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This article reviews Australian Aboriginal Studies by Japanese scholars over the period from 1892 to 2006. Both literature-based and fieldwork-based studies are reviewed, and transformations in the representations of Aboriginal people are described. Especially following the reorganization of anthropology in Japan after the U.S. occupation, a rich variety of research results concerning Aboriginal people have accumulated through studies by Japanese scholars. Major contributions by Japanese ethnographers to the study of remote, urban and rural Aboriginal communities are introduced. In conclusion, I propose four categories of ethnographic description as a blueprint by which Japanese anthropologists can further cooperate in Australian Aboriginal studies in the future.
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1. Introduction

As with all reviews of academic research, there are various manners in which a discussion of Japanese contributions to research on Aboriginal people might be organized. On the one hand, one might take Australian national policy to Aboriginal people as an organizing framework in presenting relevant academic research and writing. Whether literature-based or fieldwork-based, such research might thus be presented according to the following chronological scheme: the pre-colonial period until 1788, the extermination period until the 1830s, the period of forced protection and separation policies until the 1930s, the period to 1972 of assimilation policies, and the era of self-determination since 1972. On the other hand, one might organize the literature to be reviewed according to changes in Japanese national policy that influenced research by Japanese scholars on Aboriginal people, dividing such research into the period to 1945 of Imperial Japan and the postwar period of research since 1945. Finally, a third organizational possibility, focusing on research methodologies, would be to divide the review into sections on literature-based studies to the 1960s and on fieldwork-based study after the 1960s.

Taking these historical and methodological contexts into account, in the following I divide

Japanese research on Aboriginal people into three broad eras: (1) Pre-World War I literature-based studies, 1892-1945, (2) Post-World War II literature-based studies, 1945-1960s, and (3) fieldwork-based studies from 1963 to the present. While there is a long and ongoing history of cross-cultural interaction between Japanese and Australian Aboriginal people, including the Torres Strait Islanders, I do not discuss cross-cultural interaction in this review. Instead, I focus on Australian Aboriginal studies conducted by Japanese anthropologists, especially cultural anthropologists. I first describe literature-based research presented in the period to 1945. I then examine early postwar literature-based Japanese contributions to Aboriginal Studies. Finally, I address the period of postwar fieldwork-based research. I divide discussion of such fieldwork research into four sections on (1) early field studies, (2) community studies, (3) urban studies, and (4) rural studies.

2. Pre-World War II Literature-based Studies, 1892-1945

An important historical base for this article is the national political situation of Imperial Japan. As historian SAKANO Toru has written, the Japanese government established the South Sea Government in Palau in 1922, following the Japanese Empire's involvement in World War I. Before this, several Japanese anthropologists had conducted field research in some Asian countries occupied by Japan (SAKANO 2005). However, there was no urgent Japanese political requirement for field research in the South Seas area, because existing Western research supplied the required knowledge (SAKANO 2005). However, Australia was introduced as part of the Pacific Area in the volume on Overseas Developing Countries included in The Japanese Geography Compendium, published in 1931. Australia had thus come into the field of view of the Japanese Empire (SASAKI and TATSUE 1931). After Japan left the League of Nations in 1933, the Southward Advance was begun. In August 1936, the Southward Advance was officially described in a blueprint for the Empire (SAKANO 2005: 388-389). After the Greater East Asia Co-Prospereity Sphere was proposed in 1940, the Empire rushed into the Pacific War in December 1941, and the Ministry of Greater East Asia was established in 1942. In this way, Australia increasingly became seen as an important 'resource' for Imperial Japan.

Against this historical background, we can treat TSUBOI Shogoro (1863-1913, Tokyo Imperial University) as the earliest Japanese anthropologist to address the subject of Aboriginal people, In 1892, TSUBOI wrote in an article entitled "Archaeology and Anthropology" that "Some Australian natives seem still to be living utterly in the Stone Age" (TSUBOI 1892: 10). After he took a position as professor at the Tokyo Imperial University of Science, TSUBOI
wrote a series of articles about Aboriginal people. For example, in Woman and Child, introducing different perceptions of reproduction, different customs of marriage, cannibalism, and selective population thinning, he wrote that “There is no difference in terms of the love emotion; regarding love for children we can’t find any differences in Australia”. It is worth noting that here there was no apparent disdain in his text, although disdainful comments may be often found in other works after Tsuboi.

As Sakano (2005:404) has pointed out, after 1924, when Torii Ryūzō (1870-1953), who succeeded Tsuboi, left Tokyo Imperial University, Japanese anthropology greatly shifted toward physical anthropology. From this time, views of Aboriginal people began to change as the natural science concept of ‘race’ took precedence over the theretofore natural history inclination of academic anthropology. Nishimura Shinji (1879-1943, Waseda University), wrote an article on ‘Race’ that was included in The World Geography and Customs Compendium, which was edited by Torii et al. and published in 1930. Regarding Aboriginal people, on the one hand he assessed that “their social customs are complicated and their mythology tremendously rich”, while on the other hand he wrote “the mode of life of Australian natives is characteristic of the Old Stone Age” and “has many primitive characteristics”. For example, Nishimura wrote that the Aboriginal concept of numbers consisted solely of 1 and 2 (Nishimura 1930:60). In another article in the same compendium, a different author writes of the “Australian Race” as being “the lowest race”. The caption under a photograph of Aboriginal people in another article, reads: “most ugly people” and “barbarian fishing”. However, all these authors, including Sasaki, were amateurs on Aboriginal people. Authors of this period appeared to make frequent reference to the Nishimura article. In this way, Nishimura’s discourse, along with that of Koyama Eizō (1899-1983) became the main resource for non-professional authors writing on Aboriginal people. Through these inter-textual citations, recognizable and apparent traits seem to have been reproduced in many essays, while these negative descriptions were so often repeated that Japanese readers seem to have become convinced that such representations were based on established facts.

As the physical anthropological concept of ‘race’ had by then become mainstream in Japanese anthropology, the tone of this discourse again underwent transformation after the official declaration of the 'Southward Advance' by the Japanese government. For example, after Japanese residents in Australia were evacuated because the Japanese Empire bombed the North of Australia in August 1941, so-called 'dojin' (土人: natives or aborigines) came to be treated as “spontaneous important collaborators in the Co-Prosperity Sphere”. The term 'genjuming' (原住民: natives or original inhabitants) was advocated instead of 'dojin' (Hirano 1942:4).
The academic who symbolically embodied this transformation was KODERA Renkichi (1892-1992) who had studied anthropology in France. He was the only academic to go to Australia before World War II. Boarding a Japanese ship, he arrived at Port Darwin and reported on the population, race, and socio-cultural problems of the ‘genju-dojin’ (原住士人, KODERA 1941:162). The following year he addressed the origins, effects of separation and isolation, and various problems of ‘genju-min’ (原住民, KODERA 1942) in the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. After writing for the need for an economic ethno-science, KODERA’s last treatise reported on “Australian Policies for the Natives” (KODERA 1943). This first Japanese fieldwork-based academic research was buried in mainstream literature-based discourse and was almost never referred to by later Japanese anthropologists.

In this period of great transition, OKA Masao (1898-1982) and others established the national Ethnic Research Institute in 1942. Some thirty anthropologists came to work under this Imperial regime of anthropological research. In 1943, The Complete Translation of The Official Year Book of The Commonwealth of Australia and the Yearbook of the Southern Region were published in order to systematically acknowledge Australia as “occupying our great attention for its broad area, affluent resources, and necessarily geopolitically important position to our nation” (Gōa Chōsa Sho in Gōshu Renpō Kokusei Chōsa Tōkeikyoku 1943 (1940):1). In this historical context, KIYONO Kenji (1885-1955, Association of the Pacific Area), FURUNO Kiyoto (1899-1979, Ethnic Research Institute), and MABUCHI Tōichi (1909-1988, Taihoku Imperial University), jointly contributed to The Yearbook of the Southern Region on ethnicity, religion and society among Aboriginal people. According to another article written by KIYONO, “Australian Natives......number fifty thousand in the expansive area of Australia. Moreover, because many of them are living in the harsh inland, the governance of these natives is of little importance to the management of Australia. For this reason, today Australian native study is mainly conducted for academic interest”. KIYONO also wrote that “Because they show many inferiorities in physical characteristics, in short, because they exhibit characteristics resembling anthropoids or hominoids, they are useful when examining human physical evolution. And because there remain many primitive natural states in their mode of living, they also are very useful when considering the evolution of the civilization of human beings” (KIYONO 1943:137). This perspective was shared with MABUCHI and FURUNO (MABUCHI 1943; FURUNO 1943). Also during this period, TANASE Joji (1910-1964, Tokyo Imperial University), wrote about ‘Australian natives’ in Study of Ethnic Religion, and in The Journal of Anthropological Society of Nippon SUGIURA Kenichi (1905-1954, Tokyo Imperial University) proposed a study of the social organization of “Australian natives” based on “field research materials” (SUGIURA 1943). HIMEOKA Tsutomu (1907-1970, Kyoto Imperial University), argued in the Japanese Journal of
Ethnology that the social forms of "Australian natives" were the result of being in a low hunter-gatherer condition (HIMEOKA 1943). SUZUKI Jirō (1916-, Ethnic Research Institute), wrote "from 1943 to the early part of the following year, I had planned to study Australian natives and the extinct Tasmanians. But as, there was of course no chance to conduct field research, so I had to rely only on the literature" (J.SUZUKI 1950: preface).

Outside academia, by order of the Minister of Health and Welfare in 1943, the Imperial Government made a series of classified documents entitled Global Policy with the Yamato People as Nucleus. One article, 'Australian Natives as Primitive People' states that "because their population is quite small and has no social and economic political force, they have no value as an object of ethnic policy" but that "from the view of anthropology they have a special value as the lowest living race" (Kōseishō Kenkyusho Jinkō Minzokubu 1982 (1943):1219-1220). This article described language classification, physical characteristics, and the mode of culture of the 'abori-jin' (アボリ人) 1 but recognized "almost no sign of cultural progress" (Kōseishō Kenkyusho Jinkō Minzokubu 1982(1943):1244). The Outline of Ethnic Research, published by the Ethnic Research Institute, was mimeographed and circulated. This proposed that the "nationalism of some peoples (especially domestic minor ethnic groups) should be suppressed" but also that "a contrived nationalism should be constructed and given to some ethnic groups" (J.SUZUKI 1969:24). We can see that there was almost no possibility that the Imperial Government would promote the status of Aboriginal people, while there was a great possibility that it would suppress them.

In summary, in Pre-World War II literature-based studies, we see that as the interests of Japanese anthropologists drifted from natural history to natural science, they categorized Aboriginal people as being in the lowest position, in terms not only of evolutionary hierarchy, but also of intelligence and aesthetics.

3. Post- World War II Literature-based Studies, 1945-1960s

After defeat in World War II, many anthropologists in occupied Japan initially feared that they would be held responsible for war crimes. Although a few early articles were written on Aboriginal people, and while some geography articles were revised, but the only early post-war comprehensive study on Aboriginal people was Social Organization of Primitive People published in 1950 by SUZUKI Jirō. According to the author, this title was originally planned as the Social Life of Australian Natives, and was to have been published before World War II (J.SUZUKI

---

1 In Japanese pronunciation, the syllable "gine" of "Aborigine" sounds the same as "jin (人)" which means "person, people, or race", so some misinterpretation is suggested here.
1950). This is the first complete work on Aboriginal people by a Japanese author and shows several innovations, such as introducing findings on female rituals and everyday Aboriginal life. However, although diplomatic ties with Australia were resumed in 1951, politically the Japanese no longer needed to cooperate with Aboriginal people because Australia had lost its potential role as a directly accessible source of natural resources.

However, in parallel with Japan’s period of rapid economic growth, ethnographies appeared in top 10 bestseller lists, and included titles such as The Expedition to Mongolia, The Inca Empire, and The Country of Sky Burial. In fact, a general study textbook called Anthropology, was produced by Tokyo University in 1961 (ISHIDA et.al.1961). In the 1960’s, Japanese anthropology developed and became popular through the publication of Peoples of the Earth, a volume in the compendium Illustrative History of World Cultures. Nine anthropologists from different generations contributed to this volume, including OKA Masao who wrote ‘Australian Natives’ and KAWADA Junzō (1934-) who wrote ‘Totem and Taboo’ (KAWADA 1960: 220). A bit later, ISHIKAWA Eikichi (1925-2005) wrote, “in the eighteenth century when the British started to colonize Australia, the natives in this continent (Australian Aborigines) still lived in the Old Stone Age, but the reason for this surprising slump is not in their racial disposition, but in environmental conditions which restricted their life ways” (ISHIKAWA 1965:244). As suggested by this statement, in the anthropology of this period, the term ‘race’ became less important and the concept of ‘culture’ or ‘social structure’ was emphasized as the means by which human beings adapt to the environment (cf. MATSUZONO and MATSUZONO 1967).

In summary, post-World War II literature-based studies of Australian Aboriginal people, removed from the urgent pre-war social situation, and under the influence of the U.S. Occupation, were integrated with previous works. However, anthropologists were unable to conduct field research abroad. During this period, anthropologists viewed Aboriginal people from a functionalistic paradigm. Those anthropologists who had studied Aboriginal people before World War II left their universities. Moreover, E.KOYAMA and J.SUZUKI changed their research objectives, while SUGIURA passed away suddenly.

4. Fieldwork-based Studies, 1963 to Present

A. Early Field Studies

The first fieldwork-based study of Aboriginal people by a Japanese was conducted by SUSATO Shigeru (1926-), who led a Waseda University expedition in 1963 (KAWASE 1990: 60-61). This party traveled for nearly five months around Alice Springs and visited nine communities, including Hermannsburg. However, because of the short stay at each commu-
nity, the resulting research ended up being reported on only a few pages in ‘The Expedition to the Australian Natives’ (NAKAMOTO 1990).

Full-fledged field study among Aboriginal people started with linguist TSUNODA Tasaku (1946-), who studied in Monash University. TSUNODA documented the Warungu language for his Master’s thesis, the first English contribution by a Japanese academic to Australian Aboriginal Studies. At that time only two Warungu speakers were still alive (TSUNODA 1991: 82), and they had not spoken their language in over ten years (TSUNODA 1996: 152). When TSUNODA arrived in Australia in 1971, Aboriginal people were in the midst of a great transformation, including a sovereignty movement. TSUNODA spent ten months in the field, but his research was conducted without consideration of the changing power relations between Aboriginal people and researchers.

However, when TSUNODA got into the field of Djaru language studies in 1975, he encountered a self-determining Aboriginal group. One night while staying at a station in Kimberley, he was invited to the campfire and was asked to give the group assistance in return for data on the Djaru language and for introducing his research to Japan (TSUNODA 1996: 153-154). In response to this request, TSUNODA lectured in 1975 and 1976 on the differences between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultures. He also wrote an Aboriginal grammar to be used as a textbook, as well as a dictionary and various pamphlets. In 1995 the Kimberley Language Resource Centre requested that he research the Wandjirra and Malngin languages (TSUNODA 1996: 157). Because the fieldsites TSUNODA studies are very specific, his contributions have been limited to linguists in Japan, but have been more influential in Australia.

During this time of Aboriginal social reform, SHINPO Mitsuru (1931-), a sociologist who had studied Indigenous affairs at British Columbia University, began researching social change. From 1977 to 1978, SHINPO visited more than 40 communities in the Northern Territory having been requested by the Northern Territory Department of Education to do educational research about Australian Aboriginal people. He produced three books based on this field research. One book was about his main research theme, The Social Process of Aboriginal Education in the Northern Territory, submitted to the Department of Education in 1978. Savagery and Civilization discussed Aboriginal history and reported on the current situation around Alice Springs and Darwin (SHINPO 1979). In The Australian Natives, SHINPO took a more academic style. He wrote a literature review of traditional communities in the first chapter, added a second chapter on studies of social change, and he also examined the current Aboriginal situation from several angles, including government policy, economy, and education (SHINPO 1980). Half a decade later, he went back to Australia and after a year’s research compiled Sad Boomerang (SHINPO 1988), which introduced the world of Aboriginal people working in the
cattle industry. SHINPO has provided Japan the multilayered and multifaceted information necessary to understand the world of Aboriginal people.

Concurrent with SHINPO, SUZUKI Jirō went into the field in Australia in July 1977. Because he had compiled a literature study on the Aboriginal people and since his research interest was in racism after the war, SUZUKI was an ideal person to study the Australian social situation in the 1970s (SUZUKI and KANEKO 1982: 244). After traveling around Victoria, New South Wales, and the Northern Territory, SUZUKI published a series of newspaper articles, 'Between Primitive and Modern: the World of the Independent Australian Natives' (SUZUKI 1977: 17th Oct.). In these, SUZUKI reported on such items as the background of non-Aboriginal Australians' "sense of guilt toward the natives", "the native's appraisal" of national policy after referendum, paternalism, racism, and alcoholism, the latter three of which are still problems in Queensland and other states. He also reported that the social status of females was improving, and that Aboriginal demands for land rights was a point at issue. He also noted that rising Indigenous momentum derived from Aboriginal self-determination and that Aboriginal people were making efforts to build domestic and international solidarity. Although SUZUKI's research appears to have been limited to discussion with several leaders, he compiled this series of articles into *From Primitive to Modern*, published in 1981.

In summary, as the episode from the Waseda party suggests, 'expedition' fever propelled anthropologists and prepared the groundwork for academic Australian Aboriginal studies in Japan. During the 1970s, another trend evidenced signs of change, when 'human rights' came to the forefront, and the keyword 'salvaging' replaced that of 'origin seeking'. For this reason, while early Japanese researchers studied Aboriginal people who spoke endangered languages, urban Aboriginal people were rising up against the imbalance in human rights. Consequently, Aboriginal people, increasingly empowered with self-determination, came to reject anthropological research that was based on an unfair power balance between researchers and informants.

B. Community Studies

   (1) Arnhem Land

   (a) Maningrida

Arriving in Australia without any contact with the above academics, KOYAMA Shūzō (1939-) was the key person in the creation of a new trend in Australian Aboriginal Studies in Japan. In 1976 KOYAMA joined the National Museum of Ethnology. The next year, Levi-Strauss's *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (2nd) was translated into Japanese, but in Japan there was no field researcher on Aboriginal people who could respond to this subject. KOYAMA, who had previously worked on domestic research projects, had the opportunity to go to Aus-
tralia in 1980 in order to buy overseas collections for the Museum. However, in his early field studies the prevailing Aboriginal social conditions undoubtedly caused KOYAMA much concern.

In this situation, KOYAMA faced the problem of constructing good relationships with Aboriginal people as an agent of the Museum of Ethnology, while at the same time carrying on his own research and giving guidance to younger researchers. Firstly, he promoted the cause of Aboriginal people and was taken into their kinship system as the son of an Aboriginal leader. KOYAMA then came up with the idea of exhibiting “a whole village in the Museum” (S.KOYAMA 1981:40). From the early stages of his research, he invited two female artists from Earnabella to Japan and had them make batik. One day when he talked about Japan in Arnhem Land, the local Aboriginal leader said “Take me out to your country” (S.KOYAMA 1987:33) and KOYAMA did so in 1986 for an exhibition entitled “The Hunter's Dream”.

Secondly, in his own research, KOYAMA examined Aboriginal population data from 35,000 years ago to the present, and identified three phases of demographic change of natural increase, destruction, and recovery. He then analyzed internal and external factors affecting Aboriginal society (S.KOYAMA 1988). In Maningrida, by analyzing the historical process of outstation movements using data from the minutes of the Bawinanga Aboriginal Corporation from 1978 to 1984, he came to understand what had historically taken place there (S.KOYAMA 1991). In 1992 he published Hunter's Land for a Museum exhibition. However, he didn't compile only his own highly academic articles, but also often cited the work of younger researchers.

Thirdly, in cultivating Aboriginal research by young Japanese anthropologists, KOYAMA has probed research trends at the Australian National University and has accepted much advice, for example regarding the need for more female researchers. Almost every year, KOYAMA has expanded the number of researchers engaged in collaborative research at various field locations. For example, at Maningrida, GOTO Toshiko (1955-), HORIE Yasunori (1948-), KAMADA Mayumi (1958-), and KUBO Masatoshi (1949-) continue to carry out research.

(b) Gamadhi Outstation

After MATSUYAMA Toshio (1944-) accepted a position in the National Museum of Ethnology, he did field work mainly at the Gamadhi outstation in 1982, 1984, 1986, and 1988. As an early researcher, he also took on multiple roles, such as being an agent of the Museum, field researcher, and a pioneer setting an example for younger researchers. As a Museum agent, he bought 142 bark paintings for exhibition, and has made four documentary films, including Maradjiri, the Star Ceremony in Djinang (1986) which depicts a Djinang ritual lasting two weeks (MATSUYAMA 1988). In Japan, these films were the first academic documentaries on Aborigi-
nal people.

As a field researcher, using an emic and micro approach, MATSUYAMA has reported on the everyday hunting and food regulations of the Djinang (MATSUYAMA 1994) and on the transformation of the star ceremony, which was previously held at funerals but is now held on birthdays. In order to understand the details of historical transformation, he recorded Djinang purchases for four years and confirmed the impact of the cash economy on Aboriginal society (MATSUYAMA 1994a:Ch.2). From these articles he compiled Living in the Eucalyptus Forest in 1994. This was the first Japanese book based on intensive field study in an Australian Aboriginal community.

As a pioneering academic, MATSUYAMA has also worked to connect Aboriginal studies with Indigenous studies. Therefore, when he shifted his theme to urban Aboriginal people, he organized symposia on the Aboriginal Concentration in Cities and Aboriginal Identity in 1988 and on Research on Urban Indigenous Societies in 1996, comparing the results of his fieldwork with Indigenous societies in other nation-states.

(c) Galiwinku

SUGITŌ Shigenobu (1951-) who first went to Australia in 1984, initially concentrated his research in Galiwinku, on Elcho Island. The Aboriginal people on Elcho Island were moved there during World War II, when the town's master plan was formulated (SUGITŌ 1990: 86). In 1942 Elcho Island people decided to disclose their sacred poles “to the public, hold a sacred ritual, and in turn to obtain White goods” (SUGITŌ 1990:88). With this event as a turning point, Elcho Island Aboriginal “sculptures were transformed from the sacred to the common” (SUGITŌ 1986:13), and the people became ‘weekend hunters’ whose crafts were virtually their only means of subsistence. SUGITŌ followed the points of access between Aboriginal logic and the market economy, and introduced computers into Aboriginal fieldwork. His estimate of Galiwinku population according to their ideal marriage regulations resulted in an unexpected finding (SUGITŌ 1991; 1992), as computer simulation indicated that strict implementation would restrain population growth. By extension, he took part in the Study of Mathematical Ethnology and has developed a computer application for the Alliance Project, in which he developed software for anthropological research (SUGITŌ ed. 2003).

KUBOTA Sachiko (1959-) conducted intensive research from 1986 to 1987, and continues to study the Yolngu culture in Galiwinku, Arnhem Land. KUBOTA postulated that “women possess the driving force which will open the future of the Aboriginal people in a society in which bears so many problems in the midst of conflict with White society” (KUBOTA 1992a: 80). Her outlook was based upon Yolngu women’s activities in craft making and marriage choice. According to her research, in which she analyzed 82 employees, 869 craft makers, 5 family
networks, and 40 homes, there are more women than men in Yolngu craft making. These women have organized unique women's networks based on kinship relations, and craft sales are stable (KUBOTA 1991). Above and beyond being supported by social security, there are more employed women in general wage labor as well as professional careers (KUBOTA 1996) and under these conditions their marriage choices and household composition tend to strengthen women's solidarity (KUBOTA 1992b). Moreover, by making bark paintings without sacred themes, and thereby avoiding the possibility of social conflict, Galiwinku women seem to have adapted actively to social change. In 2005, KUBOTA published *Gender Anthropology of the Aboriginal Society*.

Regarding the historical background which allowed such moderate adaptation in Galiwinku, KUBOTA developed an understanding of the history of mild forms of Aboriginal cultural contact with missionaries in the early 20th century, and suggested that this intimate relationship with missionaries shaped the ideal image of women in Galiwinku, which in turn influenced their marriage and career choices (KUBOTA 2002). Today she suggests that this continuous contact with mainstream society has changed the Aboriginal people's discursive form of myth narratives so that they have become clearer and more logical to mainstream society, thus smoothing the progress of a local museum project (KUBOTA 2006).

KUBOTA's research is a dialogue between substantial field material and earlier studies depicting aspects of social change in Yolngu society. As a result, Australian Aboriginal Studies in Japan finally responded to LEVI-STRAUSS' work, 30 years after the National Museum academicians began their research.

(2) Broome

HOSOKAWA Kômei (1955-) entered the field of Broome, West Kimberly at the beginning of 1986. HOSOKAWA's early research focused on pidgin-creole languages, and he realized that "Yawuru speakers still remain" (HOSOKAWA 1988:77), but admits that "Sincerely speaking, the author was not so interested then in 'salvage linguistics', but rather that Yawuru research was begun from a sense of professional duty" (HOSOKAWA 1989:33). However, he also writes that at that time in Western Australia "Legal conditions were not mature, but nonetheless several Indigenous organizations such as the leading example of the Kimberley Land Council had been formed and started acting on their agenda" (HOSOKAWA 1989: 34). Consequently, "the author came to find himself an advocate, literally running around" (HOSOKAWA 1989: 34). After spending a year with the Yawuru, in 1991 he submitted *The Yawuru Language of West Kimberley* to the Australian National University as his doctoral thesis. Sensitive to power balances, HOSOKAWA tackled the representation of Aboriginal people in image productions, following the history of Aboriginal representations from abused native to active film-
maker, in which he found a parallel relationship between ethnography and Aboriginal people (HOSOKAWA 1991). HOSOKAWA's areas of focus, based on this perspective, are broad: Yawuru language study (HOSOKAWA 1994b:1995:2001); native title rooted in the Aboriginal life-world (HOSOKAWA 1994a); the empathetic world between the Indigenous body and their environment (HOSOKAWA 2003b); and resource development issues deriving from administration, tourism and the energy industry (HOSOKAWA 2003a). Not only has HOSOKAWA striven to be an advocate and an interpreter of different cultures but he has also continued to redefine the relationship between Indigenous environmental views and modern democracy (HOSOKAWA 2005) and between 'field' and 'home'. As HOSOKAWA writes, "(As activist rather than academic) I got involved in the Jabiruka issue" (HOSOKAWA 2005:54), and he has made continual efforts as an activist to link Indigenous problems to the Japanese life-world, so that he has contributed to opening a crack in Japan as an enclosed imagined community.

In summary, in order to conduct field research in the context of Aboriginal self-determination policy, members of the National Museum of Ethnology needed to cultivate constructive partnerships in the field. For this purpose, young anthropologists were sent to the town of Maningurida, to an inland outpost in Gamadhi, to the coastal Galiwinku area, and other areas. Researchers with different themes worked in these diverse fieldsites, but also established joint research organizations.

C. Urban Studies

Because the National Museum team had begun with remote community studies, urban studies were delayed. Urban field studies were begun by early researchers who conducted research in the Redfern district of Sydney. Especially after a large protest movement against the Australian bicentenary was held in Sydney 1988, urban field studies have gradually come to the fore (NARITA 1988).

(1) Sydney

In urban field studies, it was SUZUKI Seiji (1956-), who had studied anthropology and sociology at Queensland University, who worked on the formidable subject of the anthropology of Sydney. In his first book Aboriginoal spople between Spression and Tradition(S. SUZUKI 1993(1985)), part I is devoted to Australian Aboriginal historical processes. Part II, based on three sets of national statistics from 1971, analyzed population, socio-economic status, education, healthcare and social welfare, housing problems, law, and political participation.

However it wasn't until after he started urban field studies, in 1989, that SUZUKI's work became more timely. By that the late 1980s, the majority of Indigenous Australians were living in urban areas, with Sydney holding the largest number. In his second book The Urban
Aboriginal people between Opression and Tradition (S. SUZUKI 1995), by introducing a description of the Aboriginal people in Sydney and comparing this with images of other Aboriginal people belonging to different generations, SUZUKI suggested the historical transformation of self-imagery. Through this research, he documented the extinction of ‘traditional’ Aboriginal culture in Sydney. At the same time, a new set of conditions arose under the multicultural policy, in which the Australian Government gave preferential treatment to Indigenous people. In this context, non-Aboriginal people tended to treat urban Aboriginal people who didn’t display external traits as Aboriginal people as ‘not real’. In order to present an Aboriginal self-image to mainstream society, these urban Aboriginal people became keen to learn their own culture, which had been objectified, through university study or dance schools. However, the ‘traditional’ Aboriginal culture which these urban Aboriginal people perceived as ‘real’, was according to SUZUKI an “arbitrary mass of cultural traits” (S. SUZUKI 1995:158) which had been chosen by urban taste. SUZUKI concluded that ‘Urban Aboriginal people’, inventing this imagined ancestry, were culturally a very new group (S. SUZUKI 1995: 2002).

(2) Adelaide
MATSUYAMA Toshio applied the life history method to the urban field of Adelaide. He reported on the conditions of Aboriginal women who lived under state and federal Aboriginal policies. These women arrived in Adelaide, following family and blood relatives, and identified with fellow Aboriginal countrymen but made critical comments on multicultural policy (MATSUYAMA 1993). These urban Aboriginal people, who had to accept assimilation policy, started to gather together under the name of ‘aboriginality’, which became the ground for cultural resistance. Because urban Aboriginal people in Adelaide collectively call themselves ‘Nunga(s) [people]’, the outline of the Nunga looks clear to outsiders. In fact, however, the Aboriginal people in Adelaide are made up of people of different origins and different positions. Under the Reconciliation Council and ATSIC in the 1990s, they strengthened their sense of aboriginality, developing their own dreaming and naming their children in their own language.

In summary, around 1988, the year of the Bicentennial event, another trend arose on the stage of Australian Aboriginal studies in Japan. Although the urban situation had been reported on by earlier field researchers, new research themes were added, including studies of cultural learning and of the acquisition of aboriginality among urban Aboriginal people.

D. Rural Studies
With the advance of community studies and urban studies, it became clear that there was
an expanding gap between tradition, as located in remote areas, and the city.

(1) Mingenew and Geraldton

UEHASHI Naoko (1962-) did fieldwork in the elementary schools of Mingenew and Geraldton in the Murchison Region of Western Australia in 1990. UEHASHI's fieldsite choice was a result of the options offered by a voluntary organization (UEHASHI 2000: 9), but as a consequence of this selection we are able to know more about 'rural' Aboriginal people who live somewhere between the 'remote' and the 'urban'. The cattle industry was started in the Murchison region in the 1830s. The Yamatji people, who live around the rural city of Geraldton, present varied life histories in which some have lived on reserves or in fringe camps, stations, and missions. After describing the acculturation manifest in their marriage system from 177 cases (UEHASHI 1993), as well as several life histories (UEHASHI 1997), UEHASHI portrayed these people as living under a double standard of separation and assimilation. On the one hand Aboriginal people in this region have managed to continue their traditions and to be proud of their work in the stations, calling them 'our stations' (UEHASHI 2005:53-54). On the other hand, they have been given the social status of 'wards' of the state (UEHASHI 2005:55). They are not able to manage their own compensation and consequently lack opportunities to become more familiar with the mainstream cash economy.

(2) Dagragu

In 1996 HOKARI Minoru (1972-2004) did fieldwork in Dagragu of Gurindji country, a place of symbolic value in Australian Aboriginal history. HOKARI had studied the economic history of the relation between the tribal economy and work in the stations, and by analyzing previous studies on Gurindji history he developed a concept of the Gurindji in which they kept their autonomy even though being discriminated against. In his field research of 1997 and 1999, HOKARI was fascinated with Gurindji oral histories on the origin of the White Man (HOKARI 2004) as well as their performative mode of historical practice. Gurindji oral histories were not uniform, but diverse and generated by historical practice (HOKARI 2001). HOKARI argued persuasively that this movement was an attempt to subjectively reconstruct Gurindji country (HOKARI 2000). As a 'strategic historian', HOKARI's long term goal was not to incorporate Gurindji historical practice into Western history, but rather to invite people to take part in equitable cross-cultural communication under the standard of 'historical truthfulness'.

(3) Morre, Walgett, and Wilcania

It is understandable that MATSUYAMA, in his study of urban Aboriginal people, was inter-
ested in the rural towns from which people had come. First, he reported on the life histories of an Aboriginal family in Adelaide who had come from a mission settlement. This study shows how 'Nunga(s)', once they had become such, participated in the movement to regain their homeland amidst 'native titles to land' reform (MATSUYAMA 2006:Ch.3). In New South Wales, MATSUYAMA reported on the rural towns of Moree (MATSUYAMA 2006:Ch.4) and Walgett (MATSUYAMA 2006:Ch.4), which have different historical backgrounds. Through these works, MATSUYAMA described the diverse figures in and multilayered histories of the 'Blackfella way', as contrasted against White society.

In summary, after solidifying community and urban studies, a broad 'rural' contact zone became an important research theme. Because contact zones generate cultural gathering, closing, negotiating, articulating and dispersing, rural areas can be a matrix which generates diversity. In this framework, community, urban, and rural studies are facing the new millennium under new Australian government policy regarding Aboriginal people.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, I consider the question of what contribution Japanese researchers can make to Australian Aboriginal studies? This question is about what researchers from Japan, as a whole, can achieve in order to share three ideal types of ethnography with Australian researchers and Aboriginal people. During the past few decades, the social situation of Indigenous Australians has changed nationally and internationally. On the other hand, in Australia, domestic researchers take on important roles as cultural translators of domestic policy and industry.

In this situation, what kind of academic solidarity can be constructed? I suggest here four domains of ethnography: ① open ethnography, ② native ethnography, ③ non-domestic and non-indigenous ethnography (e.g. Japanese ethnography), and ④ creating ethnography. Domain ① would be open ethnography wherein domestic researchers and Indigenous peoples in the field jointly work together to construct an ethnographic work. This could be the world of traditional ethnography. Domain ② could be called native anthropology. Domain ③ can be thought of as ethnography written by non-indigenous and non-domestic researchers. This could be the where Japanese studies contribute to Australian domestic and Indigenous research. And the last is the ethnographic domain ④ where domestic researchers, Indigenous peoples, and non-domestic researchers all share in creating the ethnography. As Gregory Bateson (1979) once suggested, two (or more) descriptions are better than one. Using this four-domain description, we can open up new ethnographic relationships for the future.
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