, as their
empire grew, to view themselves also as a superior people, not only in comparison with the
colonised Other, but even with Westerners. In the works of TORII Ryūzō, there was also a major
shift from an early emphasis on a proto-Caucasian Ainu as the major ancestral group of the
Japanese to a growing emphasis on a Tungus people.

The importance of the frontier to anthropology and in defining Self is demonstrated in the
life of the pre-war Japanese anthropologist, TORII. Indeed, the expanding frontiers of the
Japanese empire constituted the major site of his fieldwork (see below). TORII’s life and field
trips plot to a certain extent at least the fashion in which anthropology and empire were linked,
and maps the process of negotiation and renegotiation with Japan’s Others. Japanese
imperialism was one between geographic neighbours, and much of his fieldwork can be
interpreted as an attempt to unearth the racial origins of the Japanese. Given the geographical
proximity and cultural affinity between Japan and its colonised Others, it is hardly surprising
that the politics of difference were not mapped in terms of colour onto the body in imperial
Japan, but in terms of culture, politics, and economy. Conceptualising difference was a process
that differed from the Western invention of the white-black dichotomy, but which did borrow
from the Victorian enthusiasm for the concept of civilisation. Thus, one characteristic of

\[13\] For a recent paper on TSUBOI and the concept of “race,” see YONAI (2003). For race in anthropology in
general, see STOCKING (1994/2001).

\[14\] In one of his very early works on the Liaodong Peninsula, TORII also discovered an Assyrian influence on the

\[15\] See STOCKING (1982/2001: 287) and his discussion of how the nature of anthropology in imperial powers such as
Great Britain, where the object of anthropological enquiry was the “dark-skinned ‘others’ in the overseas
empire,” differed from that of many parts of the European continent, where the object was the internal peasant
Other. Although it would be an exaggeration to define pre-war Japanese anthropology as falling completely
within the tradition of Volkskunde rather than Volkerkunde, it is important to note that Japan’s external Others
could be (and frequently were) redefined as internal Others as the empire expanded.
Japanese anthropology was that it was a lot closer to Volkskunde — the study of the internal and/or close Others within the state — than was anthropology as generally understood in the West.\textsuperscript{15}

A second major characteristic was that, as SHIMIZU (1999: 160-61) notes, unlike anthropology in the West, a central focus of pre-war Japanese anthropologic inquiry was the Japanese people and culture. This interest in Self as opposed to Other was part of the search for identity. “Japanese” self-identity, together with the constitutive elements of that identity, was a product of modernity, an ambiguous and evolving ideology of power, which replaced a pre-modern identity that was founded on local patriotism centered on the “han” or feudal domain. It emerged together with a modern, centralised Japanese nation-state — one that defined itself as an empire from its very birth — and the various assimilationist policies that were devised (and imposed on the peripheries of Japan) by this new nation-state. One of the catalysts of this modern self-identity was the Western impact and the deeply felt anxieties it triggered. There was a growing realisation that the world’s peoples and cultures were ranked in a hierarchy, and that the West was interested in Japan’s place in this hierarchy.\textsuperscript{16} Indeed, SHIMIZU (1998: 115) claims “anthropology in Japan began from the shocking realisation that the Japanese were the objects of Western observation.” The question of Japan’s place in the world was also a question of the superiority (or otherwise) of the Japanese race. It was a question that could only be addressed through a comparison with other races: had nature endowed Japanese with a superior (or inferior) physique and mental capacity? The search for a national identity within the context of the Western impact had a crucial influence on the nature and character of Japanese anthropology. At the same time, the peoples of the Great Japanese Empire served as an important foil in the forging of identity.

The imperialist period of modern Japanese history saw the birth and growth of modern Japanese academic anthropology and (slightly later) ethnology and archaeology. At the same time, the period during which Japan was both subjected to the Orientalising gaze of the West and to cultural imperialism on an unprecedented scale also coincided with the genesis of anthropology in Japan. While it would be an exaggeration to say that anthropology in Japan was a product of colonialism and/or Orientalism, it certainly did develop within the context of both.

As anthropology developed into a professional discipline in Japan, it roughly followed the three stages identified by STOCKING (1989: 208-09) — and subsequently criticised as the “mythistory of anthropology” by VAN BREMEN and SHIMIZU (1999: 3) — of the amateur ethnographer followed by the armchair anthropologist followed by the academically trained professional. In Meiji Japan, the first two groups consisted of a mixture of Westerners and Japanese, while the third consisted solely of Japanese. In other words, the anthropologists of Japan can be divided into two groups — Westerners and Japanese — and into three levels of specialisation. In terms of history, the stages through which Japanese anthropology progressed

\textsuperscript{15} For hierarchies of race, see STOCKING (1987) and PAGDEN (1995).
can be categorised as the Western gaze upon the Japanese, succeeded by the Japanese gaze upon the narrowly and then broadly defined “Japanese,” and finally the Japanese gaze upon the non-Japanese Other (these stages can also be mapped out in terms of geography). In other words, as Western amateurs were replaced by an institutionalised and increasingly professional group of Japanese anthropologists (among whom Torii was a leading figure), the Western gaze to which Japan had been subjected was replaced by a Japanese gaze of Self and then of the peoples and cultures of neighbouring countries and beyond. In terms of anthropology, as in much else, Japan was a colonised coloniser; an observed object of the Orientalist gaze that objectified its own Others.

Another way of looking at the general history of anthropology is to focus on paradigms. In his “Paradigmatic Traditions in the History of Anthropology,” Stocking summarises the history of anthropology into a number of paradigms, including the biblical, developmental, and polygenetic schools of thought. The biblical tradition embraced a number of key concepts, including a three-branched genealogical tree in conceptualising human beings — the three branches founded by the sons of Noah, with Japheth in Europe, Sem in Asia, and Ham in Africa — and the notion of the Tower of Babel. The evolutionist or developmental tradition emphasised not a degeneration of knowledge as mankind moved further and further away from direct knowledge of God, but rather a progressive learning process. Finally, the polygenetic tradition viewed not only culture and ethnos as distinct within the framework of a universal anthrophos, but claimed that anthrophos itself was not a universal concept: the “races” were truly different (Stocking 1990/1992: 347-49). All three paradigms were seen in Japanese anthropology, although some substituted the Kiki myths that emerged from Kojiki and Nihon Shoki for the Bible.\(^\text{17}\)

**The Debate in Japan**

Yet another framework within which Japanese anthropology can be examined is provided by the broad brushstrokes of Kiyono Kenji (1885-1955), who summarises the pre-war Japanese anthropological discourse as falling into a Meiji period Koro-pok-guru theory, a Taishō period Ainu theory, and a (pre-war) Shōwa period Japanese (Japanese Proper) theory (see Kiyono 1944). This rough generalisation provides a starting line from which the early anthropological debate in Japan can be analysed.

One constitutive element of the early debate was a strong and negative nationalistic reaction to the Western impact. Indeed, the rivalry with and antagonism towards Western predecessors is clear from even a cursory reading of the literature. Thus, for instance, Shirai Mitsutarō (1863-1932) welcomed the establishment of the Tōkyō Jinruigakkai (Tokyo Anthropological Society) in 1886 specifically because he believed it would provide a means to reassert Japanese national control over the discourse on Japan; Tsubo in effect closed a

\(^{17}\) Torii based many of his assumptions of the ancient past of the archipelago on his readings of the Kiki texts.
chapter of the history of early Japanese anthropology when he removed from Tokyo Imperial University Morse's collection of archaeological findings unearthed in Ōmori; and Torii reinforced this closure by downplaying the importance of Morse as the founder of Japanese anthropology in favour of Tsuboi (Shirai 1886: 4; Oguma 2002: 13; Torii 1927/1975: 460-61; Shimizu 1999: 163 note 12).

The first major debate to take place in the context of this process of institutionalisation, professionalisation, and (on the part of Japanese writers) antagonism to Western authors, was a debate on the pre-historical people(s) of Stone Age Japan. Among the Japanese authors, the two main initial positions were those of scholars such as Tsuboi, on the one hand, who claimed that the true indigenes were a pre-Ainu people, the Koro-pok-guru, and those of others such as Koganei Yoshikiyō (1858-1944), a friend of Tsuboi and the father of Japanese physical anthropology, who thought that the Stone Age inhabitants of Japan were the Ainu. These positions were later supplemented by Torii, who agreed with Koganei that the Ainu were the indigenes of the archipelago, but also advocated the notion that a second Stone Age people also existed, the "Japanese Proper," a hybrid nation that emerged from a melting pot of a plurality of peoples from northeast Asia, Indochina and Indonesia (Torii 1918/1975). Shimizu (1999: 125) claims that the Koro-pok-guru "controversy continued for more than two decades [effectively ending when Tsuboi died in 1913], involving leading anthropologists of the years," which is correct, but adds "no foreign scholars participated in it," which is incorrect. In fact, as I have argued elsewhere, not only did a similar debate take place among "foreign scholars" as well, but it not infrequently preceded the Japanese discussion (Askew 2002).

Anthropology is usually defined as the research of the Other and alien cultures by the Self, and it thus assumes a relationship between the anthropologist as self and the objectified Other. Historically, this was (or at least has been perceived as) a power relationship between the Western, colonising Self and the non-Western, colonised, "coloured" Other in which the "civilised," "enlightened," "rational" Self defined, objectified and viewed the "indigenous," "primitive," "emotional" Other, and in which the active, masculine Self understood and analysed, while the passive, feminine Other was the object of analysis (Shimizu 1998: 111-12).

However, this understanding of anthropology fails to capture the characteristics of (early) Japanese anthropology, which consisted of an examination not of the Other but of Self and Near-self, and while imperialism and the colonial relationship were certainly not unimportant, Japan remained a colonised coloniser. Moreover, the Other was often defined in terms of time rather than place — in other words, was discovered in Japan's ancient past rather than, or as

---

18 For Edward Sylvester Morse (1838-1925), see for instance Morse (1983) and Yoshioka (1987).
19 For representative papers, see Tsuboi (1887), a reply to an earlier paper by "MS" (Shirai Mitsutarō) which had rejected the notion that the Koro-pok-guru had ever existed, and Koganei (1904/1926).
20 In one representative paper, the list of references cites twenty-nine authors (including the author of the paper in question), of which 15 are Japanese and 14 are Western authors. See Koganei (1904/1926). Not only were Western authors writing extensively on the Ainu, the subject of this particular paper by Koganei, but there was at least a degree of interaction in that Japanese authors were citing the findings of their Western competitors. Also see Munro (1908/1911: 69, 258, 648, 670) where he returns the compliment, citing Koganei.
well as, inside or outside Japan's borders.

Since Japan was a colonised coloniser, Japanese anthropology emerged in an environment where the “Japanese,” Japanese society, culture and history were subjected to the gaze of and defined by the Western observer or modern science. Early Western anthropologists in Japan debated the identity of the pre-historic inhabitants of the Japanese archipelago, and the relationship between these pre-historic “Japanese” and the modern “Japanese.” In Japan, interest in the topic was stimulated by an awareness that the “Japanese” were being defined in unflattering terms by the West (MORSE, for instance, argued that the pre-historic inhabitants had been cannibals).

Although it would be overly simplistic to claim that as the Great Japanese Empire expanded outwards, Japanese interest also began to move from the pre-historic past of the archipelago to the colonies of the present (SHIMIZU 1998: 116), a shift did certainly occur in terms of both time and geography as the borders of Japan expanded. This shift, however, was one in which the depiction of pre-historic Japan became much more complex, and in which the peoples of areas around Japan began to play a far more significant role. Here, I will argue that as the Japan of the day colonised Asia, pre-historic Asians colonised Japan. A major figure behind both the development in Japan of a professional anthropology and this discovery of a multi-ethnic Japan and a pre-historic melting pot was TORII. He was active in a Japan which was emerging as an imperial power, in a field (anthropology) which was rapidly moving away from the amateurism of the early Western anthropologists in Japan towards specialisation and professionalisation, and in an environment in which Japan observed rather than was observed. TORII was typical of pre-war anthropologists in that he was almost exclusively active in areas colonised (or at least targeted) by the empire. It is to this central figure of pre-war anthropology in Japan that we now turn.

**TORII Ryûzô**

As noted above, the expanding frontiers of the Japanese empire constituted the major site of TORII’s fieldwork. Born in Tokushima in 1870, he joined the Tokyo Anthropological Society in 1886, and began to correspond with TSUBOI. From 1893, he worked in the anthropology department (*Jinruigaku Kyôshitsu*) at Tokyo Imperial University, where he also studied.

In Japan, the classification of peoples, the way in which they were understood, perceived and ranked, was a process that took place on two levels: the classification on a global scale of Japanese vis-à-vis the peoples of the West, and the classification on a regional scale of the

---

21 Within the empire, perception helped to determine fate: a hierarchy was created, and those at the top were treated differently than those at the bottom (so that, for instance, the pressures placed on Koreans to assimilate were far greater than those placed on the peoples of the South Seas because Koreans were seen as “closer” to the Japanese).

22 Thus TORII published several papers in English and French. See in particular TORII (1917; 1917/1976; 1937) and in general the various other papers collected in TORII (1976).
various peoples (ethnic and other minorities) of the Japanese empire vis-à-vis the Japanese. In the West, Japanese anthropologists including TORII managed to “write back,” creatively engaging in the Western conversation about Japanese culture and race. Of these two levels, this paper will concentrate on the minorities of the empire as depicted in TORII’s writings on the Japanese Proper.

Despite the relatively small difference in age with individuals such as KOGANEI (born in 1858) and especially TSUBOI (born in 1863), TORII was one of the first of a new generation of anthropologists in Japan to be nurtured (if not educated) within a functioning academic, professional framework. TORII was also blessed in terms of the timing of his birth: while in his mid-twenties, in 1895, he embarked on his first field trip overseas, surveying the Liaodong Peninsula. This was the first of many overseas journeys he made to areas where he had been preceded by the Japanese military (the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 had finished just months before). Since his life was to run parallel with the expansion of the Great Japanese Empire, and in a very real sense much of his fieldwork was conducted at a time when, and in areas where, new “minorities” were being created through imperial aggression and expansion, TORII mapped the frontier in a way few others could. He was also frequently the first academic anthropologist to visit many parts of the Asian continent.

Thus, in 1896, 1897, and 1898 he travelled to Taiwan, ceded to Japan in 1895, stopping off in Okinawa in 1896. He visited Chishima (the Kurile Islands) in 1899, returning to Taiwan the next year, in 1900. In 1902-03 he visited south-western China to study the Miao, and in 1904 returned to Okinawa. In the following year, 1905, Japan emerged victorious in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05, and TORII made his second trip to Manchuria after his appointment as Lecturer at Tokyo Imperial University. From 1906 to 1908 he concentrated on Mongolia, but in 1909 returned to Manchuria. In 1910 and 1911, he travelled to Korea, annexed by Japan in 1910, and also visited Karafuto (Sakhalin) in 1911. In 1912, he went to Korea and Manchuria. From 1913 to 1916, he travelled four times to Korea. Following the Russian Revolution, the subsequent civil war, and the Japanese military intervention in Siberia, TORII’s interests expanded northwards. He travelled to Siberia in 1919, and Sakhalin and Siberia in 1921. In 1922, he was promoted to Associate Professor at Tokyo Imperial University, and also began teaching at Kokugakuin University, where he was promoted to Professor in 1923, resigning from Tokyo Imperial in 1924. He returned to China in 1926, and Manchuria in 1927. In 1928 he went to Siberia and Manchuria, then Mongolia again in 1930. In 1928 he was also involved in the founding of Sophia University, taking up a position as Dean of the Faculty of Arts. He travelled frequently to Manchuria between 1931 and 1935 in the immediate aftermath of the 1931 Manchurian Incident. In 1937, he went to South America — the one and only time he moved beyond the broadly defined frontier of the Great Japanese Empire — but was back in China in 1938 following the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War of 1937-45, and Manchuria and

---

23 Within the Japanese-language anthropological discourse, TORII’s fieldwork in Chishima led him to reject TSUBOI’s Koro-pok-guru theory.
China in 1940. Having resigned from Kokugakuin University in 1933, he accepted a position at Yenching (Yanjing) University (a predecessor of Beijing University) in 1939, where he remained (with a brief hiatus from 1941-45 during which the university was closed) until 1951, when he returned to Japan. He died fifty years ago, in 1963, aged 82 years.24

These research trips not only followed closely the footsteps of imperial expansion (and were at times partly financed by organs of imperialism), but also produced work that justified Japanese imperialism by mapping out a relationship between, and thus connecting, coloniser and colonised in the ancient past.25

This brief outline of a full and active life indicates, to a certain extent at least, the way in which anthropology and empire were linked. TORII’s travels and extensive fieldwork led him to define Japanese racial origins in terms of, in contrast to, or in comparison with many of Japan’s Others, the colonised, subordinate geographical neighbours of his own time. Ironically, in TORII’s works these neighbours played a major role in forming the ancient Japanese people.

The major fieldwork TORII conducted within Japan Proper (naichichi) took place between 1917 and 1926, and was oriented to discovering the origins of both the “Japanese” and Japanese culture. His theory about the origins of the “Japanese” had a number of characteristics. The first was the emphasis on the Asian continent. In discussing the ancient Japanese archipelago, TORII wedded archipelago to continent, and at the same time past to present. In a very real sense, his field trips to the continent informed his understanding of Japan’s ancient past. Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to say that TORII discovered Japan’s pre-history on the continent. The second major characteristic was that TORII argued in favour of an ancient melting pot and a multi-ethnic Japan. His narrative thus was representative of the pre-war “mixed nation theory” (kongo minzokuron) that focused on the ideas of an ancient ethnic melting pot and heterogeneity. In TORII’s works, the various ethnic components and experience of the Great Japanese Empire of his own day were projected back onto the past. He also foreshadowed several theories of the Japanese nation, such as the arguments that the Japanese and Koreans shared a common ancestor (Nissen Dōsoron) or that a horse-riding people (Kiba Minzoku) had conquered ancient Japan. Before examining TORII’s ideas, however, the intellectual environment in which they were developed will be briefly examined.

As noted above, the death of TSUBOI marked the collapse of the Koro-pok-guru theory and the emerging dominance of KOGANEI and TORII’s theory of the Ainu as indigenes. The challenges this paradigm faced were first those from researchers such as HASEBE Kotondo

24 For details of TORII’s life and fieldwork, see the detailed chronology contained in the separate volume (nikkan) of his Complete Works (TORII [1977: 180-222]). Also see SASAKI ed. (1993: 16-17), SUENARI (1988: 50), TERADA (1975: 68), and, for a detailed look at the connections between his fieldwork and the empire, SUENARI (1991). The large number of detailed research reports TORII wrote following his various field trips are available in his Complete Works. See TORII (1975-77).

25 TORII cannot, however, be simply dismissed as an imperialist: as noted above, not only was he allowed to remain in China after the war ended in 1945, but also to retain his position at Yenching University.
(1882-1969), who viewed the Stone Age inhabitants of the archipelago as the direct ancestors of the modern Japanese, and Hamada Kosaku (1881-1938), who argued that there was no racial break between the Jōmon and Yayoi peoples (Terada, 1975: 150-51). This debate can be summarised as one in which the two opposing sides argued for and against the notion of ethnic plurality in Japan’s ancient past.26

This was a period which saw a sudden increase in the scale, sophistication, and precision of archaeological work in Japan. Torii’s writings on the existence of three types of Jomon pottery (Usude-type, Atsude-type, and Deou-type),27 and his argument that each type of pottery was the product not of different periods but rather of different clans, not only foreshadowed his ideas about a racial explanation for the differences between Jōmon and Yayoi pottery, but was also a reflection of the increasingly sophisticated archaeological research being conducted in Japan. In terms of the arguments about race, archaeology was important because the growing awareness that Yayoi pottery was distinct and clearly not a product of Jōmon culture triggered a debate about the origins of the Japanese nation, and because it could be shown that Yayoi culture had been a Stone Age one.

Kiyono Kenji was also active at this time. He had collected the bones of 559 Stone Age individuals from various areas of Japan by 1925 when his Nippon Genjin no Kenkyū (Research of Primitive Japanese Man) was published, and had 656 by 1928 for his Nippon Sekki Jidaijin Kenkyū (Research of the Japanese Stone Age Man) (Kiyono 1925, 1928). There were indications of a shift in methodology and approach, as symbolised by the publication of Hasebe’s journal Shizen Jinruigaku (Natural Anthropology) and the publication of Furuhata Tanemoto (1891-1975)’s research on hemotypology (blood types) (Terada 1975: 152-54, 192). Anthropology in Japan was thus already showing signs of being colonised by the natural sciences, especially by Kiyono’s mathematical approach and by the anatomy of physical anthropology. Ironically, perhaps, Torii began as a natural scientist, but moved away towards a cultural approach, his fieldwork in south-western China in 1902-03 proving a turning point (Torii 1913/1975: 482).

Despite a heavy schedule of fieldwork overseas, Torii did conduct research within Japan Proper between 1916, when he returned from Korea, and 1919, when he left for Siberia, and again from 1920 to 1926. Well before this period, however, he had already begun to connect various parts of the continent to Japan. Thus, for instance, in his “Manshū no Sekki Jidai Iseki to Chōsen no Sekki Jidai Iseki to no Kankei ni tsuite (On the Relationship between Stone Age Remains in Manchuria and Stone Age Remains in Korea),” he not only noted the similarities between stone tools in Manchuria and Korea, but also argued that Yayoi period stone tools

---

26 Another challenge was the position which argued that regional variance existed in modern Japan — or, in other words, that traces of ancient ethnic plurality could be seen in the present. I hope to be able to discuss these various theories in a future paper.

27 Usude-type pottery was thin, delicate and small, Torii claimed, the product of an effeminate culture which existed close to the sea and was based on fishing, while Atsude-type pottery was large and rough, the product of an inland, masculine culture based on hunting. See Torii (1918/1975: 232-34) and Terada (1975: 173). Deou-type pottery was named after the area in northern Japan where it was discovered.
unearthed in Japan were *continental* in nature (TORII 1908/1976). The similarities were explained in terms of race: the same people had created the same tools in all three areas. TORII’s conclusions were clear: the ancestors of the Japanese had once resided in Manchuria and Korea, and had brought their culture with them to Japan from the continent.28 These early conclusions (also of course seen in the works by MUNRO and MURODOCH) were reinforced once he started his active fieldwork in Japan, beginning with the work conducted in Nara, Osaka and Wakayama in 1917. In the same year, 1917, he published an article in *Revue Anthropologique* in which he criticised MUNRO’s argument (published in the *Japan Times*) that both the Ainu and the Yamato peoples were Caucasian. According to TORII, the Yamato were a Mongolian people. The Ainu (Tsuchigumo) were the indigenous people of the archipelago, and the Tungus Yamato came to Kyushū from Manchuria and Korea, establishing a separate Stone Age culture on the archipelago which co-existed with that of the Ainu (in other words, two independent Stone Age cultures existed in the ancient archipelago). A third wave of Indonesians entered again from Kyushū, coming from the south with metal weapons (this third wave were the Hayato). Finally, a fourth wave, related to the Tungus already in Japan, arrived in about 800 B.C., married a princess of the second wave, and created the Imperial Household (TORII, 1917/1976; KUDO 1979: 208-22; TERADA 1975: 83-84). According to TORII, “the Japanese of today originated from these three nations [Ainu, Tungus, and Indonesians] ... Just like the French [he was of course writing in French], the Japanese emerged from a mixture of the blood of a great number of nations” (TORII 1917/1976: 642). At the time, his utilisation of the Kiki texts (from whence came the terms Tsuchigumo and Hayato) was not unusual: the Kiki mythology together with notion of several distinct waves of migrants and a subsequent intermarriage remained the basic framework of TORII’s theory of the Japanese nation.29

During the period roughly from 1916 to 1919, TORII refined his theory of the “Japanese Proper” (*Japonais proprement dits, koyū Nipponjin*) as Stone Age inhabitants of the archipelago and as the creators of Yayoi pottery. The Japanese Proper had travelled along a route from Manchuria through Korea to Japan, a path that TORII also covered (albeit in reverse), and were discussed in a series of papers, including “Kodai no Nippon Minzoku Ijū Hatten no Keiro” (The Route taken by the Ancient Japanese Nation in Migration and Development) (1916), “Genshi Jidai no Jinshu Mondai” (The Racial Question in Ancient History) (1923), “Senshi Jidai no Ainujin to Waga Sosen no Senkusha” (The Pre-historic Ainu and Our Ancestors’ Predecessors) (1925), and especially his monumental work, *Yūshi Izen no Nippon* (Pre-historic Japan) (1918).30

28 TORII wrote a large number of papers that made the same type of argument. For example, see TORII (1907/1976) for a paper that uses linguistics to argue for links with Mongolia.

29 See TORII (1917/1976) for a Japanese translation of the original paper. Also see TORII (1917) and the last section of a long report on the Kurile Ainu, which discusses the origins of the Japanese (TORII [1919/1976: 508-17]).

30 All the above are readily available in TORII’s Complete Works. See TORII (1916/1975; 1918/1975; 1923/1975; 1925/1975). Note that *Yūshi Izen no Nippon* was reprinted several times: the version included in his Complete Works that has been used here is the thirteenth edition published in 1925.
As noted above, TORII argued that two Stone Age peoples inhabited the Japanese archipelago — the Jōmon Ainu, the indigenes of the Japanese archipelago, and the Yayoi Japanese Proper, a Tungus people that came through the Korean peninsula from Manchuria and were the ancestors of the modern "Japanese." According to TORII, the Ainu were a "mongrel race," the product of a mixture of an originally Caucasian people with Mongolian blood (TORII, 1916/1975: 504). The Stone Age tools created by the Japanese Proper were similar to those unearthed in Korea and Manchuria, while the pottery showed similarities to pottery discovered in Korea, Manchuria, and Eastern Mongolia. Anthropology and linguistics had demonstrated a relationship between the Japanese, Koreans, Manchurians, Tungus, and Mongolians: now, TORII claimed, archaeology also confirmed this. (Note that the difference between Jōmon and Yayoi was not one of time or period but of ethnicity.) The Japanese Proper were followed by a third wave of Indonesians (a Malay race) from the south (the Hayato he believed had similar customs to Indonesians). The curly hair of some Japanese could be explained by the "Negrito blood" that this people brought from the south. In other words, this Malay people was also a "mongrel race," having intermingled with "Negritos" (among others) before coming to Japan. Finally, focusing on bronze bells (dōaku), TORII argued that a people related to the Indo-Chinese Miao from south-western China came too, bringing the secrets of metal-working with them (this group was given greater prominence here than in his 1917 papers in French); and were followed by another wave of Tungus who also brought metal tools to the archipelago.

Thus, according to TORII, in terms of race, the ancient archipelago looked very much like the Great Japanese Empire of his own day, with a large number of different ethnic groups residing within the same geographical area. The major difference was one of direction: the ancient continent had in effect conquered the archipelago, while the contemporary continent was being conquered. As we have seen, some of the ancient peoples were already "mongrel races," and all intermingled, producing a "mongrel people" (zasshu minzoku) that continued to intermarry with others. Thus "mongrels became even more complicated mongrels." "In short, the Japanese nation is not a simple one; rather, a complicated number of peoples ... have gathered in the island empire [Japan]." Miscegenation turned this multi-ethnic group into the modern Japanese nation, with the glue joining the various groups together provided by the Imperial Household (TORII 1918/1975: 390).

The implications in terms of the policies of TORII's own time are clear. First, he provided a version of ancient history that traced the links between Japan and Korea back to the Stone Age. It is therefore not surprising that he wrote elsewhere in favour of the annexation of Korea, arguing that the "Nisenjin" (Japareans) were originally the same race and therefore Korean independence could not be justified in terms of "national self-determination" (TORII 1920/1977). This model was then used for other areas of the empire. When, for instance, TORII made the happy discovery in 1918, the very year Japanese troops were sent to Siberia, that "the races which inhabit Siberia are all the same lineage as the Japanese," he could not have been unaware of the political implications of his findings in terms of legitimising any Japanese
claims to the lands and resources of the area (TORII 1918/1975: 394). Second, since he had argued that ethnic assimilation based on intermarriage had succeeded in the past, it appeared that the same model could be used for the current empire. TORII’s ancient melting pot was one in which the Japanese Proper assimilated minority peoples, and in which minorities discarded their own cultures in favour of those of the ruling majority. In other words, while assimilation could be depicted in benign terms as “fusion and unification,” it also privileged the Japanese Proper. Finally, TORII’s understanding of the distant past suggested that contemporary assimilation could be based on a shared culture that centered around worship of the Emperor. In TORII’s ancient Japan, peoples from the south — from Indonesia and south-western China — together with peoples from the north — from Korea, Manchuria, Mongolia, and Siberia — had all travelled to, and been assimilated within, the island empire. Clearly, empire, colonialism and interaction with the colonised Other was a significant constitutive element in his construction of the Japanese national identity.

As seen in the introduction, the narratives of Western authors such as MUNRO and MURDOCH also came to be based on the assumptions of an ancient melting pot that produced the Japanese nation, and of a hypothetical (pre)history of displacement, where the indigenous Ainu were vanquished by later migrants. These ideas together with the ethnic constitutive elements of the ancient melting pot were a product of the flexible and ambiguous frontier of the empire. As can be seen from TORII’s own life, his interaction with the peoples of the empire enabled him to negotiate a new Japanese identity. Whatever his own intentions may have been, moreover, his theory of ancient Japan and the origin of the Japanese nation matched the needs of empire.

**Conclusion**

Although Japanese anthropology as practiced by Japanese anthropologists developed within the context and framework of imperialism, it differed from the Western anthropology which, in Talal ASAD’s (1973/1998: 103) words, was “a holistic discipline nurtured within bourgeois society, having as its object of study a variety of non-European societies which [had] come under its economic, political and intellectual domain,” and which emerged from a relationship of dichotomies or opposites — black versus white, civilised versus non-civilised, superior versus inferior. Japanese anthropology to a much larger extent emerged from a hierarchy, but not (always) of opposites. Instead of opposites, the *distance* between Japanese and almost-Japanese was stressed. Moreover, in the nineteenth century especially, Western anthropology to a much greater extent than Japanese anthropology tended to link the concepts of progress and development to racial preoccupations and skin colour. Savages were black, barbarians red or brown, the semi-civilised were yellow, and the civilised were white (STOCKING 1994/2001). For obvious reasons, this form of racialised discourse was one that nationalistic Japanese could only engage in if the Japanese were first defined as white (or if the relative superiority of the various colours was changed). In TORII’s works on the origins of the
“Japanese,” the various ethnic components and the experience of the Great Japanese Empire of his own day were projected back onto the past, but (unlike authors such as Munro) the ideology of Caucasian rule of the non-Caucasian was not. Torii’s ancient Japan was a multinational forum in which the Japanese Proper assimilated a great variety of peoples and over which the Imperial Household ruled without racial frictions. Here, Caucasians were not only not destined to rule, but a Caucasian people, the Ainu, had been overwhelmed by the (superior) Japanese Proper.

Colonial anthropology in pre-war Japan was thus not the study (invention) of the Other in terms of a black-and-white dichotomy. Rather, it was the study of the closely related Other. Anthropology is sometimes viewed as a body of knowledge constructed around the descriptions of various Others encountered by the European Self in the course of European overseas expansion (Stocking 1990/1992: 347). However, Japanese imperialism differed from Western imperialisms; and it is perhaps only natural that its anthropology did too.

It hardly needs to be said that once the assumption was established that various races existed, and that these races could be classified and ranked along a hierarchy or ladder — savage, barbarian, and civilised man, as the classic (and sexist) categorisation went — it became possible to rewrite national histories, which were reconstructed around the theme of a racial struggle for survival and domination: Munro and Murdock encapsulate this reconstruction. In the case of Japan, as elsewhere, (pre)history was interpreted to demonstrate that a superior people or peoples had vanquished inferior foes. As I have attempted to show here, however, a non-Caucasian, hybrid, “mixed nation,” the Japanese Proper, emerged victorious from the struggle for existence in the Japanese-language discourse.

The pre-1945 Japanese discourse on national identity that produced the Japanese Proper was an imperial construct. The anthropological discourse on the (origins of the) Japanese race and nation in the Great Japanese Empire can be divided into three different narratives. The first claimed that one nation had replaced or displaced another, the second that two (or more) nations had co-existed and mixed their blood, while the third focused on the role of evolution. Torii in effect combined the first and second narratives, arguing both that the Stone Age Japanese Proper had displaced the Ainu and at the same time that the Japanese Proper were the product of an ancient melting pot. As demonstrated here, these ideas were influenced by the Japanese empire. With Torii, Japanese imperial rule overseas impacted on the construction of a modern Japanese self-identity.
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