

**Title: The Cultural Comparative Perspective in Torii Ryuzo's "Far East": The Search for Japan's Antiquity in Prehistoric Korea.**

**By Hyung Il Pai (University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.A.)**

*I. Introduction: Torii Ryuzo and the Beginning of Japanese Fieldwork in North-East Asia*

In Japan, Torii Ryuzo (1870–1893) is celebrated as the founding father of Japanese Anthropology not only as the discipline's first professional anthropologist but because he was the first to conduct field search into the far-corners of Asia (See Map) in the early twentieth century (Shiratori & Yawata 1978, Sasaki 1993). His enduring stature and academic legacy both in and outside of Japan, can be attributed to the longevity of his eighty-three year-long life and an academic career that was mostly spent traveling, living, and lecturing outside of Japan. His major contributions to the field of East Asian Anthropology is distinguished by what we would today refer to as a truly "inter-disciplinary" and "intra-regional" outlook that not only incorporated ethnographic observations, physical anthropological measurements, and archaeological surveys but also included documented oral traditions and myths recorded in ancient Chinese textual sources and Russian ethnographies (Torii 1925a). Beginning with his very first expedition to the Liaodong Peninsula in August 1895 immediately following Japan's victory in the Sino-Japanese War (See Attached Chronology Table), his wide-ranging interests took him to remote tribal villages, ancient ruins, library archives, museums and military outposts (Torii 1976) as far north to the Kuriles (1899) and the Kamchatka peninsula (1911), south to the islands of Taiwan (1896), the Ryukyus (1904) and the mountains of Yunnan (1902–3), as far west as Siberia's Lake Baikal (1919), and last but not least Manchuria (1895), Mongolia (1906–08), and the Korean peninsula (1910/11).

Torii's decades in the field (Sasaki 1993) also resulted in the accumulation of tens and thousands of ethnographic materials ranging from stone tools, baskets, weapons, clothing, headgear, toys, photographs, illustrations, maps, and books. His vast collections are still in the process of being catalogued and are now housed in various museums and libraries spread out in North-east Asia ranging from the former centers of Manchukuo in Shenyang, Zhangchun, Dalian, Beijing (where Torii lived and taught in his twilight years) to the Seoul National Museum in Korea, Tokyo University Museum (Akazawa et.al. 1992, 1993) National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka and his home-town museum in Tokushima ((Sasaki 1993). At the latter, where he is their most famous native son, he and his wife's remains are interred underneath an impressive facsimile of a typical "Korean-style" table-top dolmen burial site. His final resting place is a befitting tribute to an archaeologist who spent the peak of his career in his 30's and 40's conducting archaeological surveys in the Korean peninsula as the sole prehistoric specialist and one of the founding members of the Colonial?Governer General Committee (Pai 2001) on Korean Antiquities (1915–1943).

More than any other Japanese anthropologist, his fieldwork locations have also been immortalized since as an accomplished photographer he left behind immense number of visually stunning portraits of "indigenous" peoples that he encountered on his many trips. Last but not least, as a tireless self-promoter of his own work, he took every opportunity to emphasize in print and in his public lectures that he was an "anthropologist" (Torii 1923, 1937), a persona advertised in his many self-portraits, in which he had a knack of

inserting himself and/or with his wife amongst the shadows of picturesque ancient ruins such as dolmens, burial mounds, pagodas or surrounded by “exotic” looking natives.

The main body of this paper is divided into three parts: First, I will give a brief introduction to the Tokyo Anthropological Society which was founded in 1884 by Tsuboi Shogoro, a leading Meiji intellectual based at the medical division of Tokyo University. Torii owed his whole academic career to this patron and mentor who literally plucked him from his hometown in Shikoku to be his successor in 1893. Torii who was only 20 years old when Tsuboi invited him to study with him in Tokyo came from humble beginnings as an elementary school drop-out but was a widely read and self-taught young man from a well-to-do merchant family from Tokushima in Shikoku (Shiratori and Yawata 1978: 260). Till Tsuboi's sudden death on a conference trip to Russia in 1913, he remained a source of strength, financial aid, and personal inspiration to volunteer to go to the field in 1895 (Torii 1953). Secondly, we will demonstrate how Torii's earliest archaeological finds in the Korean peninsula (Saito 1974, Torii 1976) were informed by his earlier fieldwork in China and Manchurian regions and later on why they became indispensable to his anthropological explanation of Japan's ancient origins (Torii 1925b). Here, due to time restrictions, we will only highlight, how his ultimate research goal of illuminating the prehistoric origins of Japanese civilization in his efforts to place its developments in the ancient world order (Shiratori & Yawata 1978: 261) determined his initial selections/classifications of which “Korean” remains were relevant for study. Torii himself in his later years went further and further inland into the heartland of Mongolia and north to the Siberian coastal regions assuming the more remote, the more prehistoric, and more pure elements of ancient Japanese culture could be found. Last but not least, Torii's academic career path paralleled the rise and fall of Japanese empire for in 1949 with the Communists takeover, he was forced to return home from Beijing as a penniless and washed up exile. In conclusion, we will attempt to assess Torii's work and career in the framework of the dominant early 20<sup>th</sup> century paradigm of “Colonial Racism” practiced by other Western imperial anthropologists of the day who also had delineated “backward” races and ancient civilizations in remote regions of Africa, Asia, Americas and the Middle-east as the most important sources for documenting “prehistoric customs,” religions, and morals leading to a better understanding of human evolutionary and cultural history (Stocking 1985, 1988, Kuklick 1991).

## ***II. Tsuboi Shogoro and the Comparative Ethnological Foundations of the Tokyo Anthropological Society (1884–present)***

Tsuboi Shogoro (1863–1913), was a 22-year old biology student who founded the Tokyo Anthropological Society in 1884 at Tokyo University (Matsumura 1934). He was by all accounts a widely-read world traveler (Matsumura 1934, Nakajima 1996) and in my opinion, a brilliant social theoretician who had a firm grasp of the major scientific revolutions emanating from new discoveries involving the geological, biological, and social sciences. Beginning from the late 1880's until his untimely death at the age of 50 while on a conference trip to St. Petersburg, he was responsible for introducing and promoting to the public the then relative new European discipline of anthropology and scientific archaeology. His academic mission and proselytizing zeal is readily apparent in his contributions to every issue of the Tokyo Anthropological Journal (1886–present) during his tenure. A typical issue at that time usually consisted of four or five feature articles (Moku club 1996) relating new discoveries of Stone-age tools, pottery and relics from shell mounds from Hokkaido to the Ryukyu's as well as racial

classification/anthropometric studies of the Ainu including foreign experts such as von Siebold (Hudson 1999). In addition, there were many short research reports from outside Japan such as articles on stone tools, pottery analyses and burials identifications from the Korean peninsula, studies of subterranean dwellings in China as well as customs documented from as far away as New Hebrides, Samoa, and the Solomon islands (Moku club 1996). In addition, the back section of this monthly was chiefly devoted to featuring the latest cultural events such as openings of new museums in Europe or World Expo's and publications of new ethnographies, and ending with the latest dispatches from the man-in-the field, Torii Ryuzo whose letters appeared regularly from the late 1890's. Thus, from its inception due to Tsuboi's comprehensive approach, the scope of Japanese anthropological research had a very international outlook as well as inter-disciplinary bent. Such timely and exotic news from expeditions from places like Siberia to the South Pacific (Sakazume 1997) that were just beginning to open up to Japanese exploration, commercial, and economic ventures (Hara 1979-83) no doubt contributed to the exponential increase in the number of subscribers which jumped from a mere twenty in 1886 to 210 members the following year. By 1908, there were 492 subscribers, averaging an annual number hovering around 350 at the time of its 50th Jubilee Celebrations in 1934 (Matsumura 1934). Tsuboi himself kept up personally with the latest publications, journals, reports and exhibition catalogues documenting ethnographic peoples and excavation reports from France, Europe, England and America. The journal also conducted an active publications exchange program with all of the major anthropological institutions and their publications from around the world as well inside Japan in other related fields including geology, anatomy, biology, geography and history.

Tsuboi's major theoretical contributions to the field of Japanese archaeology have been consecrated in the first two volumes (Saito 1971-2) of the twenty-five volume series called the *Nihon Kokogaku senshu* (Anthology of Japanese Archaeology) dedicated to a compilation of the great pioneers in Japanese Archaeology in the Pre-War era. The first two volumes are chiefly devoted to a series of articles written up from his public lectures at various meetings and lectures around Tokyo beginning around 1892 after his return from studies abroad in England and France. In these lectures, he systematically introduced the major topics and concepts derived from earlier European Antiquarian traditions and for that time the more recent and hotly-debated biological/social evolutionary concepts (Harris 1968, Sanderson 1990) such as: The Three Age System devised in Scandinavia, Degeneration Theory, Survivalism, and the innate differences between "aboriginal (tojin) vs. semi-civilized/civilized societies (Ibid). In all his works, Tsuboi emphasized that only an inter-disciplinary approach that encompassed prehistoric remains, historical records, oral traditions, and physical anthropological can reveal the stages of man's progress. His writings reveal that he possessed a deep understanding, appreciation as well as kept a critical distance of how archaeological method, theory, and interpretation had evolved in Europe over the earlier half of nineteenth century. He was keenly aware that European archaeological finds of immense geological depth from cave art finds to Paleolithic stone tools or well preserved materials from mid-nineteenth century excavations of prehistoric settlements of lake dwellings in Switzerland had been compared to contemporary aboriginal populations technology who were described as living a similar Stone-Age existence in the latter part of nineteenth century in New Guinea and Australia (Tsuboi 1892). He soon became a firm believer that ethnographic fieldwork in its capacity to demonstrate "direct analogy" could serve as the most accurate resource to infer about Japan's own ancient past (Tsuboi 1905).

Tsuboi's conviction in the superiority of ethnological perspective rested in its ability to link all three divisions of archaeological inquiry ; historical archaeology, proto-history, and prehistory (Tsuboi 1889). Consequently, ethnology could provide the answer to the central question in Japanese archaeology which was to distinguish "what kind of life-styles, physical characteristics, knowledge, arts and crafts, can be correlated to the remains that our ancestors have left behind." (Tsuboi 1889:19). Thus, Tsuboi is recognized as being responsible for having laid out a systematic methodology and clear disciplinary goal in Meiji Japanese archaeology being "the study of past relics in order to define "who the ancient peoples (*jinmin*) were." (Tsuboi 1897: 44-45). His promotion of the "comparative method" (*ishi,hikaku*) was to become the favorite password for subsequent generations of Japanese anthropologists as the main analytical tool in the understanding and interpretation of pre-historical and ancient physical remains and relics (Tsuboi 1892). Tsuboi's philosophy can be summarized from his statement in 1892, in that "only the comparison of contemporary "barbaric (*yaban*), uncivilized (*mika*), half-civilized (*han-ka*) and civilized (*kaihua*) societies and their nation's peoples is the only way we can investigate the broad patterns of change in man". (Tsuboi 1892: 36). Thus, he concluded that ethnology would provide the records of man's prehistoric past that had been lost, not complete or was in the dark, or are now merely legend. Thus, the ultimate goal and educational value (Fukuchi 1887) of the field of Japanese ethnology and archaeology (Tsuboi 1905) lay in its ability to address the larger questions pertaining to the nature and origins of primitive man, to distinguish the evolving universal stages of human progress and to document the spread of pre-historic peoples and cultures (Matsumura 1934: 422).

### ***III. Colonial Racism and Torii's Re-discovery of Japan's Antiquity in the Korean Peninsula***

In 1893, the year following Tsuboi's return from a three year study abroad in England, Torii was put in charge of the Tokyo anthropological Research Laboratory where by government decree, all prehistoric finds found in the Japanese islands as well as from all over Asia were deposited. Thus, Torii had direct access to a massive database of collections of stone/bone tools, pottery, bronzes, and iron weapons. Other research assistants at that time included Yagi Sozaburo (1894) and Oono Entaro (1904) who along with Torii are regarded as the three most influential archaeologists from the late Meiji era (Saito 1974). All three's research publications reflect the intellectual influence and methodological approach of Tsuboi who pioneered the "ethnological" comparative perspective in his classifications, and periodizations of selected artifacts and pottery that later became identified as the "key racial markers" in Japanese prehistory (*Ibid.*). Thus, the earliest typologies in Japanese archaeology focussed on a select number of polished stone tools as evidence for the introduction of subsistence activities such as agriculture vs. hunting (semi-lunar knives, polished stone knives and arrowheads); bronzes indicating knowledge of metallurgy (swords, slim-daggers, and *dotaku* or bells); and the kinds of pottery design, indicating advanced mental thinking/ artistic sensibilities (eg. Jomon geometric pottery vs. "plain" Yayoi pottery), *haniwa* pottery demonstrating self-expressions and racial identity (dresses , hairstyles, tattoos) , and jewelry for self-decoration (magatama beads), (Ono 1904) and *Kofun* burial types indicating monumental architecture and the thoughts of the after-life (Yagi 1894). These artifacts were initially selected by Tsuboi for classification (Saito 1972) since he was imitating the precedent set by the European scholars he admired dominated then by the school of "Classical Evolutionists" of the mid Victorian era such as Lewis Henry Morgan, Edward Tylor, and John Lubbock (Harris 1968, Sanderson 1990). These scholars influenced by the Darwin's theories on biological evolution had promoted the field of prehistoric archaeology relying

on physical remains' of material technology, arts/decorations, and religions objects as the most representative stage markers (Lubbock 1873, Tylor 1889) for delineating man's past development from "savagery" to "barbarism" to civilization. Thus, the Tokyo Anthropological Society's colleagues, mentors, and facilities provided Torii with the material training, artifact analysis, and most importantly, the prestigious institutional backing that literally opened official bureaucratic channels in securing fieldwork permits (Torii 1953). Most significantly for Torii's own career, the Tokyo Anthropological Society had first dispatched Torii abroad (Matsumura 1934) as well as published his field reports for twenty years (Shiratori and Yawata 1978).

Torii himself was always eager to board the next boat leaving for the frontier (Torii 1953) beginning from his first trip to Manchuria in 1895 (Torii 1976), since he believed that the material evidence for Japan's origins were not to be found in Japan since the "civilized" cultural assemblage had come from abroad (Torii 1937: 19). Consequently, he became a life-long advocate of "comparative Far Eastern Studies" since it was imperative for him to integrate the ethnographic data and their associated archaeological remains of primitive, nomadic, and ancient peoples of continental North-East Asia in order to reveal valuable information and insights into the origins of Japanese ancient society (Torii 1953: 2-3) and evolution of its civilization. The enthusiasm for field research abroad then was also driven by the widely prevalent attitude of "colonial racism" (Suzuki 1998) amongst leading Meiji intellectuals of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century who had regarded the recently assimilated (Suzuki 1994) "aboriginal" Ainu populations (Torii 1937: 19, Teshigawara 1995: 92) residing in their Northern islands as "too primitive" (Suzuki 1994) judging from their appearance, customs, archaeological remains, and anthropometric measurements (Kudo 1979, Oguma 1995:76) to be directly ancestral to the Japanese imperial race and civilization (Hudson 1999: 37-8). Other nineteenth century Japanese scholars from Tokyo University who followed Torii's lead into Northern China and Korea in the early 1900's to conduct fieldwork included archaeologist Yagi Sozaburo (Ko 1996), art historians Sekino Tadashi (1904) and Ito Chuta and last but not least their professor, the sinologist Shiratori Kurakichi (Shiratori 1986, Yoshikawa 1974) the founder of the South Manchuria Railroad Company's Research Division (Hara 1979-83). They were all eager to test earlier "armchair" theories beyond the borders of the Japanese archipelago (Oguma 1995, 98) in their search for "indigenous" populations (*dojin*) and civilizations that may have served as likely ancestral candidates to the Japanese.

The late nineteenth century was also the era when the hypothesis advocating the common descent theory of *Nissen Dosoron* (Kudo 1979, Teshigawara 1995) that ancient Koreans and Japanese had once shared the same racial ancestral lineage was promoted in the guise of "pro-Korean/assimilationists" rhetoric amongst Meiji politicians, journalists and educators (Oguma 1995). Thus, anthropologists like Torii Ryuzo (Torii 1904) and ancient historians like Imanishi Ryu and Shiratori Kurakichi (1986) were directly responsible for the formulation of the concept of "Korean/ Japanese (*Nikkan*) origins' that asserted that "comparative studies" would reveal scientific data supporting the close affinities in the two countries' physical anthropological (Torii 1904) make-up (*taishitsu*), language, material culture, religion, and customs for the common ancestral/historical origins of Koreans and Japanese. This racial origins theory was already well entrenched by the time Torii was commissioned by the *Chosen Sotokufu* (1910-1911) to conduct the first systematic prehistoric surveys of Korean archaeological remains. Torii's field research in the Korean peninsula in the 1910's made the first significant contributions to not only the history of Korean archaeology but that of Japan (Saito 1974: 1-102) in his pioneering role

in laying out what are still considered to be the three most contentious topics amongst archaeologists working in the two Koreas, Japan, and China (Pai 2000): (1) The complex nature of the cultural relationship during the critical transitional period between the "Stone Age" (Neolithic Period) and Proto-Historic period as evident from the diverse nature of Korea's buried remains. The preservation quality and sheer number of Korea's ancient stone monuments led to Torii's initial attempts to devise a systematic typology of dolmens, stone-cists, and stone-piled burial mounds based on their construction methods, materials utilized, and functional use (Torii 1908, 1922); (2) The demarcation of the ethnic and territorial boundaries of North-east Asian cultures and civilizations relying on the geographic distribution of the monumental architectural, archaeological and historical remains on the banks of the middle and upper Yalu including Koguryo, Palhae, and Liao royal burials that were correlated to the ancient references of the *Weizhi Tongi-jon* (Torii 1910); (3) The chronological significance of the stratigraphically excavated pottery sequence from a Korean shell mound site at Kimhae that revealed the continuous occupation from "plain pottery", to "Kim-hae" style, to Three Kingdoms period (Torii 1924). Thus, the groundbreaking excavations conducted by Umehara Sueiji and Hamada Kosaku in 1920 (CSTY 1920) was interpreted by Torii as the primary material evidence for proving that the racial migrations (Torii 1924) of a "Plain" or "Yayoi" pottery people who had brought agriculture, metallurgy, and higher civilization from Korea to Japan during the Proto-historic (Torii 1925b, 937).

In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Torii indeed was the only person who could have even raised these topics for inquiry for he was the only one who had acquired enough field experience in China and Manchuria so that he could cross-reference the historical sources as well as archaeological materials. Secondly, he was already well-versed in all the ancient texts from China, Korea and Japan's dynastic records; the *Shiji*, *Hanshu*, *Weizhi Tongijon* and *Sam Sagi* (Torii 1910: 10-14). Therefore he could link the contents of the Kwanggaeto wang stele's inscriptions with the royal burials uncovered in the vicinity that had belonged to Koguryo's royal ancestors (Ibid.). Thirdly, his knowledge of both Chinese and Japanese *Kofun* archaeological finds such as Han mirrors, seals, coins, and inscriptions enabled him to cross-date the same Han coins called "Huaqian" (c. 14 A.D. - Wang Mang period), discovered in the layers of Kimhae shellmound (Torii 1924: 100) with Han dynasty burials' remains found in P'yongyang from the site of Nangnang (Pai 2000). These early revelations of Torii further inspired his life-long fascination with the archaeology of Korea since he could observe the geographic, cultural, and chronological continuity of North-east Asian peoples' cultural complex in Korea's prehistoric remains (Torii 1908, 1923).

#### IV. Embracing the "Primitive" Other in the Search for Japan's Origins

Torii Ryuzo's enduring influence in Japan is measured by his seminal contributions to the study of prehistoric populations of North-east Asia and their biological, historical and cultural relations to the contemporary Japanese race. Torii is widely credited for having provided the major scientific breakthrough in this debate that had raged since the mid-Meiji era (Kudo 1979, Teshigawara 1995) by delineating the key archaeological and ethnological data to prove that the Ainu were indeed the earliest indigenous people who made Jomon pottery and Stone Age tools (Teshigawara 1995: 45, Torii 1937). He achieved this feat, by essentially taking a cultural comparative and social evolutionary perspective to the interpretation of archaeological remains and ethnographic data gathered from his earlier fieldwork from Mongolia, Manchuria, Korea, and Southern China,

and applying this knowledge to explain Japanese recorded imperial myths, religions, rituals, and customs including migrations legends, heroic gods and goddesses, divination, and burial customs. In 1925, he published his seminal contribution titled "An Anthropological Perspective on Ancient Japan" (Torii 1925b), in which he synthesized his three main arguments that advocated for the "continental origins and development of Japanese civilization," and they are: (1) The diverse racial and cultural origins of Japanese ancestors are demonstrated by key technological innovations observed in the archaeological records such as the use of Yayoi era's wheel-made pottery, introduction of metallurgy (bronze mirrors, swords, iron tools), the development of agricultural equipment such as the plough and the building of monumental architectural burials such as dolmens, stone-cists and colossal kofun; (2) The arrival of these new cultural traits reflect a qualitative and quantitative change in the social evolution of a "Shamanistic Japanese theocratic state" as indicated by the complex rituals and beliefs documented in Japan's ancient records such as the existence tribal councils, religious beliefs such as the three tier division into Upper, Middle and Lower worlds, and demonstrated in practises of divination using animal bones and elaborate burial customs. (3) These "Japanese ancestral" traits (Shiratori and Yawata 1978: 266-74), in all its mythological, psychological and cultural manifestations can be traced historically, archaeologically, and ethnographically to a "common prehistoric cultural lineage" (*dongil kye'tong*) of ancient North-east Asia Peoples (*Dongbuk Minjok*). Because all North-east Asian peoples are descended from the same prehistoric racial stock, their twentieth century descendents with "primitive" life-styles and prehistoric customs were pushed out to remote parts of Mongolia, Manchuria, Russia, and Korea, where they have maintained the legends and customs comparable to that of the "original Pre-Japanese cultural and religious complex." Torii's synthesis was thus, able to prescribe and describe the complex racial, cultural, and religious origins of the ancestral Japanese race dubbed as "*Koyu Nihonjin* (Japanese proper) who had migrated from continental Asia during the Proto-historic period (*Genshi jida*) bringing with them the higher traits of civilization as evident by the Yayoi-Kofun remains in Japan.

Thus, Torii's main research agenda which was to uncover and recover Japan's ancient origins (Torii 1937), resulted in his most important contribution to East Asian Anthropology today which remains his comprehensive racial lineage and classificatory scheme that demarcated Manchuria, Mongolia, Korea, and Siberia as the "prehistoric" meeting place (Pai 1999) where all "Far-eastern" races including the contemporary populations of the Paleo-asiatics, Tungus, Manchus, Mongols, and Koreans had evolved (Shiratori 1986, Torii Ryuzo 1925a, 1976, Pai 2000). The "indigenous" nature of these primitive peoples he argued was also validated by the presence of a large number of different ethnic groups who in the twentieth century continued to lead what most scholars then had perceived as "primitive" and "barbaric" life-styles such as fishing, hunting-gathering, nomadic, and semi-nomadic activities. Furthermore, Torii's colleagues who were leading historians of the day including Shiratori Kurakichi, Ikeuchi Hiroshi, and Imanishi Ryu concurred that these late nineteenth and early twentieth century's documented ethnic peoples and tribes can be classified as the direct descendents of the historical North-east "Barbarians" identified as the *Tongi* (Dongyi) (Inoue 1974), Sushen, Yilou, Xiongnu, Koguryo, Yemaek (Weimo), and Choson (Zhaoxian) as well as the ancient Wa (sic Japan) described in ancient Chinese historical records of the *Shiji*, *Hanshu*, *HouHanshu*, *Shiji* and the *Weizhi* written between the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C. and 3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D. Henceforth, the indigenous inhabitants or *Manshugenshumin* represented by the Ainu, Gilyaks, Yukaghir, Solon, Tungus, etc. and supplemented by the archaeological study of ancient remains located in

the regions of the Sungari, Yalu, the Amur river valleys the Korean peninsula as well as Japan's Northern territories (Torii 1925a) were studied as surviving "prehistoric/primitive vestiges" (Torii 1937: 6) of Japan's ancestral relatives because their "backwardness" indicated that they were incapable of culture change. As a result, they had retained for three thousand years, the biological features, primitive cultural traits, and adaptive characteristics of the various prehistoric composite races antecedent to the Japanese who had continued to evolve into a civilized modern race.

Therefore, the driving force for ethnological, historical, and archaeological exploration in these regions that led to job as well as field opportunities for ambitious young men like Torii Ryuzo paved the foundations of Japanese anthropology (Suzuki 1995) whose analysis today cannot and should not be divorced from Japanese imperial politics (Suzuki 1995, 1998, Oguma 1995, 1998). In the late nineteenth century, the first and foremost goal of Meiji foreign policy was targetted towards the cultural assimilation and economic incorporation of their recent colonial possessions including the Northern territories, Manchuria, Korea, and Taiwan (Oguma 1998). Thus, with Torii Ryuzo's ethnological/ archaeological "re-discovery " of Korean antiquity in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the ancient history of the Korean peninsula became seamlessly interwoven into the narrative on Japan's imperial origins. Consequently, the study of "Koreans and their archaeological remains" (Pai 2001) have come to occupy the central prehistoric research laboratory for the search for the "ancient Japanese Shamanistic" universe that were designed to bridge North-east Asian peoples' collective primitive past and colonial present amongst twentieth century Japanese anthropologists (Suzuki 1995), art historians, and ancient historians (Oguma 1998, Pai 2001). Torii's fieldwork and civilization theories from the first two decades of the early twentieth on Manchurian, Mongolia, and Korea (Pai 2000) have to this day in Korea and Japan inspired countless number of works, journals, conferences and international expeditions. To cite the most prominent few; Egami Namio's "Horse-riders Theory (Egami 1964, Ledyard 1975), "Prehistoric Mongoloid dispersals" (Akazawa and Szathmary 1996) to more recent archaeological expeditions to Mongolia by led by Korean academics. Even a century later, fields ranging from physical anthropology, ethnography and archaeology (Hanihara 1986) continue to imitate Torii's methodology and in my opinion futile attempts (Pai 2000) to pinpoint the migration route of his hypothetical "Proto-Japanese" race that came to Japan in various waves bringing with them the "higher traits" of Japanese high civilization.

As I have attempted to demonstrate in this paper, what has crucially been ignored in the post-War anti-colonial rhetoric amongst both Korean and Japanese scholars (Pai 1994) is that Korean archaeological and historical data provided the most important sources for early twentieth century Japanese colonial historiography in the formulation of its theories regarding the origins of the Yamato race, civilization, and historical destiny. And therefore even a century later, the origins of Korean civilization (Pai 2000) is irrevocably intertwined with the origins of Japanese civilization (Pai 2001) and one cannot study one without the other. At the same time, both South and North Korean historians still continue to denounce such biased "imperial historiography" for having distorted "Korean" history as part of ancient Japan so as to justify the colonial occupation of the Korean peninsula .In conclusion, we have to acknowledge that Japanese anthropologists and archaeologists like their European counterparts' expeditions and excavations of the ancient world including Egypt, Mexico, and the Middle-east (Daniels 1975) played a crucial role in providing historical, scientific, and cultural justifications for Japanese expansion into the Asian continent (Pai 1994, 2000). The late nineteenth century origins of



Japanese racial rhetoric that traced their ethnic and cultural origins to North-east Asia was extremely persuasive for its wide appeal to intellectuals and politicians alike for they were all keenly aware of the technological and military superiority of Western European imperial powers which was a constant source of fear and envy (Oguma 1995). Consequently, their first hand contact experience with peoples they perceived as “lower and inferior” races in Siberia, Manchuria and Korea as well as their decisive military victories over Qing China and Russia seemed to validate their own elevated position in the social evolutionary scale as the far-superior and civilized of all Eastern races who were destined to be conquerors in the past as well as the present (Oguma 1998, Pai 2001).

A century later, Korean archaeologists also have to acknowledge that Japanese anthropology and archaeology introduced the first comprehensive approach and methodological contributions to the study of prehistory, including their adoption and application of modern recording and analytical tools, typological studies, mapping techniques, stratigraphic excavations, museum building activities and the preservations of remains. At the same time, we must also take a critical stance to analyzing how their own “emperor” centered and “ethno-centric” biases influenced their selection of which conquered “indigenous” populations (Pai 1999) and territories became subjects of inquiry, ethnographic collections, and excavations of antiquities (Pai 2001). Therefore, the search for “Japanese” style relics remaining in “timeless” ancient China (Early Buddhist art and architecture), “prehistoric” Manchuria/Siberia (Dolmens, Shamans, nomads), and “barbaric” Korea (Three Kingdoms) were focussed on tracking, romanticizing, and idealizing the “imagined” routes and roots of Japanese origins and conquest myths. Though, Japan’s colonial scholarly contributions to the study of East Asian history is comparable to the more well studied European contributions (Trigger 1989) to the field, it is regrettable that there has been a dearth of academic studies either in Japan or its former colonies. I hope this panel will be a preliminary step to such beginnings.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akazawa, Takeru et.al. 1992. Kanbanni kizamareta sekai: Torii Ryuzo no mita Aija (Lost Worlds on a Dry Plate-Torii Ryuzo's "Asia"). Tokyo: The University Museum, Tokyo University.

1993. The "Other" Visualized-Depictions of Mongoloid Peoples. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Akazawa T. & Szatmary, E. 1996 Prehistoric Mongoloid Dispersals, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ch'oe, Sok-kyong. 1997. Ilcheui Tonghwa Ideology ui ch'angch'ul (The Invention of the Japanese Imperial Ideology of Assimilation). Seoul: Segyong Munhwa Press.

Daniels, G.E. 1975. A Hundred Fifty Years of Archaeology. 2nd. ed., London: Duckworth.

Egami, Namio. 1964: “The Formation of the People and the Origin of the State in Japan.” Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko, 23: 35-70.

Frazer, James. 1981 The Golden Bough—The Roots of Folklore and Religion. Gramercy Books, Random House

Fukuchi, M. 1887 “Jinruigaku no kenkyu wa kyoiku ni hitsuyo nari (Anthropological Research is indispensable to education).” Tokyo Jinrui Gakkai (12): 91–2.

Hanihara, Kazuo. 1986. “The Origin of the Japanese People in relation to other Ethnic groups in East Asia.” In Windows on the Japanese Past, ed. Richard Pearson et. al. 75–83. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan.

Hara, Kakuten. (1979–1983): “Mantetsu chosabu no rekishi to Ajia kenkyu (The History of the Research Department of the South Manchuria Railroad and the Study of Asia).” Ajia Keizai 20–24: 48–93.

Harris, Marvin. 1968. The Rise of Anthropological Theory. New York: Thomas Y Crowell Co.

Hudson, Mark. 1999. The Ruins of Japanese Identity—Ethnogenesis in the Japanese Islands. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Kita, Sadakichi. 1921: “Nissen Ryominzoku Dogenron (The Common Origins of the Two Races –Japanese and Koreans).” Chosen 6: 3–69.

Ko, Chung–yong. 1996 “Yagi Sozaburo no Kangoku Chosa (Yagi Sozaburo's Archaeological Survey of Korea).” Kokogakushi Kenkyu 6 : 34–44.

Kudo, Masayuki 1979 Nihon Jinshuron (A Study on the Theories of the Japanese), Tokyo: .Kichikawa Kobunkan.

Kuklick, Henrika. 1991. The Savage Within—The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885–1945. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ledyard, Gari. 1975 “Gallop along with the Horseriders:

Looking for the Founders of Japan.” Journal of Japanese Studies 1 (2) : 217–254.

Lubbock, John. 1873. The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man. New York: D. Appleton and Co.

Matsumura, Ryo. 1934 “Tokyo Jinrui Gakkai gojyunenshi (The Fifty–year History of the Tokyo Anthropological Society).” Tokyo Jinrui Gakkai Zasshi 49 (11): 419–470.

Miyake, Yonekichi. 1890 “Kobutsugaku no shinbo (The Development of Archaeology).” Tokyo Jinrui Gaku Zasshi 53 : 347–352.

Moku Club. 1996 “Jinruigaku Zasshi saisai no shui chieki kanren bunken mokuroku –1910 made” (A catalogue of articles relating to Japan's surrounding countries selected from the Tokyo Anthropological Journal before 1910). Nihon Kokogaku Kenkyu 6: 3–20.

Nakajima, Minao. 1996. "Tsuboi Shogoro no Jinruigaku to Kokogaku ( Tsuboi Shogoro on the Relationship between Anthropology and Archaeology)." Nihon Kokogaku shi Kenkyu 6: 3–10.

Oguma, Eichi.

1995.Tanichi minzoku shinka no kigen (The Myth of the Homogenous Nation). Tokyo: Shinyosha,

1998."Nihonjin" no Kyokai ( The Boundaries of the Japanese). Tokyo: Shinyosha.

Ono Entaro. 1904. Senshi koko zufu (A Prehistoric Archaeological Album). Tokyo: Takayama.

Pai , Hyung Il.

1994 "The Politics of Korea's Past: The Legacy of Japanese Colonial Archaeology in the Korean Peninsula." East Asian History 7: 25–48.

1999 "Japanese Anthropology and the Discovery of "Prehistoric Korea. ". " Journal of East Asian Archaeology 1: 353–382.

2000.Constructing "Korean Origins": Archaeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth. Harvard/Hallym Series, Asia Center, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

2001 "The Creation of National Treasures and Monuments: The 1916 Japanese Laws on the Preservation of Korean Remains and Relics and Their Colonial Legacies." The Journal of Korean Studies 25 (1): 72–95.

Saito, Tadashi, ed.

1971–2.Nihon Kokogaku Senshu ( A Selected Anthology of Japanese Archaeology)–Tsuboi Shogoro. Vols. 1 & 2. Nihon Kokogaku Senshu ( A Selected Anthology of Japanese Archaeology). Tokyo: Tsukichi shokan,

1974. Nihon Kokogaku Senshu ( A Selected Anthology of Japanese Archaeology) –Torii Ryuzo. Vol. 7. Nihon Kokogaku Senshu ( A Selected Anthology of Japanese Archaeology). Tokyo: Tsukichi shokan.

Sakazume, Hideichi 1997.Taiheiyo senso to Kokogaku ( The Field of Archaeology and the Pacific War). Tokyo: Kichikawa Kobunkan.

Sanderson, Stephen K. 1990. Social Evolution–A Critical History. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Sekino, Tadashi. 1904.Kangoku kenchiku chosa hokoku (Investigations' Reports of Korean Architecture). Vol. 6. Tokyo Imperial University Engineering Department Research Report, Tokyo: Tokyo Imperial University.

Shiratori, Kurakichi. 1986. Saigai minzokushi kenkyu (A Study of Races beyond the Borders). Vol. Vol. 1 & 2. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Shiratori, Yoshiro & Yawata Ichiro. 1978. "Nihon Minzoku bunka taikai ?Torii Ryuzo hen." In Nihon Minsoku bunka taikai. Vol. 9. Shiratori Kurakichi/Torii Ryuzo, Tokyo: Kodansha, 260–450.

Stocking, George W., ed.

1985. Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture. Vol. 3. History of Anthropology. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

1988. Bones, Body, and Behavior: Essays on Biological Anthropology. Vol. Vol. 5. History of Anthropology. Madison: Wisconsin University Press

1991. Colonial Situations. Vol. 7. History of Anthropology. The University of Wisconsin Press

Suzuki, Tessa-Morris

1994 "Creating the Frontier: Border, Identity and History in Japan's Far North." East Asian History 7: 1–24.

1995 "The Invention and Reinvention of "Japanese" Culture." Journal of Asian Studies 54 (3): 759–80.

1998. "Becoming Japanese: Imperial Expansion and identity Crisis in the Early Twentieth Century Japan." In Competing Modernities in Twentieth Century Japan, ed. Sharon A. Minichiello. 157–180. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press,

Takamei, Sasaki, ed. Torii Ryuzo no mita Ajia (Torii Ryuzo's Vision of "Asia" ). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 1993.

Teshigawara, Akira. Nihon Kokogaku no ayumi (A Historical Development of Japanese Archaeology). Tokyo: Meisho Shuppan, 1995.

Torii, Ryuzo.

1904 "Chosenjin no taishitsu (On The Physical Characteristics of the Chosenjin)." Jinruigaku Zasshi 20 (25): 142–8.

1908. "Manshu no sekkijidaiiseki to Chosen no Sekkijidaiiseki to kankei ni tsuite (The Relationship between Korean Stone Age Remains and Manchurian Stone Age Remains)." In Nihon Kokogaku Senshu, Vol. 7. ed. Saito Tadashi. 2–9. Tokyo: Tsukichi Shokan, 1974.

1910. “Ourokukou joryu ni okeru Kokuli no iseki (Koguryo Remains on the Upper Reaches of the Yalu River).” In Nihon Kokogaku Senshu 7, ed. Saito Tadashi. 10–30. Tokyo: Tsukichi Shokan, 1974.

1922 “Dorumen ni tsuite (On Dolmens).” Dorumen 1 : 14–19.

1923 “Ishiizen ni okeru Chosen to kino Shui to no kankei (Korea's Relations with its Neighbours in Prehistory).” Chosen 9: 1–28.

1924 “Hamada Umehara ryoshi sho "Kinkaizuka Hokoku" o yomu (Book Review on Excavation Report of Kimhae Shellmound by Umehara and Hamada).” In Nihon Kokogaku Senshu Vol. 7., ed. Saito Tadashi. 92–103. Tokyo: Tsukichi Shokan, 1974

1925a Kyokuto Minzoku Vol. 1 (Far Eastern Races). Toyojinshu Gakusosho, Tokyo: Bunkaseikatsu Kenkyukai.

1925b Jinruigaku joyori mitaru waga jodai no bunka (Our Civilization as seen from an anthropological perspective). Tokyo: Sobunkan.

1937 Ancient Japan in the Light of Anthropology. Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai (The Society of International Cultural Relations).

1953. Aru rogakuto no shuki (Notes of One Old Student). Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha

1976. Torii Ryuzo zenshu (The Complete Works of Torii Ryuzo). Vols. 12. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha

Tsuboi. Shogoro

1889. “Nihon Kokogaku kogi soron (An Overview of Japanese Archaeology—Parts I & 2).” In Nihon Kokogaku Senshu ( A Selected Anthology of Japanese Archaeology), Vol. 2, ed. Saito Tadashi, 15–29. Tokyo: Tsukichi Shokan, 1972.

1892. “Kokogaku to dozokugaku (The Relationship between Archaeology and Ethnology).” In Nihon Kokogaku Senshu ( A Selected Anthology of Japanese Archaeology), Vol. 2, ed. Saito Tadashi. 36–41. 1. Tokyo: Tsukichi Shokan, 1972.

1905. “Kokogaku no shinka (The Real Value of Archaeology).” In Nihon Kokogaku Senshu ( A Selected Anthology of Japanese Archaeology), Vol. 2, ed. Saito Tadashi. 30–34. 1. Tokyo: Tsukichi Shokan, 1972.

Trigger, Bruce. 1989. A History of Archaeological Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Tylor , Edward B. 1889. Primitive Culture. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Umehara, Sueji. 1923 “Kokogakujo yori mitaru jodai Nissen no kankei (The Relationship between Ancient Korea and Japan from an archaeological perspective).” Chosen 8: 138–170.

Yagi., Sozaburo 1894. “Nihon Kokogaku Senshu ( A Selected Anthology of Japanese Archaeology).” In Kokogaku ni okeru Kofun no shinka (The archaeological significance of Kofun), ed. Saito Tadashi. Vol.4 116–121. Tokyo: Tsukichi Shokan, 1974

Yoshikawa, Kojiro. 1976. Toyogaku no soshishatachi (The Founders of East Asian Studies). Tokyo: Kodansha.