National Museum of Ethnology Osaka

Number 9
December 1999

MINPAKU Anthropology Newsletter

Anthropology and Disciplinary Classification in China

Bao Zhiming
Central University for Nationalities, China

In order to discuss the current circumstances of anthropology (*renleixue*, 人類学) in China from the perspective of disciplinary classification, we need to elucidate the state of ethnology (*minzuxue*, 民族学) and sociology (*shehuixue*, 社会学) as well, which are closely related to anthropology. All these subjects were introduced to China from the west at the beginning of this century. During the 1950s, anthropology and sociology were condemned as 'false sciences' that do not contribute to the construction of socialism. Departments for these subjects were abolished at many campuses during those years. Although, until then, the three subjects had existed concurrently in China, anthropology and ethnology were, in many cases, placed within the department of sociology. It was a quite common practice that scholars, whose background was in anthropology or ethnology, were offered a position at an educational and research institute for sociology, where they engaged in teaching as well as research activities.[1] Of course, there were some independent institutes dedicated to anthropology or ethnology in those days,[2] but they were few in number, compared to the institutes for sociology.

The Central University for Nationalities, China—an important education and research centre for ethnology in China.

My main point here is that, in China prior to the 1950s, the distinction between these three subjects was somehow obscured. It was a common practice to place the courses of anthropology and ethnology under the umbrella of sociology.

Up until the beginning of the 1950s, ethnology in China was very much like social/cultural anthropology. When sociology and anthropology were banned from Chinese academia during the first half of the 1950s, quite a

Contents

Bao Zhiming
Anthropology and Disciplinary Classification in China *1*

Kim Shi-deog
The Life and Culture of Korean Expatriates *4*

Kate Vusoniwailala
Cultural Treasures from the Pacific *6*

Helen Gardner
Controversial Collection *7*

Shuzo Ishimori
On the George Brown Collection *8*

Exhibition *9*

Conferences *9*

Visiting Scholars *11*

Publications *12*

The author is Associate Professor of the Department of Ethnology, Central University for Nationalities, China. He completed his PhD in sociology and social anthropology at the Peking University, China in July 1994. His major research interests are comparative methods in sociology and anthropology, social structure, social change, ethnic relations and environments. His areas of interest are Inner Mongolia, especially agricultural Mongolian area, and Tibet. At Minpaku, he studied the Mongolian incorporated in Han culture. He is going to study the Mongolian social change caused by agricultural development. He is the author of Comparative Sociology, *Beijing, 1995 and* Ke er ging Mongolian's National Life, *1999.*

few anthropologists and sociologists converted to ethnology. Emphasis was given to the practical applications of ethnology. Specific assignments given to ethnology included ethnic identification, resolving ethnic disputes, and the study of the communities and history of minority nationalities. Under those circumstances, minority nationalities became the de facto sole issue for ethnology to deal with. Ethnology became a discipline that addressed not only the culture and society of minority nationalities but also every aspect of their life, including politics, economy, language, and religion. Through this development, ethnology in China, which once used to be an equivalent to social/cultural anthropology, transformed itself into a comprehensive 'study of minority nationalities'. The consequence was the creation of a discipline extremely different from the internationally acknowledged definition of anthropology, and unique to China. In other words, Chinese ethnology became a synonym for the 'study of minority nationalities'. While the Great Cultural Revolution swept across the entire nation in 1966, ethnology was done away with in reality. When it was restored as an academic discipline at the end of the 1970s, its nature was still that of the 'study of minority nationalities'.

In 1979 and the subsequent years, sociology, ethnology and anthropology were restored to academic status one after another, triggering the foundation of a series of academic societies for these disciplines. During the first half of the 1980s, educational institutes based on sociology were facilitated in many universities such as Nankai University, Peking University and so on. Research institutes for sociology were opened at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) and some local Academies of Social Sciences as well. Institutes for anthropology were also established at Zhongshan and Xiamen Universities, whereas those for ethnology were founded at the Central University for Nationalities and CASS. After the restoration of these three academic subjects, sociology came to be recognised as separate from anthropology or ethnology in terms of its disciplinary category, methodology and the research subjects it dealt with. The first president of the Chinese Society for Sociology, after the restoration of its status, was Prof. Fei Xiaotong. Prof. Fei and a few other scholars maintained that sociology and social/cultural anthropology should belong to the same discipline,[3] but their claim never gained strong support from their peers, and thus lapsed. While belonging to an institute for research and education of sociology, Prof. Fei originally had a background in anthropology, engaging in studies of anthropology and minority nationalities. Unlike Prof. Fei, the majority of anthropologists were members of institutes for ethnology or anthropology, and not sociology. After the restoration of its status, sociology in China emphasised the importance of applying the theories and methodologies propounded in American sociology, mainly focusing on issues concerning the Han community, which accounts for the majority of the China's population. In contrast, ethnology inherited to the tradition, originating in the days before the Great Cultural Revolution, of studying minority nationalities in a comprehensive way. As for anthropology, the faculties for this discipline at Zhongshan and Xiamen Universities introduced the American system of anthropological studies, in which cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, archaeology and linguistics were all incorporated in their perspective, addressing issues related to both the Han and minority nationalities.

Another major turning point came around the middle of the 1980s, when some ethnologists started to present doubts about restricting the scope of work for ethnology merely to 'studies of minority nationalities'. These researchers defined ethnology as cultural anthropology and proposed studying the Han from an ethnological point of view. Prof. Zhuang Kongshao has taken this approach.[4] As a matter of fact, an increasing number of academics with a background in ethnology have been advocating the importance of studying the Han with the theory and methodology of cultural anthropology. In this environment, the Society for Han Studies was founded in the framework of the Chinese Society for Ethnology. It should be understood, however, that, in general, ethnology is still more narrowly defined as a discipline that focuses on the issues of minority nationalities.

Briefly put, ethnology and anthropology are distinguished from

1) For instance, internationally renowned Chinese ethnologists or anthropologists such as Wu Wenzao, Fei Xiaotong and Lin Yaohua were all professors at departments of sociology.

2) At the end of the 1920s, a Section of Ethnology was opened at the Institute of Social Sciences in the Academia Sinica, whereas a Section of Anthropology was founded in the Institute of History and Philology at Zhongshan University. Furthermore, during the latter half of the 1940s, Departments of Anthropology were established at the four campuses of Zhongshan, Tsinghua, Jinan and Zhejiang Universities.

each other in China by whether or not the scope of the work is limited to studies of minority nationalities. At the same time, since both contain cultural anthropology as an ingredient, relations between the two are quite complicated. It is difficult to draw an unequivocal line between them with regard to disciplinary classification. This compounding situation is clearly reflected in the system of classification announced by the government.[5] According to the official classification issued by the Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council, which possesses the largest influential power on these matters in China, both sociology and ethnology were defined as Primary Disciplines (一級学科) until the mid 1990s, whereas anthropology was divided into two areas of physical and cultural anthropology, both of which were categorised as Secondary Disciplines (二級学科). Furthermore, physical anthropology belonged to biology, a Primary Discipline, whereas cultural anthropology was regarded as part of ethnology. As is evidenced in this history, academic development in China has been deeply affected by politics and government policies. It would be fair to say that because anthropology failed to achieve the status of a Primary Discipline, in the government scheme, the progress of this discipline in China has been restricted to at least some extent.

In the face of an increase of international exchange in academic work during the 1990s, it came to be recognised that anthropology could be neither fully nor properly represented by the nomenclature of sociology or ethnology. In circumstances requiring communication and exchange with overseas anthropological communities, it was essential to use the term anthropology. Given this heightened awareness, an increasing number of research institutes named themselves institutes of anthropology. For example, Prof. Fei Xiaotong, who was reluctant to separate sociology from social/cultural anthropology, added the title of anthropology to the name of his institute for sociology at Peking University. Likewise, the word anthropology was added to the names of other organisations such as the Institute of Ethnology at the Central University for Nationalities and the Department of Ethnology at the Institute of Nationality Studies of the CASS. Apart from these, several universities including Yunnan and Xinjiang Normal Universities opened new research organisations for anthropology. The major momentum provided by these circumstances, encouraged a group of academicians headed by Prof. Fei to propose the 'Co-Existence of the Three Disciplines' (三科並立) for sociology, ethnology and anthropology in 1995, and support the independent progress of anthropology. Although their proposal was adopted as a central issue of the agenda during the discussion at the 1995 annual conference of the Chinese Society for Ethnology, it also provoked significant opposition among members. No conclusion was reached at the conference. Nevertheless, the momentum has gradually increased to advance anthropology as an independent discipline, clearly separate from the conventional Chinese ethnology, which carried the baggage of past history and orientations of its own.

In 1997, the aforementioned government agency, the Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council, launched an updated classification of disciplines. Although anthropology again failed to be recognised as a Primary Discipline, it was acknowledged that it contained both physical and cultural anthropology in its composition. This announcement integrated physical anthropology, which used to be placed under biology, and cultural anthropology, which used to be defined as part of ethnology, into one entity, 'anthropology', which was then classified as a Secondary Discipline under the umbrella of sociology.[6] This

3) Fei Xiaotong 1988. 'Author's Preface', *Collection of Fei Xiaotong's Work on Ethnic Studies* (in Chinese). Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House.

4) Zhuang is the first Chinese scholar to have obtained the PhD degree in ethnology after the restoration of its academic status. During the early days of his career, he focused on minority nationalities; at a later stage he switched to the study of the Han.

5) In the Chinese classification system of disciplines, they are divided into Primary and Secondary. The former is a large category that consists of several underlying subjects; the latter represents underlying subjects, within a Primary Discipline.

6) In the new classification system, anthropology, together with two other disciplines—population studies and folklore—is defined as a Secondary Discipline within sociology.

Scholars and officials celebrating the opening of the College of Ethnological Studies in 1994, at the Central University for Nationalities, China—the first and only ethnological college in China.

Within the Primary Discipline of ethnology, there are five Secondary Disciplines: ethnology, nationality theories, minority nationalities history, nationalities arts and nationalities economy.

7) In 1998, MA and PhD courses in anthropology were launched at the Department of Sociology of Peking University. The People's University of China also introduced MA course in anthropology within its Department of Sociology. At the Central University for Nationalities, in parallel to the courses for MA and PhD degrees in ethnology, those for anthropology were newly opened.

new arrangement enabled institutes of sociology, to open new courses for anthropology. By the same token, educational institutes of ethnology were allowed to facilitate an independent course dedicated to anthropology. In this context, several universities came to offer new courses for anthropology, which were ramified from the departments of sociology or ethnology.[7)]

The new classification announced by the government resulted in the separation of cultural anthropology from ethnology. It triggered further movement of Chinese ethnology in the direction of 'studies of minority nationalities', while excluding cultural anthropology from its scope. The consequence is that the gap between Chinese ethnology and the internationally recognised anthropology has widened even further. It looks as if, while anthropology is defined as a Secondary Discipline belonging to sociology, anthropology had somehow got closer to sociology. Nevertheless, they are still very distinct. There is no sign of anthropology being assimilated into sociology. At the same time, although an increasing number of institutes and academic courses manifest an association with anthropology by name, we cannot be very optimistic about the future prospects for anthropology. Especially in today's China, strong demands are imposed on academic studies, requiring them to play significant political and economic roles in society. In this context, sociology, which puts its main effort into issues concerning the ethnic majority (the Han), and ethnology, which deals with minority nationalities, are flourishing, with remarkable achievements. In contrast, the position and roles of anthropology are somehow obscured, lacking clear definition. The problem is that this subject has failed the understanding not only of the public in general but also of policy makers and those with political powers, who have the authority to decide the direction of education and research. It is feared that, in China, it would be quite difficult for any academic discipline to continue to exist and make progress, unless it succeeds in achieving the understanding and support of the overall China's population, including those in power and the public in general.

The Life and Culture of Korean Expatriates

Kim Shi-deog

National Folk Museum of Korea

The author studied folklore at the Graduate School of the National Andong University. He is now a curator at the National Folk Museum of Korea. His research interests include kinship organisation, rite of passage, and material culture. He is the author of 'History of Rites of Passage in Korea', Introduction to Folklore History in Korea*, 1996 and 'Function and Significance of the Ancestral Shrines in Lineage Groups',* Study of History and Folklore *no.4, 1994.*

Inside Korea, organisations that study Korean culture are usually either academic societies in the private sector,[1)] or research groups that belong to government agencies.

This paper will introduce research activities at the National Folk Museum in Seoul, Korea. This Museum is supported by the government and publishes its research on Korean folklore in a series entitled *Academic Reports of the National Folk Museum of Korea*. This institute conducts large-scale field work and other research on a nationwide basis. Its projects are often beyond the scope of efforts by individual researchers or private sector associations.

Since its foundation in 1945, a wide variety of surveys and studies have been conducted by the National Folk Museum. Artefacts and other materials have been collected for academic research and display. Our publications include ad-hoc reports of a nationwide field survey of village shrines: *Village Shrines* in 1969.[2)] *The Folklore of Uido Island*, vols.1, 2 and 3 were published

Reports on the life and culture of Korean communities in China (vols.1 and 2).

between 1985 and 1987 (*Academic Reports of the National Folk Museum of Korea*, vols.1, 2, 3). In 1987 a new field survey was launched, focusing on *changsŭng* posts (a pair of wooden posts each with a carved fearsome face put as guardian deities at the entrance to a village) throughout the nation. This survey was completed in 1997.[3] Most of the work currently in progress is associated with major projects that have a time frame of about ten years. Given the overall time line, the outcome of yearly progress is incorporated in annual reports, which are published in the following years. Reports of primary importance that have been compiled to date include a national survey of cultural zones, a national survey of periodical markets (traditional markets on the fifth of the month), a national survey of traditional private homes, and a survey of technology in traditional industries. Very diverse materials are collected during the survey process. Various kinds of information concerning the Museum and Korean culture are presented on the Museum web site <http://www.nfm.go.kr>. The Museum convenes special exhibitions or academic presentations approximately three to five times a year in order to show collections to the public. In addition, the institute provides a wide spectrum of educational courses for the public in general, for all ages. A variety of programmes are also offered under the title of 'The Folklore Museum Accompanying the Korean People'. Citizens are given opportunities to participate actively in these programmes. Through its many contributions, the Museum has become a primary information centre for Korean culture.

In 1996, the museum initiated a major study of life-styles and culture among Korean expatriates (and their descendants) in various parts of the world.[4] This study is an attempt to delineate the phenomenon of acculturation among Korean expatriates in other parts of the world. During the first phase of study, for three years from 1996 to 1998, we worked among Korean communities in the Heilongjiang, Jilin and Liaoning Provinces of China.[5] After completing this research, another three-year survey was launched in the former USSR. This began in 1999 and still continues. It is also planned to carry out a survey in Japan for two years from 2002, and this will be followed by another two-year survey in North America starting in 2004. These surveys

Celebration of the 60th birthday of a Korean expatriate in China.

constitute a major long-term academic project that will require ten years to complete. The scope of the planned work is so extensive and deep that the National Folk Museum of Korea is unable to carry out all parts of the task on its own. Some of the work has been commissioned to other academic societies outside the museum.

We launched this project in order to evaluate critically the generally accepted perception that Korean expatriates (and their descendants) living in their community abroad maintain traditional Korean culture and tradition as they have for centuries without transforming them. Our aim is not to explore the survival and value of genuine or original Korean culture and tradition. Our aim is to recognise and describe the contemporary life-styles and culture of Korean expatriates as they are. Special efforts are made to discover changes in culture and tradition in the life of Korean expatriates, to elucidate the process of transformation and its nature in concrete terms. In other words, the contemporary life of Korean expatriates is to be analysed in light of the historical processes of their settlement abroad and adaptation to foreign environments. While there is a focus on delineating the relations between their way of life and the specific issues and realities that they face in foreign societies, we also wish to identify the function and meaning of Korean culture

1) Six major private-sector organisations are considered to be the most important academic societies in Korea for cultural studies: (i) the Korean Society for Cultural Anthropology, which focuses on anthropology; (ii) the Korean Ethnological Association; (iii) the Society of Korean Folklore, which deals with culture and folklore; (iv) the Korean Folklore Society; (v) the Korean Society for Historical Folklife Studies; and the Asian Comparative Folklore Society. Recently, the Society of Practical Folkloristics was founded. This is characterised by its interest in the Enlightenment.

2) Currently, major efforts are being made to review and analyse the materials collected during this survey. This work has been incorporated and published in a series of reports entitled *Village Shrines across the Nation*, beginning in 1995.

3) The survey of *changsŭng* posts culminated in the publication of reports by region, one of which was *Religious Faith in Changsŭng Sottae Poles in Kang-weon Province,* Academic Reports of the National Folk Museum of Korea vol.6, 1988.

4) This project was planned in 1993 while the National Folk Museum was in the middle of relocating to a new site. Service was maintained despite various relocation requirements. Before actually launching the project, a period of approximately three years was needed for preparation to

assure financial support from the government.

5) The research in China was carried out by the Korean Society for Cultural Anthropology, which published results in three reports.

and tradition among expatriates—these are reflected in their lives to varying degrees.

As a result of our new project, we are already able to discard the stereotyped view that Korean expatriates stick to a coherent life-style as well as culture which have been petrified, fixed and made uniform through generations. The way in which Korean expatriates live outside Korea has been found to be dynamic and diversified. Their original culture and the foreign cultures that they have encountered outside Korea have been amiably fused and integrated through processes of selection and evolution. New communities have arisen with unique cultural attributes. The value of this project is that it is not limited to merely the collection and analysis of fragmented elements of Korean culture. In this programme, our efforts have centred on elucidating the entire life and culture of Korean expatriates, using an in-depth and comprehensive approach. This is evident in expatriate representations of folklore, history and culture.

Cultural Treasures from the Pacific

The George Brown Exhibition, 10 March–31 May 1999

Kate Vusoniwailala

Fiji National Museum

The author has been Director of Fiji's National Museum since 1992. She studied Art Gallery and Museum Management at Manchester University and is currently completing her MBA at the University of the South Pacific. She is a founding member of the Pacific Island Museums Association and sits on the Editorial Boards of the Fiji Museum journal, Domodomo*, the Pacific Island Museum Association's newsletter,* PIMA News*, and the* Journal of Pacific Studies *published by the University of the South Pacific.*

The opening of the George Brown Exhibition at the National Museum of Ethnology (Minpaku) in Osaka, on Wednesday 10 March, was a very special occasion. It brought together individuals from different parts of the Pacific, like drawing threads, or weaving strands of pandanus, to provide the chance for a rich cultural interchange and the strengthening of ties between Minpaku and its neighbouring Pacific Island Museums. Colleagues from Japan, Australia, Papua New Guinea and Fiji enjoyed the opportunity to share their views on this innovative and thought-provoking exhibition.

The imaginative way in which the organiser approached the exhibition was of great interest to guests. The open display of objects in trays, was reminiscent of walking through a collection storeroom, where accession numbers were apparent and objects were arranged according to 'provenance' and 'type', providing a voyeuristic experience for those visitors not usually allowed beyond the public spaces of museum galleries.

The overall result was a convincing portrayal of the objects as part of a cohesive collection, accumulated by the Reverend George Brown. The size of the collection and obvious attention to detail made during the process of collecting, were made very apparent through the style of display. This was well complimented and supported by a series of historical photographs, taken by Rev. Brown himself, supplementing the text and providing a context for the collection, as well as an insight into the collector himself.

This provided an interesting approach to an exhibition—surveying the collector, learning more about him, his motives and purpose, without trying to reconstruct a context for cultural objects which had long since been removed from their original environment. It was also a dramatic and interesting contrast to the display ethos illustrated elsewhere in the Museum.

For those with a particular interest in museum collections and the process of collecting during the nineteenth century, this exhibition was very informative and well presented. For the visitors from Papua New Guinea and Fiji, the opportunity to view cultural treasures from the Pacific was a very valuable one, facilitated by the style of display—with all the objects in plain view as described above.

Another indirect benefit for those curating this collection, was that it enabled the guests from the Pacific to pick out registration inaccuracies—a legacy of earlier times when cultural objects had been removed far from their point of origin and were documented by those not totally familiar with their function and origin. The discussions held between the staff of Minpaku and the representatives of Pacific Island Museums, proved very valuable on this point and I am sure that the dialogue will continue.

As Pacific Island Museums 'recreate' themselves, and redefine their roles, one of the strong positions that they are beginning to take, is the contribution they make towards researching cultural

materials held in foreign collections, and assisting where possible with advising on the representation of those cultural materials through the medium of exhibitions and displays.

The initiative taken by Minpaku in inviting representatives from Pacific Island Museums to the opening of the George Brown Exhibition was both very welcome and forward looking, promising greater collaboration and exchange in the future. This will undoubtedly be beneficial for both parties. The representatives from Papua New Guinea and Fiji emphasised this point during the formal proceedings of the exhibition opening, when both Directors were invited to make brief speeches.

The acquisition of the George Brown Collection by Minpaku is an excellent addition to its Pacific Island collections, and was successfully showcased during the exhibition.

The logo chosen for the exhibition—a *wasekaseka*, or split whale tooth necklace from Fiji—was acknowledged and appreciated by the party from Fiji. Displayed on large banners at the entrance to the Gallery and on all the promotional materials produced for the exhibition, it immediately dispelled the physical dissonance resulting from travelling so far from home. However, had that not been the case, the overwhelming hospitality extended by our hosts would have been just as successful in making our visit to Minpaku and Japan both memorable and enjoyable.

Controversial Collection

The George Brown Exhibition, 10 March–31 May 1999

Helen Gardner
La Trobe University, Melbourne

The George Brown Collection of over 3,000 objects—gathered during the Methodist missionary's long career in Oceania—must be one of the most mobile collections of artefacts in the world. It has been sold three times this century and housed on three separate continents. Following Brown's death in Australia in 1917 the collection was purchased, after discussion between English and Australian institutions, by the Bowes Museum in Brown's home town in the north of England. In the 1950s it was sold again to the University of Newcastle where it was used as a teaching aid. In the 1970s it was relocated to the Hancock Museum, a division of the University. The sale of the George Brown Collection in 1985 to the National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, Japan raised a number of questions amidst considerable controversy. In a charged political atmosphere museum professionals in the Pacific, England and Japan debated some of the intangible issues of museum collection and ownership. In England, those who argued against the sale claimed that the collection was a source of regional or national pride—'the only significant collection of Melanesian material in the north of England'. These broader arguments of nationalism and self-respect hid sharper tensions between museum staff and the university administration. The latter was intent on cutting costs and viewed the collection as a disposable asset. From the Pacific, moral arguments against the sale were based on the iniquities of colonisation. The collection was seen to represent a historical 'plundering' of newly decolonised countries. In an entirely different register, citizens in the deeply Christian states of the Pacific claim Brown as a founding father of their faith. At the opening of the Osaka Exhibition Soroi Eoe, Director of the Papua New Guinea Museum, discussed Brown's role in the Christian history of his nation in an eloquent plea for the exhibition to tour Papua New Guinea.

Considering the controversy over the sale and history of the collection, it was fitting that Professor Shuzo Ishimori, organiser of the George Brown Exhibition and key player in its purchase for the National Museum of Ethnology, chose to include these stresses in the first display of the material since its arrival in Japan over ten years ago. As a result, the George Brown Exhibition was as much an essay on collections and museums as it was on the missionary. Professor Ishimori displayed over 2,000 items in interconnected rooms, each one representing a single island group. While some of the exhibits, in particular the masks and larger carvings, were shown in glass cases, the rest were laid

In 1994 the author began her PhD research at the Department of History, La Trobe University, Melbourne. The topic of her research is the Reverend George Brown, Methodist missionary to the Pacific from 1860–1908, with a special focus on his collecting and scientific interests. More broadly, she is interested in museums as national institutions and the ways in which they represent the peoples of other nations. Forthcoming publications include 'Gathering for God: Reverend George Brown and the Christian Economy in the Gathering of Artefacts' in M. O'Hanlon (ed.), Hunting the Gatherers: Collectors, Agents and Agency in Melanesia *(provisional title), London: Oxford University Press and 'Morally Suspect, Legally Subject: Reverend George Brown and the New Britain Raid', in D. Kirkby (ed.),* Empires Reach.

out on storage shelves with nothing to separate the viewer from the object. This reflexive display style recalled the storage spaces of museums and presented to the public the geographic range, style and sheer volume of the collection. The exhibition style reminded me that throughout the twentieth century this collection has been largely hidden from public view in the back rooms or basements of institutions. In a comment on cataloguing and classification all items displayed their museum identification tags and there was no attempt to hide the four other numbers painted onto each object by the museums that owned the collection previously.

Ishimori's exhibition showed concern for the historical details of the collection. The cannibal fork display, for example, included a discussion of the long history of these objects as favoured souvenirs in Europe. Further to this was deliberate inclusion of a souvenir shop as part of the exhibition, a reminder that many of these objects were gathered through a trade that continues to be an important source of revenue in Pacific nations. Brown's collecting techniques were also exhibited. The display of Trobriand food bowls showed about thirty of these virtually duplicated objects, reflecting Brown's desire for a representative sample of various 'types' of artefacts showing incremental variation. Similarly, Ishimori mimicked Brown's typological interests by arranging spears and clubs according to the missionary's own photographs of these objects. Absent from this reflexive inquiry into the issues of collection, display and cataloguing was any reference to Brown's relationships with Islanders. While many of the items were gathered through trade, most were gifts offered by Pacific peoples to their missionary in recognition of his role in their Christian lives. There are, therefore, other stories that can be told through the complex archive of George Brown's Collection of material culture.

On the George Brown Collection

Shuzo Ishimori
National Museum of Ethnology

In 1985, news of an offer to sell the George Brown Collection, then held by the University of Newcastle, reached Minpaku. The Museum Collection Committee decided to negotiate with the University of Newcastle because the collection would greatly improve coverage for Melanesia. Education budget cuts by the British government, under Mrs. Thatcher, led the University vice-chancellor to sell the collection. This was approved by the board of trustees, with the condition that the collection should be purchased and stored as an integral whole, and preferably by a museum in the Pacific area to facilitate access by researchers in that area. Eventually, the University and Minpaku came to an agreement. It was understood that our museum support the will of Rev. George Brown and maintain the collection as an integral whole.

At the special exhibition we displayed over two thousands items, the maximum limit for our space, together with about fifty photographs taken by Brown, and some modern photographs. As Helen Gardner mentions in her accompanying article, the collection has been largely hidden from public view in the back rooms of various institutions. This was probably the first opportunity to display so many items to the public of any country. Nearly sixty thousand visitors were able to gain a sense of closeness to Pacific history by seeing artefacts displayed openly on trays, and photographs of the collector and his family and his mission activities. We are relieved to report that there were no damaged objects and no thefts during the exhibition.

As Kate Vusoniwailala has mentioned, the George Brown Collection is a very suitable focus for collaboration and exchange between museums in the Pacific and Minpaku, in the future. We will continue to invite museum staff from the Pacific area to work with this collection, and we are open to suggestions about how items can be used or lent for exhibitions by other institutions.

A research report on the George Brown Collection, written in Japanese, has already been published (*Senri Ethnological Reports*, no.10, 1999). I. Hayashi (NME) reviewed the history of George Brown's activities as a

missionary and a collector. C. Shirakawa (Kawasaki Univ. of Medical Welfare) discussed what was collected and what was not collected in New Britain, and found that Brown could not collect masks and related materials used by secret societies. H. Sekine (Nagoya Univ.) studied artefacts from the Solomon Islands and how they represent the social scene in a period when traditional warfare continued. K. Hashimoto (Kyoto Bunkyo Univ.) examined artefacts from Fiji, and S. Kobayashi (Tokyo Zokei Univ.) investigated objects from Trobriand Islands. A. Nobayashi (NME) examined the bones attached to spears, and found that many were not human bones, as had been reported by Brown. P. Matthews (NME) investigated Brown's experience and views of physical environment through his writing and photographs. M. Ujitani (NME) discussed practical issues related to conservation of the collection.

Exhibition

Ethnic Cultures Crossing Borders: People Moving, Cultures Mixing

Special Exhibition

'Border-crossing' is one of the keywords in globalisation. Ethnic cultures are no exception. Ethnic groups have never been completely separate. Recently, people have been mixing more and more with other people, creating richer cultures, but also stimulating greater self-assertion by ethnic groups.

Our special exhibition focuses on nine topics. On the first floor, languages, music, movies, calendars, and world maps are displayed under the theme of people and cultures crossing borders. The second floor presents examples of how indigenous people have been asserting their own cultures. The display titles here are 1) Aboriginal People in the Central Desert, Australia, 2) Inuit of the Arctic, 3) Shamanic Visions of the Amazon, and 4) Artists of the Kalahari Deserts. About 1,800 items are displayed, most of them from our collection. Twelve calendars are from the Musée National des Arts et Traditions Populaires in Paris, France. The exhibition is held from 9 September 1999 to 11 January 2000. With this exhibition we are also trying some new display approaches. We have set up a temporary studio named 'Minpaku Ethno-station' to allow live broadcasts on FM radio by a multi-lingual private radio company. Also, in addition to 'hands-on display', we employ a 'feet-on display', in which maps and signs are placed on the floor, with explanations. Thus we attract visitors' attention to the floor. All display stands are at a height of 60 cm for visitors on wheelchairs. On the second floor, paintings and sculptures are presented together with other ethnic artefacts and photographs so that visitors can learn how and why ethnic art is produced. A symposium titled 'Arts and Representation of Ethnic Cultures' was held on 15–16 December 1999, to develop the themes of this exhibition. A colourful exhibition catalogue has been published and an original Minpaku calendar for 2000 is for sale at our museum shop.

Hirochika Nakamaki
Chief organiser
National Museum of Ethnology

Indian movie magazines.

Conferences

New Horizons in Bon Studies

Monbusho International Symposium
23–27 August 1999

Bon culture existed in Tibet before Buddhism arrived and has survived to the present. Bon has been defined in various ways. Some scholars regard Bon as a large body of folk beliefs that involve divination, offerings, curse, beliefs in local deities, and shamanistic concepts of souls and cosmos. Some refer to Bon as a religious complex of ancient Tibet led by priests called Bonpo, who were believed to have supernatural power and conducted the royal funeral rites. Yet others say that Bon is a later non-Buddhist religion of Tibet embodying all kinds of beliefs and practices, first appearing in the eleventh century and becoming well established by the fifteenth century. This organised Bon has features that are amazingly similar and sometimes identical to features in Tibetan Buddhism. It has developed a sophisticated system of metaphysics, philosophy, doctrines and cosmology, which the Bonpo people claim to be very distinct from those of

Buddhism. It has its own canons consisting of hundreds of volumes. Although the Bonpo were oppressed constantly by Buddhists before modern China, they were able to keep their religious tradition alive and popular among the people, and even had political potentiality.

Whichever definition we choose, we can be certain that something essential or basic from Bonpo culture has remained in Tibetan culture since ancient times. Some indigenous beliefs held by the Bonpo appear universal to humanity. In order to perceive the cultural complex more clearly, we need an effective scholarly network, and interdisciplinary approaches to the subject. These were the original reasons for my organising a Bon project, in close partnership with Dr Samten Karmay of CNRS, Paris.

It must be admitted, unfortunately, that Bonpo studies are generally far behind those of Tibetan Buddhism, which are now flourishing world-wide. This is particularly evident in Japan. Despite a long academic tradition of studying Tibetan Buddhism in Japan, other aspects of Tibet have long been left unexplored—although there have been some distinguished studies on history and linguistics. In order to promote the neglected areas of Tibetan studies, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture (Monbusho) and the National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka supported an overseas field research project (Field Research grant #08041040) and a joint-survey in 1996–99 fiscal years.

In order to discuss the results of our research, twenty-four project members met in Osaka during the fourth week of August 1999. Papers were also given by ten invited scholars who were not members of the project.

The titles of their presentation were as follows:

Session 1: Bon and its Relation with Buddhism
P. Kvaerne (Univ. of Oslo), The Study of Bon in the West: Past, Present and Future.
K. Mimaki (Kyoto Univ.), Bonpo Cosmology as Described in the Bon *sgo gsal byed* and a Comparison with Buddhist Cosmology.
H. Blezer (Univ. of Leiden), The Bon *dBal mo Nyer bdun (/brgyad)* and the Buddhist *dBang phyug ma Nyer brgyad*: A Brief Comparison.
D. Rossi (State Univ. of Portland), The *Lo rgyus chen mo* in the Collection of the *Ye khri mtha' sel* attributed to Dran pa Nam mkha.

Session 2: Cosmology and Ritual
Samten Karmay (CNRS), The *yul lha cult in sBra-chen*.
A. N. Blondeau (EPHE), The *mKha' klong gsang mdos*: Some Questions about Ritual Structure and Cosmology.
D. Martin (Univ. of Jerusalem), Mental States and Other *mDzod-phug* Lists and Passages with Parallels in Works of Vasubandhu.

Session 3: Bonpo Society and Related Rituals
H. Ishii (Tokyo Univ. of Foreign Studies), Bon, Buddhist and Hindu Life Cycle Rituals: A Comparison.
C. Ramble (German Project of Nepal), The Secular Surroundings of a Bonpo Ceremony: Games, Popular Rituals and Economic Structures in the *mDos-rgyab* of *Klu-brag* Monastery (Nepal).
M. Schrempf (Free Univ. of Berlin), Sponsorship of Bon Monasteries in A-mdo Shar-khog.
G. Samuel (Univ. of Newcastle), The Indus Valley Civilization and Early Tibet.

Session 4: Possession and Related Rituals
S. Nagano (International Buddhist Univ.), Sacrifice and *Lha-pa* in the *Glu-rol* Festival in Reb-skong.
B. Bickel (Univ. of California, Berkeley), A Non-Buddhist Stupa in the Himalayan Foothills: Its Sociocultural and Ethnolinguistic Significance.
M. Tachikawa (NME), Mandala Visualization and Possession.
M. Mori (Koyasan Univ.), The Bon Deities Depicted in the Wall Paintings in *Bon-brgya* Monastery.

Session 5: Bonpo Monasteries and Their Localities
Tsering Thar (China Center for Tibetan Studies), *Bla-ma* of Bon Religion in Amdo and Khams.
Phuntsog Tsering (Tibet Academy of Social Sciences), *rTags gzigs kyi skor la mdo tsam gleng pa*.
Dondrup Lhagyal (Tibet Academy of Social Sciences), The Family Lineages of Bon in Central Tibet.
S. Miyake (Otani Univ.), *g-Yung drung gling, sMan ri* and Other Monasteries in Central Tibet.
Ugyen Pelgen (Sherubtse College), The Bonpos in Bhutan.
Zheng Due (China Center for Tibetan Studies), A Study on the Relationship between Bon Religion and Folk Religion in Tibet.
Drolma Thar (China Center for Tibetan Studies), *Klu-'bum* and Religious Beliefs in Countryside.
A. Klein (Rice Univ.), Early Developments in the Bon Philosophical Tradition: The *Gal mdo* and Its Context.

Session 6: Linguistic Approach to Zhangzhung
Y. Nagano (NME) & Y. Nishi (Kobe City Univ. of Foreign Studies), A General Review of Zhangzhung Studies.
T. Takeuchi (Kobe City Univ. of Foreign Studies), Y. Nagano (NME) & S. Ueda (Institute of Mathematical Statistics), An Analysis of Dounghuang Manuscript IO 755.
Y. Takahashi (Kyoto Univ.), A Descriptive Study of Kinauri (Pangi dialect): A Preliminary Report.
G. van Driem (Univ. of Leiden), Zhangzhung and Its Next of Kin in the Himalayas.
J. A. Matisoff (Univ. of California, Berkeley), Zhangzhung and the West Himalayish Branch of Tibeto-Burman.

We plan to publish eight volumes from the project and symposium—these will appear in the *Senri Ethnological Reports*, under the auspices of the National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, by the end of 2002. Bon Studies 3 and 4 will present proceedings of the symposium.

Bon Studies 1
Bonpo Mandalas
Editors: Tenjin Namdag, M. Tachikawa & Y. Nagano

Bon Studies 2
A Catalogue of the Bonpo Publications
Editors: Samten Karmay, Tenjin Wangyal, D. Martin & Y. Nagano

Bon Studies 3
New Horizons in Bon Studies
Editors: Samten Karmay & Y. Nagano

Bon Studies 4
A Linguistic Approach to the Zhangzhung Language
Editor: Y. Nagano

Bon Studies 5
A Zhangzhung Lexicon
Compiler: Namgyal Nyima
Editors: Samten Karmay & Y. Nagano

Bon Studies 6 & 7
A General Survey of Bonpo Monasteries and People
Compilers: Tsering Thar, Phuntsog Tsering, Dondrup Lhagyal & Ch. Ramble
Editors: Samten Karmay & Y. Nagano

Bon Studies 8
Notes on the Zhang-zhung Language
Author: F.W. Thomas
Editors: G. Qessel, T. Takeuchi & Y. Nagano

Yasuhiko Nagano
Convenor
National Museum of Ethnology

The Twentieth Century's Daily Necessities

8th International Symposium, Tradition and Change of Ethnic Cultures in the Twentieth Century
4–6 November 1999

In this century, how is it that the value of the native traditional techniques have changed? And how have domestic machines affected daily life? This was the eighth symposium in the long-term joint research project, 'Tradition and Change of Ethnic Cultures in the Twentieth Century'. The four sessions were as follows:

Session 1: Communal Illusions of Twentieth Century's Life
Papers: Foretelling of the Twentieth Century Life (Masaki Kondo, NME); Daily Necessities in the USSR (Mitsuyoshi Numano, Tokyo Univ.); Diverting Life-styles Using Today's Junk in Japan (Shinya Okamoto, Nagoya Art Univ.); Development of Tourism Resource through the Native Technique in Oceania (Shigeki Kobayashi, Tokyo Zokei Univ.); Comments (Makoto Yoshida, Kobe Univ. and Makito Minami, NME).

Session 2: Munitions/Civil Demands
Papers: Demand for Japanese Products in Korea during under the Rule of Japan (Byung Sun In, Museum of Korea Indigenous Straw and Plant Handicraft); Switchover between Munition and Civil Demand for Development of Aluminium Products in Japan (Koji Asaoka, National Museum of Japanese History); Patent and Secret behind Scientific Inventions (Koji Miyake, Mukogawa Women's Univ.); Comments (Josef Kreiner, Bonn Univ.).

Session 3: Transfiguration of Materials
Papers: Development of an Inexpensive Mat and Its Popularisation in Japan and USA (Hiroyuki Kadono, Mukogawa Women's Univ.); Rayon Development and Its Spread in Japan (Kimiko Yokokawa, Mukogawa Women's Univ.); Demand for Sanitary Towels and Changes in Sensibilities regarding 'Kegare' in Okinawa (Ryoko Shiotsuki, Japan Women's Univ.); Comments (Koji Sato, NME).

Session 4: Coming of the Age of Electrification
Papers: New Life Styles of Female Workers Seen in the Public Television in Northern Thailand (Kyonosuke Hirai, NME); Deviant Development of Electric Rice Cooker in Japan (Masatomo Yamaguchi, GK Institute of *Doguology*); Laundering and a Sense of Neatness in Germany (Akiko Mori, NME); Comments (Zenjiro Tamura, Musashino Art Univ.).

The sessions were followed by a fruitful discussion with the following Minpaku research staff: Toshio Asakura, Nobuyuki Hata, Yuki Konagaya, Teiko Mishima, Mitsuhiro Shimmen and Hiroshi Shoji.

The symposium was from 4 to 7 November 1999 at Minpaku, and the papers will be published from Domesu Publishing Co.

Masaki Kondo
Convenor
National Museum of Ethnology

Visiting Scholars

The following visitors have been sponsored by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture (Monbusho):

Cissé, Dr Mamadou
is Associate Professor of the African Department of the French National Institute for Oriental Languages and Civilisations (I. Na. L. C. O.). He is the author of *Dictionnaire Français-Wolof* (Asiathèque, 1998), *Unités et catégories grammaticales en Wolof* (N. E. F., 1998), many bilingual tales (Wolof-French) and numerous articles on Wolof language and culture. His main research interests are descriptive linguistics, comparative linguistics and ethnolinguistics. At Minpaku he hopes to contribute to a better understanding of totemism in relation to joking kinship as practised in parts of Western Africa, mainly in the Sudano-Sahelian region.

Garfias, Professor Robert
studied anthropology and ethnomusicology at the University of California, Los Angeles and was director of the Graduate Program in ethnomusicology at the

University of Washington for many years. He is now in the Department of Anthropology at UCI (University of California, Irvine). He has conducted research on the music of many cultures of the world, most notably, Japan, Burma, Romania, Latin America and Turkey. He is currently completing work on a book that attempts to look at musical practice in several cultures and to define music as a form of human cultural expression. He is also engaged in the use of new computer technology such as MIDI (musical instrument digital interface) as a means of precise reconstruction and analysis of music performance for research in ethnomusicology. He was a Visiting Professor at Minpaku from 16 August to 15 November 1999.

Kawlra, Dr Aarti
was born in Punjab, India. She completed her M Phil at the Department of Advanced Studies in Sociology, Delhi University, and at the Department of Humanities and Social Science, Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi. She has worked at the National Handicrafts and Handloom Museum, New Delhi and continues to be involved with issues pertaining to artisan work and products. Currently, she is teaching at the National Institute of Fashion Technology, Chennai. Her primary research has concerned handloom weaving in the context of material culture and community studies. She is a Visiting Associate Professor at Minpaku from 18 October 1999 to 31 January 2000 and will work on a comparative study of the sari and the kimono in the contemporary context.

Pfaff, Mr Walter
was born in Zurich, Switzerland in 1949 and studied at the Academy for Music and Performing Arts in Vienna. After graduation he worked as a theatre director in Europe, India and the USA. In 1989, while continuing his work as a director, he began teaching Performing Ethnography at Zurich University and Theatre Anthropology at Vienna University. In 1997 he became a curator at the Museum for Design in Zurich and consequently at the Theater Museum in Vienna. He is now director of the Swiss Parate Laboratory Group, and of the Center for Theatrical Research (C.T.R.T.) in Burgundy, France. His current research focuses on daily and extra-daily body-techniques in performance situations. At present he is writing a book, *The Society of Performers*, which will be published by the end of next year. He is a Visiting Professor at Minpaku from 1 September 1999 to 17 March 2000.

Publications

The following were published by the Museum during the period from July to December 1999:

◊ *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology*, vol.24, no.1, September 1999. Contents: M. Shimmen, 'Nationalism and Christianity under the Socialist State Romania'; K. Kazama, 'Diversification of *Mwaneaba*: The Local Meeting Houses in Tabiteuea South, Kiribati'; Xiao Hua Deng, 'A Comparison of the Language and Culture among Min, Hakka and She Ethnics in Fujian'; and Y. Goto, 'Store Food: A Case Study of the Food Supply in an Aboriginal Community from 1988–1995'.

◊ *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology*, vol.24 no.2, December 1999. Contents: N. Kishigami, 'Current Socio-Economic Situations of Urban Inuit in Canada: A Case Study from Montreal'; Kyung-soo Chun, 'Representing Colonialism and Nationalism in the Korean Museum'; and H. Watanabe, 'Jomon Clay Figurines and the Goddess Cult: An Ethnoarchaeological Study, part 3'.

◊ L. Qurčabaγatur Solongγod, *ZUM ČINGGIS-QAΓAN-KULT*. Senri Ethnological Reports, no.11, 316 pp., July 1999.

MINPAKU Anthropology Newsletter

The MINPAKU Anthropology Newsletter is published semi-annually, in June and December. 'Minpaku' is a Japanese abbreviation for the National Museum of Ethnology. The Newsletter promotes a continuing exchange of information with 'Minpaku fellows' who have been attached to the Museum as visiting scholars from overseas. The Newsletter also provides a forum for communication with a wider academic and anthropological audience.

MINPAKU Anthropology Newsletter is accessible through our homepage at: http://www.minpaku.ac.jp/eng/index.htm

General Editor: Naomichi Ishige
Editor: Shigeharu Tanabe
Editorial Panel: Isao Hayashi, Eisei Kurimoto, Peter Matthews, Akiko Mori, Yasuhiko Nagano, Akira Saito, Hiroshi Shoji, Shigeharu Tanabe, Shigeyuki Tsukada.
Production: Setsuko Ikuta, Tamiko Urano, Mugi Yamamoto

Contributions and correspondence should be sent to:
Professor Shigeharu Tanabe, Editor, MINPAKU Anthropology Newsletter, National Museum of Ethnology, Senri Expo Park, Suita, Osaka 565-8511, Japan.
Tel: +81-6-6876-2151
Fax: +81-6-6878-7503
E-mail: nletter@idc.minpaku.ac.jp

Please note that signed articles represent the views of their writers, not necessarily the official views of the National Museum of Ethnology.

ISSN 1341-7959

This Newsletter is printed on recycled paper.

Printed by Nakanishi Printing Co., Ltd.