

# Untold Stories in the History of Anthropology: Japan, Colonialism, Anglophone Hegemony, and World Anthropologies<sup>1</sup>

Takami Kuwayama

<https://doi.org/10.46585/cargo.2024.2.48>

*Abstract: Because of the imbalance of power in the academic “world system,” the history of anthropology outside the central countries is rarely told. This article contributes to solving this problem by discussing the development of anthropology in Japan since the late nineteenth century and Japanese achievements in the emerging “world anthropologies” movement.*

*Keywords: history of anthropology; world system of anthropology; world anthropologies; colonialism; Ainu; Japan; East Asia Anthropology*

## Introduction

Japanese anthropology is one of the many anthropologies that exist in the world today. Its history is much longer than commonly believed, dating back to the late nineteenth century. With a membership of over 1,800 specialists, the Japanese

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is a substantially revised version of the lecture given online as the twelfth in the East Asian Anthropology Lecture Series at Shandong University, China, on November 23, 2023. I am grateful to Professor Okpyo Moon for her invitation. I am also grateful to Professor Petr Skalnik for his encouragement during the revision process, as well as to the anonymous reviewers for their useful comments and suggestions.

Society of Cultural Anthropology, founded in 1934, has become one of the largest national anthropological organizations. However, in the “world system” of the discipline, which is dominated by the United States, Great Britain, and, to a lesser extent, France, the achievements of Japanese anthropologists are not widely known outside of Japan. This article aims to fill this knowledge gap by first describing how anthropology developed in Japan as the only non-Western colonial power before World War II and later as a defeated nation (Part I)<sup>2</sup>, and then situating contemporary Japanese anthropology within emerging “world anthropologies” (Part II).

## Part I: A Brief History of Japanese Anthropology

Much has been said about the “colonial roots of anthropology” since the late 1970s, when Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) was published. The central theme of this debate is, in the words of Michel Foucault, “power and knowledge.” More specifically, European and American anthropologists have asked how knowledge about non-Western culture was produced under the modern system of colonialism. What has been overlooked in this debate is the fact that Japan was also a colonial power before its defeat in World War II, and that the colonial roots in question deeply affected East Asia and its neighboring areas.

### *I-1 The beginning: S. Tsuboi and R. Torii*

As the discipline of anthropology emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century, a central concern of Japanese intellectuals was the genealogy of the Japanese race and its relationship to the Ainu. In 1877, an American zoologist named Edward Morse (1838–1925) accidentally discovered a mound of shells on the outskirts of Tokyo. At the time of his discovery, Morse was on his way to the capital where he was to meet with Japanese scientists at the Imperial University of Tokyo. The Japanese government had hired him as a full professor at a high salary. Afterwards, Morse excavated the shell mound and found human bones, which he claimed to be a sign of cannibalism.

---

<sup>2</sup> There is no definitive account of the history of Japanese anthropology in its entirety. In writing Part I, I have drawn on the following works, among others: Kreiner (2012, 2013), Kuwayama (2008), Nakao (2016), Oka (1979), Sekimoto (1995), Terada (1981), Yamaji (2011), and Yamashita (in press). Other useful works are referenced in the text or footnotes where appropriate. Shimizu (1999), which is one of the few English-language works on the subject, is quite detailed and focuses on the colonial roots of Japanese anthropology. Shimizu and van Bremen (2003), also in English, is a collection of papers by an international team of anthropologists on wartime anthropology in Japan and its neighboring areas.

Morse's claim inspired Japanese intellectuals. Among them was Shōgorō Tsuboi (1863–1913), often called the “father of Japanese anthropology.” Even as a student, he had a rivalry with those foreign scholars who wrote about Japan independently of Japanese theories. Nevertheless, Tsuboi followed Morse's view, and since there was no reference to cannibalism in the scientific literature on the Ainu, he surmised that a dwarf people called *Korpokkur*, an ancient race in Ainu legends, were the ones who practiced cannibalism. Tsuboi later became involved in a heated controversy with a leading Japanese biologist, Yoshikiyo Koganei (1859–1944), who argued that the Japanese race was descended from none other than the Ainu. Unfortunately, Tsuboi's sudden death while traveling in Russia put an end to this controversy without reaching conclusions. To this day, there is no definitive theory of the genealogy between the two races.

The Tsuboi-Koganei controversy reveals a characteristic of Japanese scholarship in general: many Japanese theories about Japan have been presented as counterarguments to Western theories. Tsuboi's research is a typical example. Although he basically accepted Morse's view of Japan's Neolithic people, he did not like foreign scholars talking about Japan. So, in 1884 he founded a small anthropological society, the first of its kind in Japan, which can be interpreted as an attempt to bring the discourse on Japan back to the Japanese.<sup>3</sup>

The fact that Japanese anthropology began with the study of the Ainu, a subjugated indigenous people, demonstrates that colonialism, whether internal or external, was deeply rooted in the discipline. This is evident in the trajectory of Ryūzō Torii (1870–1953), who was Tsuboi's student. Like his mentor, Torii's research interests were broad, encompassing not only the social and cultural aspects of the peoples he studied, but also their biological makeup and archaeological remains.

Torii's field research was extensive in scope and duration. First, in 1895, the year the Sino-Japanese War ended in Japan's victory, he carried out the first fieldwork in the history of Japanese anthropology in the Liaodong Peninsula, where he discovered dolmens. Second, from 1896 to 1910, he visited Taiwan, which was ceded to Japan in 1895, a total of 5 times to study the people called “aborigines” at that time (Figure 1). He used cameras for the first time in Japanese anthropological research. His 1910 work (Torii 1976) contained as many as 132 photos of the Amis people. Third, after noticing similarities between the Taiwanese and the people of Southwest China, Torii visited mainland China and conducted

---

<sup>3</sup> Another well-known example is the vast Japanese-language literature on Japanese culture, both critical and sympathetic, that emerged after the publication of Ruth Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* in 1946.



Figure 1. Ryūzō Torii writing fieldnotes as Taiwanese aborigines looked on in 1896.  
Source: Promotive Association of Torii Ryuzo Archives, Kochi University of Technology.  
<http://www.muse.or.jp/torii/>

fieldwork among the Miao, an ethnic minority group. His ethnographic report, published in 1907, attracted the attention of French scholars, which led him to begin writing in French. He later received a medal of distinction from the French Academy. Fourth, in 1899, he studied the Ainu living in the Kuril Islands. Fifth,

from 1910, when Japan colonized Korea, until 1932, Torii explored the country a total of nine times. During this period, he found the largest dolmen in East Asia in Unnyul County in present-day North Korea. Sixth, for a total of 40 years, from 1895 to 1935, he visited Northeast China and Inner Mongolia 14 times, frequently with his family. In his later years, his research in China focused on the analysis of royal tombs from the Liao dynasty (916–1125).<sup>4</sup>

A comparison with the Cambridge Torres Straits Expedition of 1898 is in order here. This expedition is often regarded as a turning point in the history of British anthropology, as collecting first-hand data in the field has since become the norm for producing ethnographies. The influence of Charles Seligman, who joined the expedition, on Bronislaw Malinowski is well known.<sup>5</sup> It is worth remembering, however, that Torii's fieldwork was just as intensive as that of the members of the Cambridge expedition. In terms of frequency and duration, Torii far surpassed the British. Thus, in both Great Britain and Japan, modern anthropology based on what came to be known as "participant observation" began at about the same time, but only one side of the story has been told, to the neglect of the other.<sup>6</sup>

### *I-2 The interwar period: Japan's invasion of East Asia and its aftermath*

Kyōsuke Kindaichi (1882-1971) was a pioneering anthropologist and folklorist who studied the Ainu (Figure 2). Chronologically, he appeared a few decades after Franz Boas (1858-1942), but he studied the indigenous people in a similar way: their research styles were both that of a repeat traveler, visiting the same place over a long period of time, but staying only briefly at each time – in contrast to Malinowski, who was known for his two-year fieldwork at virtually one time

---

<sup>4</sup> These explanations are based on a video lecture entitled "Torii Ryūzō to Sono Jidai" (Ryūzō Torii and His Times) by Kazuya Ogura, chief curator at *Kenritsu Torii Ryūzō Kinen Hakubutsukan* (Prefectural Memorial Museum of Ryūzō Torii), Tokushima. Torii is seldom mentioned among Japanese anthropologists today, while his achievements are widely remembered among Taiwanese anthropologists (personal communication with Sanpei Wu, 2023).

<sup>5</sup> Perhaps the Cambridge Torres Straits Expedition is remembered today more for the people involved than for its content. The team was organized by Alfred Haddon, who recruited W. H. R. Rivers and Charles Seligman. Rivers developed what came to be called the "genealogical method" of kinship analysis, and Seligman taught Bronislaw Malinowski and E. E. Evans-Prichard at the London School of Economics.

<sup>6</sup> This is a typical example of the dominance of Anglophone communities as an aspect of the world system of anthropology. Together with France and Germany, they form the "core" of this system, as symbolized in the title of a University of Chicago Press book *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology* (Barth, Gingrich, Parkin, Silverman 2005).



Figure 2. Kyōsuke Kindaichi (center) with Ainu narrator Matsu Kannari (right) and her sister Nami Chiri (left), mother of Yukie Chiri. The photo was taken at Kannari's home in 1960. Courtesy of the Morioka Memorial Museum of Great Predecessors

(1915 to 1918). Kindaichi repeatedly visited Hokkaido to study the Ainu language as a linguist and their customs as an ethnologist. His research on the Ainu epics called “Yukar” received wide attention in Japanese academic circles. In addition, like Boas, who worked with George Hunt of the Tlingit nation as a research partner rather than a native informant, Kindaichi not only encouraged a young Ainu woman, Yukie Chiri (1903-1922), to write about Ainu mythology (Chiri 1978), but also annotated a nine-volume collection of Ainu epics compiled by her aunt, Matsu Kannari (Kannari and Kindaichi 1964). Today, when indigenous people criticize anthropological research as one-sided because, in their view, anthropologists only do research and do not give back what they have received from the indigenous community, Kindaichi's and Boas' approach serves as a model<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Kindaichi's relations with the Ainu were not without problems, however. For example, Yukie Chiri's younger brother, Mashiho Chiri (1909-1961), studied linguistics at the Imperial University of Tokyo under Kindaichi's tutelage. Chiri respected him as a scholar,

In Taiwan, which became a part of the Japanese Empire in 1895, Nenozō Utsushikawa (1884–1947), who had a Ph.D. in anthropology from Harvard University, founded the Institute of Ethnology at the then Imperial University of Taipei in 1928, the year the university opened. It was the seventh Imperial University of Japan and a predecessor of today's National University of Taiwan. The institute was small in both personnel and budget, with only one professor, one assistant, and a few students from Japan. From 1930 to 1932, they conducted fieldwork among the aborigines of Taiwan and published in Japanese *A Study of the Genealogy and Classification of Taiwanese Aborigines* (Taihoku Teikoku Daigaku Dozoku Jinshugaku Kenkyūshitsu 1935). This was considered a major achievement, but its influence was limited compared to the massive reports produced by the Japanese colonial government some 15 years earlier (Shimizu 1999: 133–136).

One legacy of the Institute of Ethnology in colonial Taiwan is that Tōichi Mabuchi (1909–1988), a major figure in postwar Japanese anthropology, was trained there as a student. During the war, his fieldwork was extended to Indonesia, and it was through this experience that he became familiar with Dutch structuralism and its approach to the study of Indonesian social structure<sup>8</sup>. From 1953, Mabuchi taught in the anthropology department at the Tokyo Metropolitan University, which is famous for its emphasis on fieldwork training.

As for Korea, the Institute of Religion and Sociology was established at the Imperial University of Keijō (pronounced KyongSong in Korean), now Seoul. Its leader was Takashi Akiba (1888–1954), who had studied anthropology with Malinowski in London and was strongly influenced by his functionalism. In 1934, Akiba wrote a paper in Japanese entitled “The Dual Organization of Rural Rituals,” in which he argued that Korean peasant society had a dual structure, Confucian and folk (Shimizu 1999: 137). This theory of duality is reminiscent of the conclusion drawn by Vincent Brandt, the American anthropologist who

---

but occasionally questioned his sincerity as a person (Minato 1982: 56–58). After World War II, Mashiho Chiri became the first Ainu to be appointed a full professor at Hokkaido University.

<sup>8</sup> Dutch structuralism is a name given to the body of work on Indonesia before World War II, led by de Josselin de Jong, J. P. B. (1886–1964) at the University of Leiden. It became known by this name after the popularization of Claude Lévi-Strauss's structuralism in the 1950s and beyond. A major source of inspiration for the Dutch structuralists was the study of classification by Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss. Even before Lévi-Strauss, they investigated Indonesian social structure in terms of binaries such as wife giver/wife receiver, men's canal/women's canal, above/below, and so on (Miyazaki 1984). The focus of Mabuchi's research was on Taiwan and, in his later years, Okinawa, but he was instrumental in spreading structural analysis in postwar Japanese anthropology.



Figure 3. Tōichi Mabuchi with Taiwanese aboriginal children in 1929  
Source: Photo Archive, Department of Anthropology, National University of Taiwan

wrote *A Korean Village: Between Farm and Sea* in 1971. Some Japanese anthropologists insist that it is unlikely that Brandt was unaware of Akiba's work, but this is a moot point.

Just as Mabuchi received his professional training in prewar Taiwan, Seiichi Izumi (1915–1970) did the same in Korea. After the war, Izumi got a teaching position in the new anthropology department at the University of Tokyo. He was to become the first director of the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka, which opened in 1977, but he died shortly before the opening. One of Izumi's most memorable words was about his fieldwork among the Sakhalin Ainu in the early 1950s. When he asked an old Ainu woman about her life, she shouted at him, "You don't know how hard our life is and how poor we are. Did you come all the way here to humiliate us? Or are you taking advantage of us to make money and get a doctorate?" This experience forced Izumi to reflect on the nature of anthropological research. He said, "People often call me an expert fieldworker. Certainly, my life has been a series of fieldwork since I was in my twenties. But do I really like fieldwork? Or am I well-suited for it? I don't know for sure. Such



self-reflection has been on my mind lately. I say this because fieldwork is always painful for me” (Izumi 1969: 4–5, translation mine).<sup>9</sup> I think this is an honest confession from a truly experienced fieldworker.

According to Katsumi Nakao (2014), there is a significant difference between Taiwan and Korea both before and after the war. In Taiwan, Japanese anthropological research was conducted without being strongly influenced by the colonial policies of the Japanese government. Rather, its emphasis on the differences between Taiwan and Qing China, while emphasizing Taiwan’s distinctiveness, led to a situation in the 1990s and beyond in which Japanese research during the colonial period is highly valued by Taiwanese who assert their independence from the mainland. Japanese anthropological research in colonial Korea, on the other hand, was strongly influenced by the demands of the Japanese state and was also linked to Japan’s intention to invade China. For example, the study of Korean shamanism by Akiba and his associates was conducted in part to meet the need to maintain security by suppressing folk beliefs. In Nakao’s view, Korea was merely a research object for the Japanese anthropologists, and their attitudes differed greatly from those of their Korean counterparts, who were studying their own culture in search of their national identity. For this reason, contemporary Korean scholars are critical of Japanese research during the colonial period, regardless of its academic values.

China is said to be in a different situation. The research conducted by the teams of the South Manchuria Railway Company, known by its Japanese acronym “*Mantetsu*” (*tetsu* means “iron” used in the construction of railways) is undoubtedly the most detailed and comprehensive of all the research conducted by the Japanese in China before the war. Although the researchers were not professional ethnologists, they studied many aspects of village life in China, and the results were of great value not only for military purposes but also for scholarship. Until recently, however, the use of the *Mantetsu* materials was controversial in both China and Japan for the same reason as in Korea, but today their scholarly value is again being recognized. Indeed, some of them have been translated into Chinese and published in the 2010s (Grove 2020: 23).

### *I-3 Folklore studies as a twin discipline of anthropology*

The sociocultural branch of Japanese anthropology, or ethnology as it was called before the war, developed in close connection with folklore studies. *Nihon Minzoku Gakkai* (Japanese Society of Ethnology) was founded in 1934, and its

---

<sup>9</sup> The American historian Miriam Kingsberg Kadia’s recent work (Kadia 2020) focuses on the experiences of Izumi and his contemporaries during the First and Second World Wars.

folklore counterpart was established the following year.<sup>10</sup> While anthropologists insisted that comparisons of Japan with other countries were essential, folklorists argued for the study of Japan itself. Despite these differences, there was a great deal of overlap between the two disciplines, both in terms of subject matter and personnel, because Japan modernized later than the major Western countries, and antiquated customs and practices, such as those studied by Western anthropologists in the premodern world, were often found in remote villages within Japan.<sup>11</sup>

#### *I-4 The post-W. W. II period: Japan as the defeated*

After its defeat in World War II, Japan underwent dramatic changes, and anthropology was no exception. Before the end of the war, the term “*minzokugaku*” (ethnology) was used for the social and cultural branch of the discipline, but it was replaced by *bunka jinruigaku* (cultural anthropology). There were two major reasons for this name change. One is that ethnology had a tarnished image in postwar Japan because of its association with the military. The other was the introduction of the American type of anthropology, symbolized by the opening of the Cultural Anthropology Seminar at the University of Tokyo in 1954. Following these changes, the Japanese Society of Ethnology finally changed its name to the Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology in 2004.

For about two decades after the war, it was difficult to conduct fieldwork overseas, so Japanese anthropologists were forced to do research in the Japanese countryside as an alternative. This was not without merit, however, as good ethnographies were produced about topics that had seldom been studied before, such as fox possession (Yoshida 1972). With the economic boom that began in the 1960s, Japanese anthropological research expanded globally in terms of countries studied, reaching almost every corner of the world. In the 1970s,

<sup>10</sup> In 1935, *Minkan Denshō no Kai* (Popular Tradition Society) was founded on the initiative of Kunio Yanagita (1875–1962). The term “popular tradition” was a Japanese translation of the French “*traditions populaires*.” After World War II, it changed its name to *Nihon Minzoku Gakkai* (Folklore Society of Japan) in 1949, the only national organization of folklorists in Japan today. In Japanese, ethnology and folklore studies are both called “*minzokugaku*,” although the characters used are different.

<sup>11</sup> This is not to say that folklore studies in the West was a field completely independent of anthropology. In the United States, for example, Boas served three times as president of the American Folklore Society (AFS) in 1900, 1931, and 1934. Past presidents of the AFS include Alfred Kroeber (1906), Robert Lowie (1916–1917), Edward Sapir (1929–1930), A. Irvin Hallowsell (1940–1941), Melville Herskovits (1945), and Dell Hymes (1973–1974). As for British anthropology, Edward Tylor was deeply involved in the activities of the Folklore Society, founded in London in 1878. Between 1890 and 1892, he was one of the vice-presidents of the Folklore Society.

when “*kokusaika*” (internationalization) was the buzzword of the day, cultural anthropology became popular as the study of other people’s lifestyles. Today, when information about the rest of the world is readily available on the internet, cultural anthropology is not as popular as it once was, but it continues to attract the attention of people who are seriously interested in the Other.

At this point, questions may be raised about the relationship between anthropological practice and colonialism in postwar Japan without colonies. This is a difficult question on which opinions differ widely. What is certain, however, is that Japan’s defeat in the war clearly revealed the political side of anthropology, especially the politics of fieldwork conducted in its former colonies. In fact, due to the tarnished image of ethnology mentioned earlier, the term was rarely used for courses in the study of other cultures taught in postwar Japanese universities. The only notable exception was the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka, which opened in 1977 and has born its name ever since.

Among the major Western powers, it was not until the 1960s, when there was much rebellion against the political developments that were shaking the world, such as the Vietnam War and the emergence of counterculture, that they became fully aware of the connection between anthropology and politics. Two books were published in the early 1970s that symbolized this emerging awareness: *Reinventing Anthropology* (Hymes 1974) and *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter* (Asad 1973). In this regard, Japanese anthropologists were ironically ahead of their American and European counterparts, although the term “colonial roots” was not used. However, the Japanese sense of victimization caused by the atomic bombings obscured the fact that Japan was the aggressor in Asia and the Pacific. As the generations get younger, this negative side of Japan’s duality as a perpetrator and a victim of the war seems to be lost on researchers.

### *I-5 Three major characteristics of Japanese anthropology*

Before concluding this section, I would like to add three things to the preceding descriptions. First, as mentioned at the beginning on the origins of the Japanese people, Japanese anthropologists have had a deep interest in their own country. This contrasts with Euro-American anthropology, which focuses on the study of distant countries or ethnic groups with radically different traditions.<sup>12</sup>

Second, the various groups of people studied by Japanese anthropologists have tended to be historically and culturally close to them. This is exemplified by the

---

<sup>12</sup> It is well known that Chinese anthropologists, especially those on the mainland and in Hong Kong, tend to focus on the study of their own culture, but probably for different reasons.

Japanese interest in China and Korea. As a result, the deep divide between the “civilized” and the “uncivilized,” which characterized Western anthropology, has been ambiguous, although this is not to deny the Japanese arrogance in colonial times.<sup>13</sup>

And third, Japanese research on other cultures has reached almost all corners of the world, but Japan has been and continues to be a favorite subject of Western anthropologists. Two of the most famous examples are John Embree’s *Suye Mura: A Japanese Village* (1939) and Ruth Benedict’s *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture* (1946). *Suye Mura* was published in the same year as Hsiao-Tung Fei’s *Peasant Life in China*. Significantly, these books were prefaced by A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Bronislaw Malinowski, respectively. Thus, we can say that 1939 marks the beginning of the functionalist study of East Asia by Western anthropologists. Since the late 1980s, however, their research orientation toward Japan has changed greatly, and many of them are studying popular culture such as *anime* (animations) and *manga* (comics).<sup>14</sup>

Regarding the relationship between Japanese anthropologists and the Ainu people, a very important event occurred during the preparation of this article. It will be mentioned in the concluding section.

## Part II: Japan’s Place in the World System of Anthropology and Its Contributions to Emerging World Anthropologies

In this section, I will first discuss why Japanese anthropology has received little attention in the wider world in terms of what the late Swedish anthropologist Tomas Gerholm called the “world system of anthropology,” and then show how the growing awareness of Japan’s and other countries’ peripheral status in this system has led to the emergence of “world anthropologies.”

### *II-1 From native anthropology to world anthropologies*

I will begin by describing my own research as I have been working on this topic since the late 1990s. My ideas were first presented in Japanese in the *Japanese Journal of Ethnology* (Kuwayama 1997) and later elaborated in *Native*

---

<sup>13</sup> For example, the natives of the Pacific islands were called “*dojin*,” which literally means “earth people.” Similarly, the aborigines of Taiwan were called “*seiban*,” following the Chinese use of the term to refer to those indigenous people who had not yet been Sinicized and were therefore considered uncivilized.

<sup>14</sup> For details, see Bestor and Bestor with Yamagata (2011), especially Part III “Cool Japan,” and Robertson (2005).

*Anthropology: The Japanese Challenge to Western Academic Hegemony*, published in English in 2004 (Kuwayama 2004a).<sup>15</sup> The central question I posed in that book is why Japanese anthropologists' writings about their own culture are little appreciated overseas, especially in the Anglophone world, and why their writings about other cultures are equally underappreciated.

By "native anthropology," I mean the attempt by natives, especially those studied and described by Western scholars, to represent their own culture in their own language from their own point of view. Although the term "native" has often had pejorative connotations, in this context it refers, from the Latin word "*nativus*," to anyone who was born and raised in a particular place, whether "civilized" or "uncivilized." Native anthropology, sometimes referred to as "local," "indigenous," or "home"<sup>16</sup>, does not simply raise methodological questions, such as the merits and demerits of fieldwork conducted by native members of the community under study. Rather, it poses a fundamental challenge to the existing structure of anthropological knowledge, in which the stronger/seer/describer/knower determines the identity of the weaker/seen/described/known.

In formulating my ideas, I was initially inspired by Gerholm's 1995 work. He argued that there is a "world system" in anthropology in which only a few countries occupy the center, and their collective power has pushed other countries to the periphery. The power imbalance is such that the center teaches, while the periphery listens. Gerholm compared this relationship to that between the mainland and remote islands.

It seems that the map of the discipline shows a prosperous mainland of British, American and French anthropologies, and outside it an archipelago of large and small islands – some of them connected to the mainland by sturdy bridges or frequent ferry traffic, others rather isolated. On the mainland, people can

---

<sup>15</sup> This book was later expanded and translated into Japanese (Kuwayama 2008). Still later, the Japanese version was translated into Chinese in 2019, and a Korean translation is in progress.

<sup>16</sup> The distinction between "native" and "indigenous" is ambiguous and complex. Third World scholars generally prefer the latter because it is relatively free of the colonial implications of the former. "Local," on the other hand, is a neutral word that merely refers to a particular place, whether Western or non-Western, colonial or colonized. It therefore obscures the power differences that exist in the modern world system. "Home" is frequently used by Western scholars studying their own culture. Throughout my career, I have used "native" because it clearly shows that the subjects of the former colonial powers are beginning to "invade" the academic space previously closed to them. This invasion signals the radical change now taking place in the structure of anthropological knowledge. For details, see Kuwayama (2004a: 2–4).

go through their professional lives more or less unaware of what happens on the islands. The reverse seems not so often to be the case. If international anthropology to a great extent equals American + British + French anthropology, in other words, then these national anthropologies need hardly take external influences into account to more than a very limited degree (Gerholm 1995: 159–160).

Gerholm's words resonated with me because they corresponded to my experiences in the United States and back in Japan. Before entering graduate school at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) in 1982, I had little professional training in anthropology and knew very little about what Japanese anthropologists did. Moreover, during my 11 years as a graduate student and a junior professor in the world's most powerful country, I unwittingly absorbed the American bias against non-Western scholarship. Therefore, I was greatly surprised when I returned to Japan in 1993 to find that the level of scholarship among Japanese anthropologists was much higher than I had expected. In some areas they surpassed the Americans.

I wondered how this could have happened. I asked myself, "Why is Japanese anthropology so little known internationally, at least in the Anglophone world?" The flip side of that question was, "How can American anthropologists get by when many of them don't know or care what people in the rest of the world are doing?" As I pondered these questions, I happened to read Gerholm's article. The answer was obvious: in what he called the "world system of anthropology," or more broadly, the "world system of knowledge," there was, and still is, such a great imbalance of power between the center and the periphery that the United States, located at the center, dominates Japan, located at the periphery.<sup>17</sup> I later found that I was not alone in feeling this way as more than a few anthropologists based in peripheral countries were eager to redress the power imbalance. Their collective efforts gave rise to what came to be called "world anthropologies."

## *II-2 A sketch of the path to world anthropologies*

World anthropologies is a movement that respects the different kinds of knowledge produced by anthropologists around the world, and thus seeks to create an intellectual space in which scholars of all nationalities can engage in dialogue on an equal footing. At its heart is a growing awareness of the diversity

---

<sup>17</sup> Due to space limitations, I refer interested readers to my previous work (Kuwayama 2003, 2004b, 2004c, 2012, 2015a, 2015b, 2017), which includes critical reviews of previous literature on native/indigenous anthropology.

of anthropological traditions, which has led to a desire to make anthropology a global discipline, rather than a monopoly of a few powerful countries.<sup>18</sup>

A most recent book on this subject is *Histories of Anthropology* (D'Agostino and Matera 2023), which covers 20 countries or regions in over 650 pages.<sup>19</sup> The aim is succinctly expressed in the plural form of the word "histories." In the introduction, D'Agostino and Matera trace the beginnings of world anthropologies to a conference held in the United States in the 1960s that explored the possibility of studying the history of anthropology as an independent field of inquiry. Parts of this initiative materialized in the early 1980s, according to the editors, in the book series by George Stocking entitled "History of Anthropology," published by the University of Wisconsin Press. It ran to 12 volumes and was completed in 2010. The publisher claims that "this series covers the history and present practice of anthropological inquiry," but in fact it mainly covers developments in the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany. Germany was included because of its influence on founding figures such as Boas.

As D'Agostino and Matera pointed out, a critical step was taken in 1982 when two Swedish anthropologists, Gerholm and his colleague Ulf Hannerz, edited a special issue of *Ethnos* entitled "The Shaping of National Anthropologies" (Gerholm and Hannerz 1982). This was probably one of the first times the word "anthropologies" was used in the plural. In the same year, *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries* (Fahim 1982) was published. This book was the result of an international symposium held in Austria in 1978 under the auspices of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.<sup>20</sup> It questioned the validity of Western theories in the context of non-Western developing countries, but the focus was more on methodology than on rethinking anthropology.

Two decades later, in 2003, an international conference was held in Italy to examine the state of anthropologies outside the North Atlantic region. One of its outcomes was the publication of a landmark book, *World Anthropologies*:

---

<sup>18</sup> Even in the age of globalization, the nation or country continues to function as the unit of scholarship both academically (e.g., reading, writing, lecturing, fieldwork) and institutionally (e.g., educational system, allocation of funds). The fact that almost every anthropological association in the world bears the name of a particular country or region testifies to this point. There are, of course, internal differences within a nation, but many commonalities among its members emerge in international comparisons.

<sup>19</sup> Because the editors are Italian based, the anthropologies represented in this volume are almost inevitably biased toward Europe and its former colonies. From Asia, China, India, and Viet Nam are represented, but not Japan.

<sup>20</sup> The same Foundation financially supported the international meeting held in Brazil in 2004, which led to the creation of the World Council of Anthropological Associations.

*Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power* (Ribeiro and Escobar 2006). Two years earlier, in 2004, one of the book's editors, Gustavo Ribeiro of Brazil, had played a leading role in founding the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA). As stated in its constitution, the first of the primary objectives of this association is "to promote the discipline of anthropology in an international context." The unit of participation is the country or region, not the individual, and it is now represented by more than 55 national or regional anthropological associations around the world.<sup>21</sup>

All of this led to the launch in 2014 of a new section called "World Anthropology" in *American Anthropologist*, the flagship journal of the American Anthropological Association (AAA). This was a significant step in the realization of world anthropologies, as it was finally recognized by the largest and most influential anthropological society in the world, even though the section title should have been in the plural.<sup>22</sup>

Similar developments have taken place outside of Europe and the Americas. In Southeast Asia, for example, anthropologists from across the region met at the National University of Singapore in 2014 to discuss the "making of Southeast Asian anthropologies." This gathering resulted in an edited volume, *Southeast Asian Anthropologies: National Traditions and Transnational Practices* (Thompson and Sinha 2019). They acknowledged their debt to earlier publications for inspiration, such as *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia* (Yamashita, Bosco, and Eades 2004), which won the Choice Outstanding Book of the Year award in 2005, and *Asian Anthropology* (van Bremen, Ben-Ari, and Alatas 2005).<sup>23</sup>

Just a few remarks about Francophone communities are in order here, since the so-called "West" is diverse and far from being unified. In 2015, Francine Saillant, one of the authors of the *Lausanne Manifesto: For a Non-Hegemonic Anthropology* (2011) wrote an article for the World Anthropology section of

<sup>21</sup> The first chair of the WCAA was Ribeiro (2004-2005), followed by Junji Koizumi (2005-2008) from Japan. Subsequently, WCAA leaders were concerned about mission overlap with the existing International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES). The establishment of the World Anthropological Union (WAU) in 2016 was a solution to this concern. The first chapter of the WAU Constitution declares that it "incorporates" the two organizations, "each as a distinctly separate but constituent chamber in a federal structure."

<sup>22</sup> In November 2023, the "Members' Programmatic, Advisory, and Advocacy Committee" was established within the AAA. This committee covers eight areas of engagement, one of which is "world anthropologies."

<sup>23</sup> An anonymous reviewer pointed out the importance of *The Lausanne Manifesto: For a Non-Hegemonic Anthropology* (2011) in the development of world anthropologies, but I was unable to obtain it.



*American Anthropologist*, in which she argued for the continued importance of Francophone anthropologists, especially those outside of France, in forming an independent intellectual community that examines a range of issues in a Francophone context. Her argument, however, is not that of an isolationist, but rather a stern response to Anglo-Saxon hegemony on the one hand and Franco-French hegemony on the other. To create a non-hegemonic anthropology, Saillant argued, we would need “a relational and dialogic anthropology” (Saillant 2015: 149), and for its realization “a heteroglossic and multisited universalism” (*ibid.* 150), by which she implied that a mere recognition of the diversity of national traditions around the world is not enough.

The question of how academic knowledge is produced and circulated is now a major concern in various fields, as evidenced by the publication of the *Routledge Handbook of Academic Knowledge Circulation* (Keim et al. 2023).

### *II-3 A Japanese anthropologist’s trajectory*

Below I add some personal recollections to the chronology just outlined. First, in 1982, when the special issue of *Ethnos* on national anthropologies appeared, I entered UCLA as a graduate student. At that time, the hegemony of Anglophone anthropology was so firmly established that there was no such idea as world anthropologies. Even in Japanese studies, works written in Japanese were rarely referenced, and I was “penalized” for my extensive use of them when I submitted my work for review to a major American journal. Through this experience, I began to wonder if journal refereeing might become a barrier to diversifying the discipline of anthropology. Much later, Gordon Mathews took up this question in his 2010 article (Matthews 2010).

Second, in 1997, four years after my return to Japan, I wrote my first article on native anthropology, which I mentioned at the beginning. At that time, the Internet was beginning to be used worldwide, and the English abstract of my article was quickly circulated. I am indebted to the late Jan van Bremen, a Dutch anthropologist, for inviting me to contribute the abstract to the newsletter of the Japan Anthropology Workshop (JAWS), an international organization of anthropological specialists on Japan. Among those interested in the topic was Mathews, who has since played a major role in making East Asian anthropologies better known to the rest of the world. As of 2024, he is chair of the WCAA.

Third, in 2002, I attended a session on the internationalization of anthropology at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association. Among the speakers were such dignitaries as Stocking and Hannerz, but the large conference room was almost empty. I was genuinely surprised, but it was a sign of the indifference of most Americans at that time to anthropologies other than their

own. I was fortunate, however, to meet Ribeiro there for the first time. Our most recent face-to-face meeting was at the 2014 Congress of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES), held in Japan. A series of conferences were held there to review the progress of the WCAA in the 10 years since its founding.

Fourth, in 2008, international scholars based in East Asia, notably Shu-min Huang (Taiwan), Kwang-ok Kim (Korea), Gordon Mathews (Hong Kong), Ok-pyo Moon (Korea), Hirochika Nakamaki (Japan), and Mingming Wang (China), held the first meeting of the East Asian Anthropological Association (EAAA) in China. This association is similar in ideal to the WCAA but consists of individual members working in the region. The language of its meetings is English, which limits the participation of non-English speakers, but in Gerholm's words a "bridge" is being built between the "remote islands" of the world system.

Fifth, in 2014, a special committee was established within the Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology (JASCA) to disseminate information about Japanese anthropology abroad. The Japanese government, concerned that Japanese research was little known in the rest of the world because of the language barrier, had announced the previous year that it would provide funding to academic societies willing to increase the proportion of English-language articles in their journals. While chairing the committee, I was also the editor-in-chief of the *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology* (JRCA), which has been publishing both review articles and original articles in English since 1998 (Kuwayama 2017). Its main purpose is to make the research of Japanese anthropologists accessible to non-Japanese readers.

Sixth, in 2015, I wrote an article for the World Anthropology section of *American Anthropologist* arguing for the contemporary relevance of "world folklore studies" as proposed by Japanese folklorist Kunio Yanagita (1875-1962) in 1934 (Kuwayama 2015a). Exactly 90 years ago today, Yanagita problematized the power imbalance between the West and the East, which he argued had prevented the creation of a global community of folklorists to share research findings in different parts of the world. He therefore proposed the creation of a national association in each country first, and then an international federation in which scholars from large and small countries could participate on an equal basis.<sup>24</sup> From this point of view, the WCAA is a realization of Yanagita's 1934 project in anthropology.

---

<sup>24</sup> In 1921, Yanagita was dispatched by the Japanese government to Geneva, where he served as a member of the League of Nations Mandate Committee. It is possible that his proposal for world folklore studies was inspired when he saw many countries, large and small, working together for a common goal. I am indebted to Takanori Shimamura for this observation.

Finally, in 2022, I participated as a speaker in an online meeting organized by the WCAA entitled “Hegemony in World Anthropologies.” The purpose was not to condemn the three central countries of the world system identified by Gerholm, but rather to spread awareness that there is still an inequality between the center and the periphery, and what actions should be taken to overcome the problem.

#### *II-4 Practical suggestions for overcoming the barriers to world anthropologies*

At present, world anthropologies is a work in progress and more of an ideal than a reality. It has many problems to overcome before it can be fully realized. In what follows, I will address some of the most serious ones and suggest practical solutions.

The greatest problem is the language barrier. This is especially serious for people outside the Indo-European language areas, since English has become the *de facto* “lingua franca” today. However, the situation is changing for the better as the quality of automatic translation is rapidly improving. DEEP L, of which there is a free version, is highly recommended: it works as both a translator and an editor. As in other fields, artificial intelligence (AI) is beginning to make possible what was unimaginable even a decade ago. Let us make the most of it.

Far more difficult than mastering the English language is knowing how to write in a way that appeals to an international audience. Under present circumstances, that audience is primarily Anglophone, or educated in, or under the influence of, the central countries of the world system. Given that approximately 70 percent of the anthropology journals listed in the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) are either American or British,<sup>25</sup> in order to have articles accepted by the world’s leading journals, we must write according to the “grammar” set by scholars from these countries. This grammar dictates the kinds of writing styles, topics, theories, and methods we should use. Citation practices are a part of it (Kuwayama 2004a: 9–10).

Again, the situation is changing rapidly. According to Junko Kitanaka, an internationally renowned Japanese medical anthropologist, book editors in the English-speaking world are beginning to be aware of the diversity of anthropological traditions and, above all, writing styles and are therefore seeking manuscripts

---

<sup>25</sup> In 2017, a total of 82 journals were listed in the SSCI under the category of anthropology. Of these, the United States accounted for 38 (46.3 percent) and the United Kingdom accounted for 21 (25.6 percent). Together, these two countries accounted for 72.0 percent of all journals listed in SSCI (Kuwayama 2017: 162–163). The situation has not changed much since then.

from different parts of the world. Although this applies mainly to book writing rather than journal publishing, it is consistent with my own experience: an editor from a major British publisher came to Japan around 2019 to encourage manuscript submissions. Although the language that authors must use is still English, this fact is surprising because Japan has long been outside the region from which authors are recruited. Non-English-speaking scholars in peripheral countries should make the most of this opportunity.

To change the current citation practices that favor Anglophone scholarship, I propose that we compile annotated bibliographies of the works that are considered foundational in each country, whether classical or contemporary, on a particular topic, and then translate them into the core language, which is English. Once this is done, it is relatively easy to translate into other languages. In the Internet age, such bibliographies can be quickly and inexpensively uploaded to the website in digital form, rather than on time-consuming and costly paper. My proposal follows the model of the WCAA online archive called “*déjà lu*,” where past articles representative of the member associations have been uploaded. However, there is one major difference: the bibliographies I propose will allow new entries to be made based on the existing ones, so that they will be constantly updated. Third party comments are also welcome, and the authors are expected to respond. Such an initial exchange of ideas will eventually help to create a dialogic space across national academic traditions.

Professors can do one more thing: include excellent works produced on the periphery on the list of required readings and to assign them in class. Unfortunately, today there is a pattern of neglect in which the writings of peripheral scholars are habitually sidelined, even when they are written in English and deserve serious attention. If this practice continues, the hegemony of Anglophone scholarship will be further reinforced. But if students are exposed to peripheral writings early on, they will learn to appreciate different kinds of theories, methods, and styles of argumentation, which will eventually lead to a more balanced view of the subject they are studying.

### *II-5 The future of world anthropologies and publishing situations*

Whether or not world anthropologies will advance depends on many factors, but one thing we should consider is the publishing situation in each country. In Japan, for example, anthropologists can write in Japanese for both professional and lay readers. JASCA has its own journal called *Bunka Jinruigaku* (*Japanese Journal of Cultural Anthropology*), formerly *Minzokugaku Kenkyū* (*Japanese Journal of Ethnology*), which has been published quarterly since 1935. In addition, the general book market is large enough for anthropological writings to sell well.

Even doctoral dissertations can be turned into books after revision. Under these circumstances, most Japanese anthropologists do not feel the need to publish in English, which leads to indifference to situations in other parts of the world, hence the general lack of interest in world anthropologies.

Anthropologists in Hong Kong, on the other hand, are in the opposite situation, as they are practically forced to write in English and publish in internationally recognized journals in order to find their jobs or to be promoted to higher positions. In small European countries, especially those outside the Anglophone world, anthropology is such a small field that some of them have neither professional journals nor widely circulated journals for which they can write in their own languages. The demand for anthropological writing in the general book market is also small. Other countries in other regions face a similar situation, according to the recent AAA report “Comparing the Situations of Anthropologists around the World as to Publication and Evaluation Criteria” (Mathews et. al 2024).<sup>26</sup> Ironically, this fact has led to a heightened awareness of what is going on in the larger world, hence the general interest in world anthropologies.

There are, of course, other factors that influence the position of a country or region in relation to world anthropologies. The situations surrounding them are so different that the progress of world anthropologies depends on whether we have the will to listen to different voices from different parts of the world. It is the stories of the many “little traditions” in the periphery, including Japan, which have been overshadowed by those of the few “great traditions” in the center, that deserve special attention.

## Concluding Remarks

Today, as the topics that anthropologists study have diversified, with a stream of new theories borrowed from other disciplines, not many anthropologists have the luxury of reflecting on where we have come from and what we have achieved or failed to achieve as a scholarly community. Yet to determine the direction of the present and the future, we must look to the past, for we are never free from it. Hence, the importance of studying the history of our discipline.

In the case of Japanese anthropology, the relationship with the Ainu people has always been a hidden point of contention or, as the Japanese say, a “small fish

---

<sup>26</sup> This report is based on the findings of the international task force organized by Gordon Mathews following the WCAA online conference “Hegemony in World Anthropologies” mentioned above. Members were recruited from China, Chile, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Nigeria, Norway, and South Africa. I represented Japan.

bone stuck in the throat.” As mentioned in Part I, Japanese anthropology has its origins in the study of the Ainu, but these people have been treated as living specimens, as evidenced by the examination of their physique and, occasionally, the collection of their ancestors’ bones through grave excavations, all in the name of science. Much of the anthropological research on the Ainu was a typical case of internal colonialism and exploitation.<sup>27</sup> It is not surprising, then, that they have regarded anthropologists as their “*teki*” or enemies. Even today, the Ainu’s resentment of anthropologists has not completely dissipated.<sup>28</sup>

Given the growing importance of indigenous studies around the world, this is an unfortunate situation, to say the least. As a partial solution, JASCA issued a formal apology to the Ainu people in April 2024, self-critiquing the traditional priority given to research at the expense of the welfare of the people studied. The question remains, however, whether reconciliation is truly possible, and if so, whether the Japanese and the Ainu can engage in dialogue on an equal footing. To facilitate a fruitful dialogue, it would be beneficial for contemporary anthropologists to gain a deeper understanding of the history of their discipline, given the limited attention it has received in recent times.

The same is true of Japan’s relations with Korea and China. Since its defeat in World War II, Japan has forged strong ties with its former enemies, the United States and its European allies, based on a thorough self-criticism of its wartime conduct. Indeed, many postwar Japanese scholars were educated at leading American or European universities, where they learned the fruits of advanced research. Despite the power imbalance that I problematized in Part II, channels of communication, albeit mostly unidirectional, were opened at the professional level. However, the same cannot be said of Korea and China, with which Japan has yet to resolve outstanding issues both diplomatically and emotionally among the public. With the exception of regional specialists and those involved in pan-East Asian activities such as the EAAA, there is little information about the activities of anthropologists outside their own country. Again, a deeper, more

---

<sup>27</sup> Although much of this was done by physical anthropologists, this alone does not exonerate cultural anthropologists, as the two groups often worked together in the field. In the minds of many Ainu, at least, there is no distinction between physical and cultural anthropology.

<sup>28</sup> While teaching at Hokkaido University from 2003 to 2018, I met a young Ainu man who told me that anthropologists were the “*teki*” (enemy) of his people. And when I organized a JASCA symposium on the Ainu in 2010, an elderly Ainu man, a former elementary school principal, called the JASCA office in Tokyo to complain about the grave excavations. These reactions prove that for the Ainu, anthropologists are anthropologists, whether they are physical or cultural anthropologists.

comprehensive understanding of the past, both as researchers and as researched, is essential to improving the present situation.

As for world anthropologies, I will conclude with a gentle warning, especially to those who find themselves outside the center of the world system. As in everything else, parochial nationalism in scholarship is unproductive and self-defeating. The call for world anthropologies is in no way an attempt to replace one kind of hegemony with another. The current relationship between center and periphery is certainly unequal, with the former having overwhelming power over the latter. However, our goal should not be to overturn this relationship, i.e. to have the peripheral countries rise above the central ones, but to create a world in which both can share and examine research results as equal partners. Thus, it is not a question of reversing the hierarchy of actors within the current system of power, but rather of changing the system itself to create a space where all actors are equally respected. A “horizontal” as opposed to a “vertical” structure of the anthropological discipline is called for.

## References

- Akiba, Takashi. 1934. Sonsai no Nijū Soshiki (The Dual Organization of Rural Rituals). *Chōsen Minzoku (Korean Folklore)* 2: 5–10.
- Asad, Talal (ed). 1973. *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.
- Barth, Fredrik, Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin, and Sydel Silverman. 2005. *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Benedict, Ruth. 1946. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bestor, Victoria Lyon, Theodore C. Bestor, Akiko Yamagata (eds). 2011. *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Culture and Society*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Brandt, Vincent. 1971. *A Korean Village: Between Farm and Sea*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Chiri, Yukie. 1978. *Ainu Shinyōshū (A Collection of Ainu Myths)*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten (orig. 1923).
- D'Agostino, Gabriella, and Vincenzo Matera (eds). 2023. *Histories of Anthropology*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Embee, John. 1939. *Suye Mura: A Japanese Village*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fahim, Hussein (ed). 1982. *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: Proceedings of a Burg Wartenstein Symposium*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- Fei, Hsiao-Tung. 1939. *Peasant Life in China: A Field Study of Country Life in the Yangtze Valley*. London: Routledge.

- Gerholm, Tomas. 1995. Sweden: Central Ethnology, Peripheral Anthropology. In *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, edited by Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo A. Roldán. London: Routledge: 159–170.
- Gerholm, Tomas, and Ulf Hannerz. 1982. Introduction: The Shaping of National Anthropologies. *Ethnos* 47(I–II): 5–35.
- Grove, Linda. 2020. A Brief History of Japanese Field Research on China. In *Fieldwork in Modern Chinese History: A Research Guide*, edited by Thomas David DuBois and Jan Kiely. London: Routledge: 22–34.
- Hymes, Dell (ed.). 1972. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Izumi, Seiichi. 1969. *Firudowāku no Kiroku: Bunka Jinruigaku no Jissen (Records of Fieldwork: Practicing Cultural Anthropology)*. Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- Kadia, Miriam Kingsberg. 2020. *Into the Field: Human Scientists of Transwar Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kannari, Matsu, and Kyōsuke Kindaichi. 1964. *Ainu Jojōshi Yūkarashū (A Collection of Ainu Epics, Yukar)*. Tokyo: Sanseidō.
- Keim, Wiebke, Leandro Rodriguez Medina, Rigas Arvanitis, Natacha Bacolla, Chandni Basu, Stéphane Dufoix, Stefan Klein, Mauricio Nieto Olarte, Barbara Riedel, Clara Ruvituso, Gernot Saalman, Tobias Schlechtriemen, and Hebe Vessuri (eds). 2023. *Routledge Handbook of Knowledge Circulation*. London: Routledge.
- Kreiner, Josef (ed.). 2012. *Kindai Nihon Ishiki no Seiritsu: Minzokugaku-Minzokugaku no Kōken (The Birth of Japanese Consciousness in Modern Times: Folkloristic and Anthropological Contributions)*. Tokyo: Tokyodō Shuppan.
- Kreiner, Josef (ed.). 2013. *Nihon Minzokugaku no Senzen to Sengo: Oka Masao to Nihon Minzokugaku no Kusawake (Prewar and Postwar Ethnology in Japan: Masao Oka and Other Pioneers in Japanese Ethnology)*. Tokyo: Tokyodō Shuppan.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 1997. *Genchi no Jinruigakusha: Naigai no Nihon Kenkyū o Chūshin ni (Native Anthropologists: With Special Reference to Japanese Studies Inside and Outside Japan)*. *Minzokugaku Kenkyū (Japanese Journal of Ethnology)* 61(4): 517–542.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 2003. Natives as Dialogic Partners: Some Thoughts on Native Anthropology. *Anthropology Today* 19(1): 61–77.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 2004a. *Native Anthropology: The Japanese Challenge to Western Academic Hegemony*. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 2004b. The “World System” of Anthropology: Japan and Asia in the Global Community of Anthropologists. In *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*, edited by Shinji Yamashita, Joseph Bosco, and J. S. Eades. New York: Berghahn Books: 35–56.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 2004c. Native Discourse in the Academic World System: Kunio Yanagita’s Project of Global Folkloristics Reconsidered. In *Asian Anthropology*, edited by Jan van Bremen, Eyal Ben-Ari, and Syed Farid Alatas. London: Routledge: 97–116.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 2008. *Neitivu no Jinruigaku to Minzokugaku: Chi no Sekai Shisutemu to Nihon (Native Anthropology and Folklore Studies: Japan in the World System of Knowledge)*. Tokyo: Kōbundō.



- Kuwayama, Takami. 2012. The Ainu in the Ethnographic Triad: From the Describer to the Described. In *Anthropologists, Indigenous Scholars and the Research Endeavour: Seeking Bridges towards Mutual Respect*, edited by Joy Hendry and Laara Fitznor. London: Routledge: 44–54.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 2015a. On Kunio Yanagita's 1934 "World Folkloristics" Project. *American Anthropologist* 116(3): 658–662.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 2015b. Introduction: Bridging the Anthropology of Japan Inside and Outside Japan. *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology* 15: 75–79.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 2017. Japanese Anthropology, Neoliberal Knowledge Structuring, and the Rise of Audit Culture: Lessons from the Academic World System. *Asian Anthropology* 16(3): 159–171.
- Mathews, Gordon. 2010. On the Referee System as a Barrier to Global Anthropology. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 11(1): 52–63.
- Mathews, Gordon, Gonzalo Diaz Crovetto, Thomas Hylland Eriksen, P-J Ezeh, Shannon Morreira, Yasmeen Arif, Chen Gang, and Takami Kuwayama. 2024. Comparing the Situations of Anthropologists around the World as to Publication and Evaluation Criteria. *American Anthropologist*: 126(3): 524–535. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13981>).
- Minato, Masao. 1982. *Ainu Minzokushi to Chiri Mashiho-san no Omoide (Ainu Ethnography and Recollections of Chiri Mashiho)*. Tokyo: Tsukiji Shokan.
- Miyazaki, Koji. 1984. *Oranda Kōzō Shugi* (Dutch Structuralism). In *Bunka Jinruigaku 15 no Riron (Fifteen Theories in Cultural Anthropology)*, edited by Tsuneo Ayabe, Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha: 79–94.
- Nakao, Katsumi. 2014. *Kindai Nihon no Jinruigakushi: Teikoku to Shokuminchi no Kioku (The History of Anthropology in Modern Japan: Memories of the Empire and the Colonies)*, abstract of the doctoral thesis submitted to Kyoto University.
- Oka, Masao. 1979. *Ijin Sono Ta: Nihon Minzoku-Bunka no Genryū to Nihon Kokka no Keisei (Strangers and Others: The Origins of Japanese Ethnic Culture and the Formation of Japanese State)*. Tokyo: Genshōsha.
- Ribeiro, Lins Gustavo, and Arturo Escobar (eds). 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. Oxford: Berg.
- Robertson, Jeniffer (ed). 2005. *A Companion to the Anthropology of Japan*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Saillant, Francine. 2015. World Anthropologies and Anthropology in the Francophone World: The Lausanne Manifesto and Related Initiatives. *American Anthropologist* 117(1): 146–150.
- Sekimoto, Teruo. 1995. *Nihon no Jinruigaku to Nihon Shigaku* (Japanese Anthropology and Historiography). In *Iwanami Kōza Nihon Tsūshi: Bekkan 1 Rekishi Ishiki no Genzai (Iwanami Lectures on Japanese General History: Annexed Volume 1 The Present State of Historical Consciousness)*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten: 123–147.
- Shimizu, Akitoshi. 1997. Colonialism and the Development of Modern Anthropology in Japan. In *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania*, edited by Jan van Bremen and Akitoshi Shimizu. London: Routledge: 115–171.

- Shimizu, Akitoshi, and Jan van Bremen (eds.). 2003. *Wartime Japanese Anthropology in Asia and the Pacific* (Senri Ethnological Studies 65). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Taihoku Teikoku Daigaku Dozoku Jinshugaku Kenkyūshitsu (Institute of Ethno-Racial Studies, Taipei Imperial University). 1935. *Taiwan Takasagozoku Keitō Shozoku no Kenkyū* (A Study of the Genealogy and Classification of Taiwanese Aborigines). Tokyo, Taipei: Tone Shoin,
- Terada, Kazuo. 1991. *Nihon no Jinruigaku* (Japanese Anthropology). Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.
- Thompson, Eric C. and Vineeta Sinha (eds). 2019. *Southeast Asian Anthropologies: National Traditions and Transnational Practices*. Arts Link, Singapore: NUS Press.
- Torii, Ryūzō. 1976. *Jinruigaku Kenkyū, Taiwan no Genjūmin 1: Joron* (An Anthropological Study of Taiwanese Aborigines 1: Introduction” (orig. 1910). In *Torii Ryūzō Zenshū 5* (Collected Works of Ryūzō Torii 5). Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha: 3–74.
- Yamaji, Katsuhiko (ed.). 2011. *Nihon no Jinruigaku: Shokuminchi-shugi, Ibunka Kenkyū, Gakujutsu Chōsa no Rekishi* (Japanese Anthropology: The History of Colonialism, Study of Other Cultures, and Academic Fieldwork). Nishinomiya: Kwansai Gakuin University Press.
- Yamashita, Shinji. In press. *Nihon Jinruigaku no Ketsumyaku: Denshō no Genba to Ronri* (The Genealogy of Japanese Anthropology: The Field and Logic of Tradition). Tokyo: Fūkyōsha.
- Yamashita, Shinji, Joseph Bosco, and J. S. Eades (eds). 2004. *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Yoshida, Teigo. 1972. *Nihon no Tsukimono: Shakai Jinruigakuteki Kōsatsu* (Possession in Japan: A Social Anthropological Analysis). Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha.

**Takami Kuwayama**

tkuwayama.anth.ucla.89@gmail.com

Hokkaidō University