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Foreword

Hiroaki Izumi's occasional paper describes the work of Kyoto primatologists, and its eventual development through ecological and behavioural studies of human hunter-gatherers such as those by Jiro Tanaka and Kazuyoshi Sugawara. After the Second World War, Kyoto primatologist Kinji Imanishi led a team of researchers of great skill and passion. At that time, Japanese researchers could not easily travel abroad, but Imanishi's successor Jun'ichiro Itani arranged for fieldwork to be carried out first with Africa's great apes and soon with African hunter-gatherers, pastoralists and swidden agriculturalists. Ecological anthropology at Kyoto, both in the Centre of African Area Studies and in the Integrated Faculty of Human Sciences, inherits this tradition.

To a Westerner or to an African, at first glance it may seem odd to study humans with the same methods one uses in the study of baboons and chimpanzees. Yet that is exactly what, at least originally, the Kyoto primatologists did. I first met Jiro Tanaka at my fieldwork site in Botswana in 1974. I was working with Nharo (Naro) in the Ghanzi farms, and he with G//ana and G/wi hunter-gatherers in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. He was on a mercy mission to Ghanzi's hospital, and on the way back to the Reserve made a detour to visit me. He had brought five G//ana and G/wi with him, and they, the Naro (Nharo) I was with, Tanaka and I all
shared meat, beer and stories through the night. Later Tanaka and I shared anthropological talk, and he told me that his methodology was much the same with a human population as with non-humans – but that working with humans was more fun, because you could talk with them as equals. I was skeptical of his methods, but when later I read his work it became clear that his approach, with its grounding in observational skills and behavioural analysis, had something to offer. Contrary to what some might imagine, it was rooted less in evolutionism, and more in an ecological thought designed to understand human genius through relations between environmental utilization, social action and cultural knowledge.

Tanaka’s writings frequently stress egalitarianism, and this ethos came across in his relations with the Bushmen or San he worked with. Curiously, it is also characteristic of the ethos of Kyoto University, where from the nineteenth century onwards professors have been called by the suffix –san (Mr or Ms) rather than the more formal –sensei (teacher), as in other institutions. Tanaka went on to become leader of several teams of researchers and has recently retired, both as the much respected Professor of African Area Studies at Kyoto and as President of the Japan Association for African Studies.

The other main writer described by Izumi here is Kazuyoshi Sugawara. I first met him in the Kalahari too, when in 1982 he and Masakazu Osaki were beginning their fieldwork with G/wi and G//ana in the Central
Kalahari Game Reserve. Sugawara was also originally a primatologist and very much a product of the Kyoto School, but his uniqueness derives, among other things, from the addition of discourse as a focus and from his blend of ecological study, brilliant linguistic competence and the phenomenology of French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty. Sugawara has superb knowledge of the extremely difficult G/wi language and G/wi modes of expression. He has written very widely on this, but much of his work is still available only in Japanese. As part of a brief research project I did on Japanese hunter-gatherer studies, I had the good fortune to interview Sugawara in Kyoto in 2002. Izumi here follows that up with his own ‘fieldwork’ insights from his stay in Kyoto in 2005. Izumi, I think, has a much deeper understanding of Sugawara’s approach and of its derivation in Kyoto primatology than I, not least because he can read Japanese and I cannot. He also has an ‘ethnographic’ understanding of Kyoto through his short period of ‘fieldwork’ there, and he communicates his understanding subtly but eloquently in this paper.

Hiroaki Izumi completed his MSc in Applied Linguistics at the University of Edinburgh in 2004 and his MSc in Social Anthropology in 2005. This occasional paper is based on his informative and imaginative dissertation for the latter degree. It is not merely a translation or summary of Kyoto work. Rather, it offers much analytical insight into the theoretical basis of Kyoto writings on southern African hunter-gatherers. These are all too often poorly understood in the West and in Africa, where it is easy to
imagine, erroneously, that studying human society using primatological methods is somehow not to understand it in human terms. If anything, Kyoto ecological anthropology today is more, not less, enlightened than Western ecological approaches in its incorporation of discourse and agency.

The Centre of African Studies at Edinburgh has a very long association with African studies in Japan, as indeed it has a long association with African studies in Africa too. The publication of Izumi’s paper should help to increase knowledge of the fascinating work of Kyoto anthropologists and to improve understanding of that tradition’s complex theoretical basis.

Alan Barnard
Professor of the Anthropology of Southern Africa
University of Edinburgh
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REFERENCES
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Current literature describing the Kyoto school of thought in anthropology1 shows a strong tendency to reduce its uniqueness of the theoretical innovations into culture, by involving a Western/Eastern cultural dualism. Several Westerners (e.g. Haraway: 1989; Philips: 1997; de Waal: 2003) assumed that it was only Japanese culture that made it possible for Japanese to uncover socio-cultural details of non-human primates. Haraway (1989) focuses on the Japanese discovery of the matrilineal structure of Japanese monkeys, assuming that ‘there is a strong Japanese cultural preoccupation with mothering and with mother-son relations that has different tones from western versions’ (ibid: 254). She argues that ‘the absence of a monotheistic, patriarchal father god changes men’s imagination about women and females’ (ibid). Similarly, Philips states as follows:

Japanese, perhaps encouraged by the Buddhist doctrine of reincarnation, tend to look at humans, including themselves, as just another animal on the landscape. Shinto beliefs, indigenous and still quite widespread in Japan, are pervaded by animism (Philips 1997: 165).

---

1 Here anthropology means a discipline which pursues to study humankind, including primatology (see details in chapter three).
Obviously, these Western views are based on their cultural prejudices which would be interpreted by Japanese as their ‘political message’ (Sugawara: 2002a). On the other hand, Kinji Imanishi and his followers similarly reduced the uniqueness of the Kyoto school of thought into Japanese culture (e.g. Umesao: 1960; Kawai: 1976; Imanishi 2002a [1984]). They highly praised Japanese culture, which did not have a clear opposition between the God, human, and nature, and argued that Japanese monotheism creates a peaceful coexistence between them, which is different from the Western world where the God controls the heaven, thus having a hierarchical relationship. The extreme view of the ‘Imanishi ideology’ was criticised because of its connection to politics (Kuroda: 1991).

Today, these ‘traditional’ understandings of the Kyoto school are no longer applicable to situate the dynamic organisation and mechanism of current Kyoto anthropology. Instead, there is a need to deconstruct these cultural preoccupations to further look into the nature of it. This occasional paper shows the history and development of the primatological approach\(^2\) of the Kyoto school in Japanese primatology and ecological anthropology. It highlights the following two aspects. First, to trace the history and development of the Kyoto primatological approach provides us an interesting case to examine particular paradigm shifts, namely its development, slump, decline, and return. It is necessary to review these

---

\(^2\) This means the theoretical and methodological innovations of the early Japanese primatology which was initiated by Imanishi and his followers (see details in section 2.1.).
particular historical and theoretical transitions not only to situate a diversity of interests and approaches of the current Kyoto anthropologists, but also to look at the future direction of the Kyoto school. Secondly, the Kyoto school of anthropology has played a peripheral role, but is not the centre of attention in the Western socio/cultural anthropology. Introducing the uniqueness of the Kyoto approach will contribute to the academic communication between the East and the West. In particular, Kyoto’s emphasis on empirical study as well as its inter-disciplinary approach is positive, not only to suggest new ideas to enrich our understanding of humankind, but also to provide a consistent basis for future research.

This paper consists of two large sections, namely, Japanese primatology (chapter two to four) and Japanese ecological anthropology (chapter five). First, the second chapter of this paper focuses on the rotation of paradigms within Japanese primatology, from the early approach to sociobiology, to reveal its historical and theoretical formations. Next, the third chapter sheds light on the current academic organisation of Kyoto anthropology. This shows that there are a variety of interests and approaches within the Kyoto school, respecting its multiplicity. Thirdly, chapter four shows one of the recent trends of the Kyoto school of anthropology. In particular, I will concentrate on Kazuyoshi Sugawara’s (2002a) phenomenological approach which tries to make more sophisticated the legacy of the Kyoto school of primatology. In chapter five, I shall examine how the primatological approach is evident in Japanese ecological anthropology. First, I shall go
back to the time of Imanishi and chronologically describe the details of the
history, approach and objectives of Japanese ecological anthropology.
Secondly, focusing on Japanese studies on San hunter-gatherers, I will try
to extract the nature of Japanese perspectives, comparing Japanese and
Western approaches, in particular, Tanaka (1971) vs. Silberbauer (1981),
and Nishida (2004) vs. Wilmsen (1989). Finally, in conclusion, I will
discuss the advantage of the Kyoto approach, the future direction of the
Kyoto school of anthropology, and tasks for future research, respectively.
CHAPTER TWO: HISTORY OF THE KYOTO APPROACH IN JAPANESE PRIMATOLOGY

The primatological approach of the Kyoto school has gone into decline. In his report of 'the defeat and the return of the thought of the continuity between non-human primates and humankind', Sugawara (2003a) shows the historical recognition that the Kyoto primatological approach was defeated by the hegemony of sociobiology. It rapidly spread within the Kyoto school in the late 1970s, particularly, after the publication of the *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, by E.O. Wilson (1975). Saito (2003) indicates that this publication was used as a textbook in the Kyoto school in 1977 and 1978, and eventually, the sociobiological perspective became dominant over the Kyoto approach in the early 1980s. Behind this, there was recognition among Kyoto scholars that the sociobiology is science, whereas the traditional Kyoto approach is semantics (ibid: 72).

The main purpose of this chapter is to review the history of the paradigm shifts within Japanese primatology, paying attention to approaches of Imanishi, Itani, and sociobiology. It is necessary to trace these particular historical and theoretical transitions in order to situate a diversity of interests and approaches of current Kyoto anthropology. First, I shall begin with Imanishi's concept of the structural-functional approach. Next, I will show the first turning point of the Kyoto approach, namely, Itani's

---

3 This chapter further develops Sugawara (2003a).
emphasis on social structuralism. Thirdly, I will show the decline of the Kyoto primatological approach and its paradigm shift to sociobiology. Finally, in chapter four, I will show one of recent trends of Kyoto anthropology which try to enhance the sophistication of the primatological perspective, in particular Sugawara’s phenomenological approach.

2.1. 1940s-1950s: Imanishi’s influence on the establishment of the Kyoto primatological approach

Japanese primatology was founded by members of the Kyoto school immediately after the Second World War. With Kinji Imanishi (1902-1992) as the leader, Toshizo Kawamura, Jun’ichiro Itani (1926-2001), Masao Kawai, and Kisaburo Tokuda began to study Japanese monkeys (*Macaca fuscata*) in 1948. This opportunity arose during their research into wild horses in Miyazaki, Japan. Their first organisation, the Primate Research Group, was established among the members in 1951. In fact, this was more than 10 years in advance of Western scholars studying primatology. The group’s main interests involved ecology and social behavior. Particularly, Imanishi was interested in the evolution of human society, such as the formation of the human family.
2.1.1. Imanishi's structural-functional approach

The focus of early Japanese primatology was to investigate the entire social system of Japanese monkeys, such as their social order, blood relationship, and leadership. Sugawara (2003a: 74) states that the early Japanese approach was quite similar to the structural-functionalism of British social anthropology. These features were strongly influenced by Imanishi's (2002a [1941]) thoughts. Imanishi paid great attention to the entire relationships between living forms and their environment, and between individuals, and he argued that the structure of relationships would constrain their social characteristics. Imanishi (2002b [1941]) termed this feature a *seikatsu-gata* ('a life form') or a *seikatsu-ryoku* ('life energy'), and he defined a unit which shares and evolves from the same living form as a *shu-shakai* ('a species society'). Moreover, Imanishi (ibid: 48) defined a group of *shu-shakai*, which has a complementary relationship with different living forms in the same environment, as *doui-shakai* ('same rank society or synusia'). Finally, he argued that *doui-shakai* is complementarily distributed on the basis of habitat segregations, creating equilibrium.

Imanishi's perspective is based on a strong Japanese view of nature and therefore, there is no possible academic communication between the East and the West on this point. Specifically, it is in sharp contrast to the Neo-Darwinian paradigm. First, while the Neo-Darwinism sees nature as a struggle of existence, Imanishi (2002b [1941]) sees it as peaceful
coexistence. Secondly, whereas the Neo-Darwinism demonstrates that species diverge into different forms is a result of natural selection, Imanishi emphasises the continuity between similarity and difference. He explains that similarity and difference existed from the beginning of the differentiation of things from one source. He refers to this relationship as 'affinity', stating that 'as recognition of things means recognition of affinity, so we can make use of the ability to infer similarity (i.e. analogy)' (ibid: 5). From this perspective, Imanishi rejects Darwin's concept of the instinct/reason dualism. Instead, he argued that humankind is not the only subjective being, but all the other living forms are also subjective, emphasising that a shu-shakai ('a species society') is a group of individuals, having its own subjectivity. The details of his thought is found in the English translation of Imanishi's book, A Japanese View of Nature: The World of Living Things, which was published in 2002.

2.1.2. Traditional methods of Japanese primatology

The traditional methods of Japanese primatology are known as: 'individual identification', 'long-term observation', 'provisionisation', and 'anthropomorphism' (Kawai 1976: 288-293). First, 'individual identification' refers to identifying every individual member of a particular kind of non-human primates. An important aspect of this is to accept the 'personality' of every individual member of non-human primate species. In

\[\text{Kawai (1976) termed this as } kyoukan-hou \text{ ('a method of sympathy').}\]
other words, this is based on a premise that each society of non-human primates has its own social and cultural organisation (ibid). Second, ‘long-term observation’ is to conduct fieldwork for many years to observe the social and cultural organisation of a particular kind of non-human primates. The main purpose of this is to observe continuously dynamic and diverse aspects of the social phenomena of non-human primate societies. Thirdly, ‘provisionisation’ means to attract wild monkeys to come nearby, by regularly setting out foods. Kawai indicates that an innovational aspect of this is to introduce a scientific method in natural observation. This made it possible for Japanese to discover socio-cultural details of each particular kind of non-human primate species. Finally, ‘anthropomorphism’ is to see non-human primates in the same way as humankind. According to Kawai, this means to adapt oneself into a particular kind of non-human primate society in order to experience and perceive their social behaviour and customs through the ‘emotional channel’. Kawai characterised these Japanese original views as shin-shukanshugi (‘neo-subjectivism’).

2.2. 1950s-1960s: From Imanishi to Itani: The development of the Kyoto primatological approach

Japanese primatology rapidly developed in the 1950s. In 1952, the provisionisation of Japanese monkeys in Kohshima and Takasaki succeeded. After this, Japanese primatologists expanded their research areas in Japan. In 1955, the Japanese Monkey Center was officially
established. In 1957, *Primates*, a journal of primatology, was published through this organisation. Moreover, in 1959, this journal became an English-language journal with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation (Nishida 1999: 12). On the other hand, Japanese primatologists began expeditions to study various kinds of non-human primates in the world in the late 1950s. The first expedition was focused on the African great ape species, in particular, gorillas. It was conducted by Imanishi and Itani in 1958. They went to Kenya, Uganda, the then Belgian Congo, and Cameroon to do a preparatory investigation of gorillas. Although this expedition continued through 1959 and 1960, it was eventually suspended because of the disturbances in the Belgian Congo. As a result, they decided to study chimpanzees instead. The first expedition to investigate chimpanzees was conducted in 1961. With Imanishi as the leader of this expedition, two main groups, namely primate and anthropology teams, were sent to Tanzania. Itani was the leader of the former team which focused on chimpanzees, while the leader of the latter was Morimichi Tomikawa whose team focused on people living around the lake Eyasi (Ohta 2004: 273). The next two expeditions were also conducted in 1963 and 1964, and this project has been continuing since then. In the first expedition, Imanishi received the first subsidy from the Ministry of Education. In addition, Miyaji, Kawamura and Sugiyama started to study hanuman langoars in India in 1963 (Nishida 1999: 13).
The early Kyoto primatologists, who adopted Imanishi’s structural-functional perspective, succeeded to study a number of social/cultural details of non-human primate societies. Today, a majority of primatologists in the world admit that non-human primates have incest prohibitions and a variety of cultures. In fact, while Western researchers became interested in these topics in the 1970s, Japanese primatologists had discovered these facts in the 1950s. Imanishi states: ‘It was a Western dogma that all animal behaviour is based on instinct, while human behaviour is only cultural’ (Imanishi: 1951; cited in Itani 1987: 300; my translation). The main feature of the Kyoto approach in the 1950s is that Japanese primatologists tried to understand ambiguous social behaviour among Japanese monkeys in relation to their social structure (Sugawara: 2003a). Specifically, they tried to demonstrate this in terms of their ‘personality’ (see section 2.1.2.). For example, Imanishi classified the social behaviour of Japanese monkeys into two types, ‘an individual-focused behaviour’ and ‘a group-focused behaviour’, and he tried to demonstrate the latter behaviour (e.g. leadership) from Freud’s concept of identification. He argued that the children of Japanese monkeys naturally acquire the leader’s behaviours and attitudes as a model. Thus, the early Kyoto primatologists were writing ethnographies of Japanese monkeys, seeing their social behaviour in the same way as humankind (Shimada: 2003). Itani’s publication of Takasaki-yama no saru (‘Japanese Monkeys of Mt. Takasaki’), which was published in 1954, is one of the most remarkable ethnographies of this time.
2.3. 1960s-1970s: The turning point of the Kyoto primatological approach - Itani’s perspective of social structure

According to Sugawara (2003a: 74), the Kyoto primatological approach came to a turning point in the middle of the 1960s. After discovering the rule of incest prohibition among Japanese monkeys, Itani had fixed the direction of the Kyoto approach towards social structuralism, rather than psychology. Sugawara (ibid: 74) states that at this point, the relationship between Itani and Imanishi had broken down. The disagreement between the two involved the differing interpretations of male Japanese monkeys' social behaviour. For example, it was unclear among Japanese primatologists why male Japanese monkeys leave their group before the age of five. According to Itani (1987: 25), Imanishi’s psychological perspective focused on recognition between mother and son, and it assumed that there might be a psychological system which prevents sexual intercourse between them. This perspective tried to demonstrate that the rate of sexual intercourse between them is extremely low. However, Imanishi’s perspective cannot explain the father-daughter relationship, which does not have such recognition.

In 1972, Itani published *Reichourui no shakai kouzou* (‘The Social Structure of Primates’). In this publication, Itani tried to demonstrate that non-human primate social structures result from incest prohibition. Interestingly, according to Sugawara, Itani gained this idea from
Lévi-Strauss’s (1969 [1949]) *Elementary Structures of Kinship* (K. Sugawara; personal communication). For example, in *Reichourui shakai no shinka* (‘The Evolution of Primate Societies’), Itani (1987) classifies kinship systems of non-human primates into six categories (i.e. bilateral, matrilineal, patrilineal, monogamous, polygynous, and polyandrous) with significant attentions to various oppositions (e.g. a nocturnal vs. diurnal). (See the details in the English article of Itani [1985].) However, in applying social structuralism, Itani made a contradiction. Sugawara (2003a: 74; my translation) indicates that ‘while the sociality of non-human primates is determined according to their social structure, they are subjective beings who act with their own personality’. In other words, Itani’s focus on social structuralism was insufficient to approach non-human primates from the observer’s embodied mind.

**2.4. 1970s: The impact of Sociobiology**

Sociobiology was adopted by the Kyoto primatologists in the late 1970s, and it rapidly spread within the academic field, establishing its hegemony in the early 1980s (Sugawara: 2003a). This Western scientific approach was attractive to Japanese primatologists because of its systematic explanation of social behaviour and its theoretical developments. Behind this, there had been a slump among Japanese primatologists in terms of the theoretical foundations of their discipline. Especially, Imanishi had been struggling to make his evolutionary theory more sophisticated. He could
not demonstrate the core of it, namely a process of evolution of a particular kind of *shu-shakai* which shares the principle of coexistence. He simply stated that ‘when the time of evolution comes, all the members of a species change’ (Imanishi 2002a [1984]: 270; my translation), but how? After his death, many people who were against Imanishi claimed that his thought is not a scientific theory, but his own world view.

On the other hand, the Neo-Darwinian paradigm is exactly the opposite of the Kyoto approach. It has its roots in Darwin’s view of natural selection and Mendel’s genetic theory. This assumes the unit of evolution as the gene, and it explains animal/human adaptive behaviours through reductionism, focusing on the reproductive success of the individual. One of the central topics is to demonstrate how altruistic behaviour evolves as a result of natural selection. It tries to demonstrate that natural selection is the result of ‘the most adaptive forms and patterns of behaviour being transmitted during reproduction more frequently than the alternative genes which prove less adaptive’ (Layton 1997: 157). The Neo-Darwinian paradigm was enriched by adapting various models, such as Maynard Smith’s (1982) games theory, and Trivers’s (1985) reciprocal altruism. By the early 1980s, it became the major paradigm for researchers in biology.

However, some Kyoto anthropologists claim the Neo-Darwinian paradigm for the following reasons. First, sociobiologists do not reconsider their opinion that one can reduce social acts to genetics. Nakamura (2003) states
that this is an arbitrarily-defined concept which is not a natural consequence of scientific facts. He further argues that sociobiologists do not consider any effect of the individual character or history of group members on the society (ibid: 265). Next, all social acts of biological forms are seen as the maximisation of individual/inclusive fitness. Thus, non-human primates as well as humankind are mechanical things whose social acts are produced by calculating the costs and benefits of the individual (Sugawara: 2003a). Finally, sociobiology cannot explain the complexity of non-human primate as well as human social interactions. Nakamura (2003: 267-268) points out that whereas sociobiologists believe that their reductionism could explain various aspects of human lives (e.g. culture), they do not deal with aspects which seem abstract. As a result, they tend to look at limited aspects of social interactions and competing forms of interpretation.

In sum, the history of the paradigm shifts of Japanese primatology shows some interesting points. Particularly, the development and formation of the Kyoto approach were significantly influenced by trends of Western anthropology. When the traditional approach came to a dead end, Itani borrowed an idea from Lévi-Strauss’s structuralism to further try to improve it. On the other hand, when sociobiology was introduced to Japan, a majority of Japanese primatologists were attracted by the systematic explanation. Here, it seems clear that their objection was to the Kyoto approach and its scientific reliability. As Sugawara (2003a) points out, the
key point lies between the notion of anthropomorphism and the formulation of a systematic theory. In other words, observers are not entirely free from anthropomorphism because humankind has to depend on language to describe non-human primate social behaviour (Enomoto: 2001; Sugawara: 2002a). Nevertheless, this is a part of their history. In the next chapter, I will describe current academic organisations of Kyoto anthropology, which has a diversity of research interests, approaches, and publications. In chapter four, I will introduce one of the most important works of current Kyoto anthropology which tries to go beyond Eastern and Western academic traditions, specifically Sugawara’s (2002a) phenomenological approach.
CHAPTER THREE: ACADEMIC ORGANISATIONS OF CURRENT KYOTO ANTHROPOLOGY

The organisations, which are contributing to the development of the Kyoto school of anthropology today, are at least as follows: (1) Primate Research Institute (PRI), which consists of four departments (i.e. Evolution and Phylogeny, Ecology and Social Behaviour, Behavioural and Brain Sciences, and Cellular and Molecular Biology); (2) Human Evolution Studies and Natural Anthropology which are a part of the Department of Zoology of Kyoto University (these laboratories have been developed by Kyoto primatologists, especially Reizo Harako, Toshisada Nishida and Juichi Yamagiwa); (3) the Department of Anthropology, which is a part of the Faculty of Integrated Human Studies (currently, Kazuyoshi Sugawara is a member of this faculty); and finally, (4) the Graduate School of Asian and African Area Studies (AAAS) where a number of Itani’s students, such as Mitsuo Ichikawa and Itaru Ohta, are studying ecological anthropology. Some other leading scholars of the Kyoto school of anthropology diffuse to several different universities in Japan. For example, Koji Kitamura currently belongs to the Faculty of Letters at the University of Okayama. On the other hand, Masaki Nishida belongs to the Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Tsukuba.

Under these large organisations, there are several research groups. Particularly Ningensei no kigen to shinka kenkyuu-kai (‘The Origin and
Evolution of Humanity’) was established by Itani and his followers in order to develop the inter-disciplinary approach between the sciences and the humanities to understand more about the evolution of human society. Behind this, there was a strong concern among the members that there is a growing discrepancy between these two academic fields because of restrictive professionalisation (Nishida et al 2003: ii).

On the other hand, the Communication no shizenshi kenkyuu-kai (‘Natural History of Communication’), which was developed by Yutaka Tani, concentrates on social interaction. This research group is inter-disciplinary which consists of scholars from a variety of backgrounds, such as linguistics, sociology, ethology, and ethics. Using discourse data as primary resource, members of this research group have been trying to uncover a process of micro social interactions which are significant in the human recognition. Finally, Interaction kenkyuu-kai (‘The Interaction Research Group’), which was developed by Daiji Kimura, also focuses on social interaction. This group has studied ethnographic approaches to conversation analysis, especially using Michael Moerman’s (1988) Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis and Kazuyoshi Sugawara’s (1998) Kaiwa no junruigaku (‘Anthropology of Conversation’). It seems that these research groups play a temporary role for the collaborative project, and new research groups will be continuously organised according to their needs and interests.
It is generally known that the Japanese academic structure is hierarchal. However, the societies of Japanese primatology as well as ecological anthropology seem to be more egalitarian. Itani (1995: iv) emphasises that members of these academic societies have tried to avoid creating a hierarchal relationship. Instead, they tried to develop an egalitarian society, respecting the spirit of fieldwork. Especially in the Kyoto tradition, this aspect is remarkable. In my personal experience, scholars of the Kyoto school preferably use a name suffix title, -san, which is similar to Mr. or Mrs., rather than -sensei, which is similar to Professor or Teacher. However, under the influence of social change, it would be prejudiced to assume that every Japanese academic society preserves a hierarchal relationship (Ota: 1998).

In 2003, *The Origin and Evolution of Humanity* (Nishida et al: 2003) was published by the members of this research group. This publication covers topics which look at the connection between pre-human and humankind, such as the evolution of the human family, human society, emotion, and the origin of instrumentality (see details in chapter six). The contributors of the publication are the following: Koji Kitamura, Kazuyoshi Sugawara, Masaki Nishida, Masato Nakatsukasa, Takeshi Furuichi, Chie Hashimoto, Juichi Yamagiwa, Kaoru Adachi, Noriko Ito, Michio Nakamura, and Daiji Kimura. All of these members are originally from the Kyoto school. In fact, most of their backgrounds are in primatology. Among them, those who apparently have changed academic direction to anthropology are Koji
Kitamura and Kazuyoshi Sugawara. However, it is not necessary to emphasise this too much since ‘anthropology’ for them means a discipline which not only seeks to study humankind, but also includes primatology. For example, several Kyoto scholars prefer to use the term ‘anthropology’ instead of using cultural anthropology or social anthropology because it is more encompassing.

To date, members of the Kyoto school of anthropology have published a number of books which are concerned with the connection between pre-human and humankind: *Shizen shakai no jinruigaku* (‘Anthropology of Natural Societies’) in 1986, edited by Jun’ichiro Itani and Jiro Tanaka; *Zoku shizen shakai no jinruigaku: henbou suru Africa* (‘Anthropology of Natural Societies vol. 2: Africa under Social Change’) in 1996, edited by Mitsuo Ichikawa, Makoto Kakeya, Itaru Ohta, and Jiro Tanaka; *Ningensei no kigen wo motomete* (‘Pursuing the origin of humanity’) in 2001, edited by Tetsuro Matsuzawa and Juichi Hasegawa; *Hominisation* in 2001, edited by Toshisada Nishida; and so forth. In particular, *Shizen-shakai no jinruigaku* (‘Anthropology of Natural Societies’) is the first publication which consists of primatology and ecological anthropology. The contents are: Ecology and social organisations of chimpanzees (Yukio Takahata), Grouping and social interaction of Pygmy chimpanzees (Kouji Kitamura), Lifestyle and material culture of Mbuti Pygmy (Tadashi Tanno), Everyday social behaviour and group structure of the San hunter-gatherers (Kazuyoshi Sugawara), Pastoral life of Rendille (Shun Sato), Reciprocity
of Turkana (Itaru Ohta), Life ecology of Tungue agriculturalists (Makoto Kakeya), Barter trades between agriculturalists and fishermen of Songola (Yuji Ankei), Plasticity of African hunter-gatherers (Mitsuo Ichikawa), A process of social change involving aggregation and settlement: a case study on the San hunter-gatherers (Jiro Tanaka), and The origin of human equality (Jun'ichiro Itani).

Nomura; *Communication no shizenshi* (‘Natural history of communication’) in 1997, edited by Yutaka Tani; and so forth.

In sum, these examples clearly show that the organisation of current Kyoto anthropology is complex and dynamic. There is a diversity of interests in the school which covers a variety of topics, including primatology, evolution, ecological anthropology, and social interaction. Moreover, not all Kyoto anthropologists share one particular approach, but various (see details in chapter six). It seems that they accept a variety of approaches within the Kyoto school, respecting its multiplicity.

In the next chapter, I will show one of recent trends of the Kyoto school of anthropology, namely Sugawara’s (2002a) phenomenological approach. His study is unique that the main analytic framework directly comes from the French thinker, Maurice Merleau-Ponty. On the other hand, it shows a strong influence of the academic tradition of the Kyoto school, particularly, Imanishi’s notion of *shu-shakai* and Itani’s emphasis on the first hand experience. Sugawara (2002a) focuses on various social interactions, including conversation analysis, to extract the most fundamental mechanism of the human society which sustains the coexistence between individuals. In particular, emotion as a key word, he tried to solve the question of anthropomorphism from its relationship to the experience of embodiment.
CHAPTER FOUR: TOWARDS THE NEO-KYOTO SCHOOL - SUGAWARA’S PHENOMENOLOGICAL APPROACH

The publication of the Kanjou no en=jin (‘Emotional Ape=Man’) is Sugawara’s (2002a) masterpiece in which he phenomenologically tries to describe and understand non-human primate as well as humankind social acts through emotion. The main purpose of this publication is to suggest a possible direction to refute the Western paradigms, especially, the Neo-Darwinian paradigm. On the other hand, Sugawara had a clear intention to criticise Kyoto primatologists as well as ecological anthropologists for not developing any philosophical idea or theory to counteract Western traditions (K. Sugawara; personal communication).

This chapter focuses on Sugawara’s phenomenological approach. First, I will show Sugawara’s academic background. Second, paying attention to Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology, I will describe Sugawara’s concept of emotion. Thirdly, I will examine Sugawara’s phenomenological study on hybrid baboons and the San hunter-gatherers of Botswana. Finally, I will discuss Sugawara’s contributions and criticise his phenomenological study.

4.1. Sugawara’s academic background

Kazuyoshi Sugawara is not an ecological anthropologist nor an Itani school anthropologist, but rather a phenomenological anthropologist (K.
Sugawara; personal communication). His main research topic is social interaction, especially the structure and mechanism of face-to-face interaction. He entered the Kyoto University in 1969 where he gained his first degree in the Faculty of Science (zoology). In 1973, he entered to the Graduate School of Science of the Kyoto University, studying primatology at the Primate Research Institute. In his early academic career, he studied Japanese monkeys (*Macaca fuscata*) in Kohshima from 1974 to 1977, and hybrid baboons in Ethiopia from 1975 to 1976. In 1981, he obtained a Doctor’s degree on the social interaction between hybrid baboons. His main publications in primatology are: ‘Sociological study of a wild group of hybrid baboons between *Papio anubis* and *P. hamadryas* in the Awash Valley, Ethiopia’ in 1979; ‘Social comparison between two wild groups of *anubis-hamadryas* hybrid baboons’ in 1982; and ‘Ethological study of the social behaviour between *Papio anubis* and *P. hamadryas* in free-ranging groups’ in 1988.

Since 1982, Sugawara has been studying the San hunter-gatherers who live in the central Kalahari of Botswana. His interests include various topics in face-to-face interaction such as proxemic behaviour (e.g. grooming) and greetings, and the anthropological study of communication (e.g. conversation and gesture). He has published a number of articles and books on the topic: ‘Spatial proximity and bodily contact among the central Kalahari San’ in 1984; ‘Social relations and interactions between residential groups among the central Kalahari san: hunter-gatherer camp as
a micro territory' in 1988; 'Interactional aspects of the Body in co-presence: observations on the central Kalahari San' in 1990; 'Anthropology of the Body' in 1993; 'Ethnography of the Speaking Body' in 1998; 'Anthropology of Conversation' in 1998, and so forth. Moreover, Sugawara has studied narrative, cognition and ethnozoology, and food avoidance and religion among the San hunter-gatherers. Presently, he is studying the process of the tradition of bodily techniques of Dengaku (Japanese public entertainments).

4.2. Sugawara's analytical framework

The most influential theory on Sugawara's (2002a) analytical framework is Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology. Sugawara does not agree with current major paradigms of anthropology, namely biological determinism and cultural determinism, because of their prejudice for objective thoughts. Sugawara argues that both perspectives make a significant error in understanding human perception and action, and they do not suggest sufficient understanding of humankind. First, sociobiology sees every living thing as a mechanical thing which tries to achieve the maximisation of its individual/inclusive fitness. From this perspective, the social behaviour of individuals is controlled by an innate programme which calculates the costs and benefits of the individual. However, Sugawara

---

5 Theoretical frameworks which have given significant influence on Sugawara's approach are various, including Erving Goffman's sociology and Michael Moerman's ethnographic approach to conversation.
(2003b) claims that we can believe that our free mind is not entirely dependent on this innate program. On the other hand, the cultural perspective, which 'privileges the mind/sunject/culture set in the form of representation' (Csordas 1994: 9), misdescribes culture because social/cultural anthropologists cannot escape from their own intellectualism. For Sugawara, current social/cultural anthropology is characterised by 'academic competition over the sophistication of interpretations' (Sugawara 2004a: 4). Alternatively, Sugawara tries to create a way of understanding, which is not based on the authoritative scientific explanation (i.e. 'pensée du survol' (Merleau-Ponty: 1962)), but the internal way of understanding, which is constructed through everyday experience. Specifically, the 'human organism is primarily an active living body, and should not be taken as a passive spatially extended machine' (Moran & Mooney 2002: 423). The world, which humankind perceives, is essentially through the world of everyday experience as 'the lived-through world' (Merleau-Ponty: 1962). Sugawara's primary concern is that to grasp the meaning of emotion is one of the core mechanisms of the human society which sustain the co-presence between individuals, because 'emotion is the most fundamental motivation that is revealed as the expressive gesture in the face of the other' (Sugawara 2002b: 24). Let us now look at the details of Sugawara's concept of emotion.
4.3. Sugawara’s concept of emotion

Sugawara defines the concept of emotion as:

Emotion is equivalent to the expressive gesture embedded in an act-space, in which the possibility for interpreting any behaviour as a significant act, as well as that for responding to such an act is restricted (Sugawara 2002b: 24).

The central concerns of Sugawara’s theory of emotion are: first, ‘something which can be termed as emotion is the core of the internal sense’ (ibid: 2); secondly, ‘to comprehend the internal sense of expressive gestures that reveal the trinity of meaning, sensation, and orientation’ (ibid: 24); and finally ‘there is always a strong possibility that the attempt to understand the internal sense is connected to the external explanation’ (ibid: 2; my translation).

Sugawara’s approach is in sharp contrast to the approach of Csordas (1994) and his followers who focus on ‘pain’ as the experience of embodiment (Sugawara 2003b: 5). Moreover, unlike Csordas, who advocates ‘cultural phenomenology’, for Sugawara, ‘the social with which we are in contact by the mere fact of existing’ (Merleau-Ponty 1962: 362) is principally based on the ‘primatological body’. More specifically, Sugawara (2002a: 97)

---

6 This means any systematic theory, such as the Neo-Darwinian explanation.
defines the most fundamental types of primate facial expressions as 'menace' and 'grimace'. He states that the primatological body of the gregarious primates, including humankind, has a priori ability to express these two types of facial expressions. As for humankind, even if non-human primate social behaviour is unclear, we can still understand their subtle expressions because we have a priori ability to understand the trinity of meaning, sensation, and orientation through our embodied experience. For example, the social act of greeting for humankind is interactional courtesy through which we ease the tension between us. In a similar way, according to Sugawara, we can understand the social act of grooming between Japanese monkeys as 'friendship' or 'pleasure', and that of biting as 'hostility'. Behind this, there is a limitation of the human perception that humankind is not entirely free from anthropomorphism because we have to depend on language to describe a particular social act of non-human species (Enomoto: 2001; Sugawara: 2002a). Thus, facial expressions of behaviour and general attitudes of an existence are one structure, and by describing this event from the observer's embodied mind, we can internally comprehend the meaning of the social action of existence.
4.4. Sugawara’s phenomenological study on hybrid baboons and San hunter-gatherers.

This section explores Sugawara’s phenomenological studies on hybrid baboons (Papio anubis and P. hamadryas) of Ethiopia and San hunter-gatherers of Botswana. In these two studies, Sugawara tries to solve the question of what does it mean to possess another person. In his study of hybrid baboons, he focuses on various ‘movable forms’ (Merleau-Ponty: 1962) of behaviour to show that the society of hybrid baboons provides us the prototype of human field of experience, which is known as jealousy. On the other hand, Sugawara makes use of the G/wi everyday conversation, historical narratives and morphemes to describe a process of how the G/wi men and women overcome the emotional conflicts in their marital relationship.

4.4.1. Hybrid baboons (Papio anubis and P. Hamadryas) in Ethiopia

In the late 1970s, Sugawara investigated the male-female and male-male social interactions of hybrid baboons between Papio anubis and P. hamadryas in the Awash Valley, Ethiopia. Although the Swiss primatologist, Hans Kummer, had studied the social structure of hamadryas baboons in the late 1960s, that of hybrid baboons had not been investigated.

---

7 Sugawara’s (2002a) targets of the phenomenological description are various, including Japanese monkeys, hybrid baboons, vervet monkeys, chimpanzees, the San hunter-gatherers, and autistic people.
According to Sugawara (1979), *Papio anubis* are *anubis*-based baboons with a mixture of *hamadryas* genes, while *P. hamadryas* are *hamadryas* based baboons with a mixture of *anubis* genes. Their social structures as well as social behaviours are similar to their original kind, namely *anubis* baboons and *hamadryas* baboons respectively.

According to Sugawara (ibid: 21), the social structures of *hamadryas* baboons and *anubis* baboons are significantly different. The social unit of the former is a band which consists of several one-male units each of which has a stable membership. Moreover, each male possesses several females in a unit. By contrast, the social unit of *anubis* baboons is a group of 30 to 150 individuals, consisting of males, females, and their offspring. The well known social act of male *hamadryas* baboons is known as the ‘herding technique’, which was reported by Kummer. According to Kummer (1995; cited in Sugawara 2002b: 9), the ‘herding technique’ is genetically programmed in male baboons. When the possessed female goes away from the male possessor, he bites the female’s neck. On the other hand, Kummer indicates that female baboons learn to be possessed by males through their continuous attacks (1995; cited in Sugawara 2002b: 9).

Sugawara’s (1988) study shows that the number of possessed females among hybrid baboons is correlated to the morphological feature of *hamadryas* baboons. The more a male is genetically related to *hamadryas* baboons, the greater the number of females he has. Moreover, the
frequency of male attacks to females is correlated to this feature. On the other hand, Sugawara finds various ‘amovable forms’ of behaviour (Merleau-Ponty: 1962). First, there are some cases in which a male *Papio anubis* (genetically, the socially inferior species) had a continuous relationship with a female. Secondly, although most of the social acts of male hybrid baboons are correlated with genetics, the rate of the social act of appeasing between males does not correlate with the genetic explanation. That is, the rate of the appeasing is greater in *P. hamadryas* baboons, while it is smaller in *Papio anubis*. Moreover, the rate of appeasing does not change according to the genetic feature of hamadryas in each of these groups.

Given the evidence, Sugawara tries to comprehend these ambiguous social acts from his embodied mind. Specifically, he pays attention to the ‘notifying behaviour’ (Kummer 1968; cited in Sugawara: 2002b) among male hamadryas baboons. This behaviour is that the possessor of the female approaches the rival, turns in front of him, and returns back. Kummer assumed that the function of this behaviour is to show the direction of movement. Hamadryas baboons make a male unit, and the male who turns in front of the other, tells the other which direction to move. However, Sugawara (1988) finds that after this behaviour, the possessor frequently comes back to stay close to his female. Interestingly, he finds that this behaviour happens in male *Papio anubis* as well. Similarly, Abegglen (1984; cited in Sugawara 2002b: 64) finds that the notifying
behaviour is produced by a male who owns several females, and it is directed towards a rival who always tries to capture his females. Given this, Sugawara (2003b: 44) argues that 'the meaning of the 'notifying behaviour' is to show the rival one's possessed females in order to restrain his further actions (i.e. capturing females)'. In other words, entering into the structure of face-to-face interaction, where frequent struggles of capturing and recapturing females happen, the male baboons inevitably pay great attention to their rivals (Sugawara 2002a: 60). Thus, the form of their living world is continuous to the human field of experience, in particular, the emotion of jealousy.

4.4.2. Sexual relationships among the G/wi

In contrast to hybrid baboons, the G/wi society provides an interesting case in which men and women have to accept the possibility of encroachments in their marital relationship. According to Sugawara (2002a), there are two types of sexual relationship among the G/wi, namely a marital relationship, sie-ku, and an extramarital relationship, zaa-ku. This means that G/wi married couples have the chance to have a zaa-ku relationship according to their own choice. Sugawara shows that the remarkable aspect of the zaa-ku relationship is characterised by the following feature. The positive aspect is the so-called 'ideal' relationship in which married couples practise mate-swapping and have an economic mutualism for the long term. By contrast, the negative aspect is the triadic relationship which creates
emotional conflicts between the husband and the wife. Sugawara states that the G/wi associate the zaa-ku relationship with dirt, and they believe that this produces a disease among the people who are closely related to the couple. Nevertheless, the G/wi consider the zaa-ku relationship positively without imposing any punishment, and it frequently happens in this society.

The main feature of the G/wi marital relationship is the contradiction that men and women have to accept the possibility of encroachments (Sugawara: 2002a). Narratives of a G/wi man, whose wife not only had the zaa-ku relationship with another man, but also had his children, shows his arbitrary attitude. While he seriously had suffered from the emotional conflicts, he showed his generous attitude toward the children. One said, 'I will not kill the child. It is a shame' (ibid: 246), and some said, 'I felt the pain, but I didn’t feel it’ (ibid: 246). Sugawara indicates that, when a husband knows that his wife has given birth to another man’s child, he suffers from jealousy and gives a name to the child which is associated with his emotional conflicts (see details in Sugawara: 1997). Nevertheless, the husband accepts the child and raises him as if he were his own child. Another episode provided by Sugawara (ibid: 259-262), of two G/wi men, who suffered with the zaa-ku relationship, shows a process through which they achieved acceptance of a quadruple relationship. Drawing attention to the fact that the activity which they engaged with was springhare hunting, which requires two men in order to hunt more accurately and efficiently, Sugawara argues that their collaborative labour work, namely
accumulations of their bodily co-presence, made it possible for them to overcome the emotional conflicts. He concludes that 'this dialectic of emotional life was negotiated and renewed over the course of continuing face-to-face interaction... This continuity, which motivates the G/wi to determine their intention and practice, is the life of their embodied thought’ (Sugawara 2002a: 259; my translation).

4.5. Summary of this chapter

The above two studies show Sugawara’s challenge to improve and make more theoretically sophisticated the academic tradition of the Kyoto school. The core of Sugawara’s view is rooted in the legacy of Kyoto primatology, namely Imanishi’s notion of shu-shakai and his emphasis on the first hand experience. Emotion as a key word, Sugawara sees the continuity between non-human primates and humankind through facial expressions. When an observer comprehends the social acts of others through his embodied experience, the internal meaning of emotion is continuous between non-human primates and humankind. After reading Nishida’s (1981; cited in Sugawara 2002a: 162) description of a struggle for power among chimpanzees in which the leader, who was betrayed by the second-ranked male, makes a bed in darkness, Sugawara states as follows:

I could easily understand the leader’s exhausted feelings and anxious sighs. This is not because his mind or emotion is the same as humankind, but
because the form of his effort to live in the act space is similar to ours. My embodied mind automatically understands the continuity of such a deeply suffered life (Sugawara 2002a: 163; my translation).

Here, Sugawara points out that even if the social behaviour of bed making would be a product of an instinct of the chimpanzee, this social act itself cannot be segmented from the form of his lived experience. For Sugawara, to comprehend 'emotional life' means to situate the existence within a continuity of embodied experience, emphasising that such meaning can be reduced to neither genetics nor culture.

Sugawara's phenomenological study also shows his attempt to overcome the discrepancy between the Western and the Eastern academic traditions. Even for sociobiology, Sugawara suggests some possibilities to accept it to some extent, because its findings could give us some new ideas. For example, in his study of hybrid baboons, Sugawara (1988) not only finds a number of similarities with the genetic explanation, but also he finds counter examples against the external perspective. Observing phenomena on the basis of the external perspective, he could find new possibilities of understanding various 'amovable forms' of behaviour (Merleau-Ponty: 1962). This clearly shows that the Kyoto approach is not mere a product of traditional Japanese primatology, but becoming more integrated with studies in the West.
On the other hand, Sugawara’s phenomenological study suggests some questions. First, Sugawara’s main target of criticism, namely Western nature/culture dualism, is somewhat simple. He blames sociobiology for its view of all living forms as mechanical things. However, not all Western perspectives still preserve human/animal dualism. One example is the Animal Rights movement which sees animals not as human property, but as ‘persons’. Moreover, the limitations of the sociobiological explanation has been recognised widely in the world. Instead, there are some other alternative approaches, such as the structural approach to the evolution (e.g. Webster & Goodwin: 1982). On the other hand, Roderick Duncan Mckenzie (1924), a scholar of the Chicago school of sociology, adapted the ecological approach to the human community. His attempt was a scientific experiment to see human as nature, trying to analyse a process how they adapt to a particular social environment. More recently, Catton and Dunlap (1978) further developed the early approach of the Chicago school to deconstruct Durkheimian paradigm of human exemptionalism. Their approach is inter-disciplinary which includes physical and biological perspectives to study the human community. Secondly, Sugawara’s concept of expressive gesture is insufficient as if it makes unclear a variety of micro-interactions which are deeply rooted in human recognition. For example, a single word choice among bilingual speakers significantly affects the entire talk organisations (Gafaranga: 1999). Finally, Sugawara’s phenomenological description seems to be more inclined to the male-centered view. Especially, his view of sexuality on non-human
primates as well as humankind is obvious. Kawai (1976: 292-293) shows an interesting observation that ‘anthropomorphism’ is different according to gender. More specifically, while Japanese primatologists in the 1960s succeeded to clarify social behaviour of male Japanese monkeys, that of females was not satisfactory. However, once female primatologists appeared, they showed that it was easier for them to understand social behaviour of female monkeys than that of male. Thus, there is a room to examine Sugawara’s phenomenological description from a gender perspective. This direction of study would further shed light on the limitation of the human cognition.

In the next chapter, let us examine how the Kyoto primatological approach is evident in Japanese ecological anthropology. First, I will show the origin of the formation of Japanese ecological anthropology. In particular, I will show the differences between the Kyoto school and the Tokyo school. Secondly, I will go back to the time of Imanishi to chronologically explain the history, approach and objectives of Kyoto ecological anthropology. Thirdly, I will focus on Japanese studies on San hunter-gatherers, and the details of Tanaka’s (1971) study will be given. Finally, I will discuss dissimilarities of approaches between Japanese and the West, focusing on Tanaka (1971) vs. Silberbauer (1981), and the Japanese perspective vs. the revisionist perspective.
CHAPTER FIVE: HISTORY, APPROACH, AND OBJECTIVES OF KYOTO ECOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

5.1. Kyoto school vs. Tokyo school

The origin of Japanese ecological anthropology has its roots in two schools, the Kyoto school and the Tokyo school (Akimichi et al. 1995). The Kyoto school was developed under the influence of primatology. With Kinji Imanishi and Jun’ichiro Itani as leaders, it has been pursuing the evolution of human society, focusing on African hunter-gatherers, pastoralists, and shifting or ‘slash-and-burn’ cultivators (see details in chapter two). By contrast, according to Akimichi et al. (ibid: 11), the approach of the Tokyo school is focused on biology (e.g. environment, nutrition, and health), especially in North America, Oceania and Southeast Asia. The scholar who created the mainstream studies of the Tokyo school was Hitoshi Watanabe (1919-1998). In the mid 1960s, he studied social, material, and epistemological aspects of the Ainu people who live in the north part of Japan, focusing on the systematic relationships between the people and their environment. Recently, the Tokyo school has concentrated on ecological aspects and social change of agriculturalists and fishermen in Oceania and Southeast Asia (ibid: 15). In fact, several researchers have moved between the two schools, creating a complementary relationship (ibid: 14). For example, Reizo Harako, who has researched Mbuti Pygmies, studied anthropology at the Tokyo University and later he joined the Kyoto
University. Jiro Tanaka, a Kyoto ecological anthropologist, obtained his first degree in primatology at the Kyoto University. On the other hand, he studied anthropology at the graduate school of the Tokyo University.

5.2. History of Kyoto ecological anthropology

The origin of Kyoto ecological anthropology goes back to the ecological study of Pohnpeis in 1941, which was conducted by the members of the Kyoto school, especially Imanishi, Kira, Umesao, and Kawakita. Previously, Imanishi had planned several expeditions, particularly to Iran and New Guinea. However, these expeditions were cancelled because of the Second World War. In 1944, in order to establish the West North Research Center, Imanishi, Umesao, Nakao and several other scholars from various disciplines such as zoology, ethnology, botany, history, sociology, linguistics, and psychology, were sent to Mongolia (Matsubara 2002: 18). Although this research center was closed during the period of the defeat of Japan in 1945, the results of their research were published. For instance, Imanishi wrote some books on the lifestyle of Mongolian pastoralists, and Umesao wrote several articles, such as the ecological study of the people within a dairy-based economy.

The Kyoto expedition into Africa, investigating African great apes and hunter-gatherers, began in 1958 (see details in section 2.2.). Specifically, in 1963, the Kyoto anthropology group focused on: the Hadzapi East African
hunter-gatherers were studied by Hirozou Tomita, pastoralists of East Tanzania, Datoga by Morimichi Tomikawa and Tadao Umesao, agricultural pastoralists of Iraq by Toshinao Yoneyama, Shohei Wada, and Katsuyoshi Fukui (Ohta 2004: 273). Since then, Kyoto ecological anthropologists have focused on four main areas to elucidate the evolution of human society: (1) the San hunter-gatherers, who live in the dry land of the Kalahari Desert; (2) Mbuti Pygmies, who live in the tropical rain forest; (3) the ‘slash-and-burn’ cultivators, who live in Savannah; and (4) nomadic pastoralists, such as Turkana and Rendile, who live in the dry land of Kenya.

Since 1966 when Jiro Tanaka first began, continuing studies on the San hunter-gatherers have been conducted by a number of Kyoto scholars (see details in section 5.4.). On the other hand, studies on Mbuti Pygmies started in 1972 by Itani and Harako. Especially, Harako focused on the central part of the Ituri forest, studying the net hunters and archers. In 1973, Tadashi Tanno took over his research to further study the net hunters. After Tanno, Mitsuo Ichikawa took over the research in the Ituri Forest. Since 1978, they expanded their research into the Efe Pygmies who live in the north of the Ituri Forest. With Hideaki Terashima and Masao Sawada as leaders, the Kyoto scholars have been studying the relationships between Efe and agricultural people, contemporary social change, ethnobotany and social organisations, and performances such as dance and songs (see details in the English article of Ichikawa [2004]).
As for the pastoralist studies, a number of Kyoto ecological anthropologists have been studying various topics, including ecology, economy, and religion, on the East African pastoralists since the early 1970s. In 1973, Fukui began his research on the Bodi of South-western Ethiopia. Tanaka was subsidised by the Wenner-Gren foundation and the Little World Museum in 1975, and he invited Shun Sato to Kenya to study Rendile (Tanaka 2004: iii). In 1976, Itani and Ichikawa came to stay at the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Nairobi Research Station. Ichikawa began to study the Ndorobo hunter-gatherers of Kenya. In 1978, they received a subsidy from the Ministry of Education, Japan, and they organised the North Kenyan Expedition (ibid). Since then, they have been studying a number of pastoralist groups in Eastern Africa: Turkana by Jun'ichiro Itani and Itaru Ohta in 1978; Pokot by Jiro Tanaka and Tadashi Tanno in 1978; Gabra by Reizo Harako and Ichirou Imai in 1980; Pokot by Kazuaki Kurita in 1980; Samburu by Kazuhiro Kano in 1982; Turkana by Koji Kitamura in 1986; Chams by Kaori Kawai in 1986; Gabra by Toru Soga in 1990; and Gari and Samburu by Shinya Konaka in 1990 (Ohta 2004: 273-274).

5.3. The approach and objectives of Kyoto ecological anthropology

The traditions of the Kyoto school of ecological anthropology were established by non-professional anthropologists, such as ecologists,
geologists, or agriculturists (Akimichi et al 1995: 7). The trend was that anthropological research is not only for the professionals, but for anyone who finds an interest in the topic. Ichikawa (2004: 107) emphasises that 'we were trying to enjoy anthropology as a young and “soft” science'.

This Japanese approach in ecological anthropology is characterised by the following features. First, Japanese ecological anthropologists pay greater attention to the direct observation of behaviour than Western theories. This particular view is a legacy of Japanese primatology, namely its view to see humankind in the same way as non-human primates (see section 2.1.). In the first chapter of the Nomad, Sugawara states as follows:

The current trend of social/cultural anthropology is characterised by academic competition over the sophistication of interpretations which disregards the importance of empirical studies of the organisation of human society. Our consistent efforts of research have been supported by our spirit, which is to describe all aspects of living people as they are. We believe that this simple and honest spirit can contribute to revitalise anthropology, which is the only discipline to show the diversity and greatness of the nature of human life (Sugawara 2004a: 4; my translation).

Secondly, Japanese ecological anthropologists adopted an inter-disciplinary approach to study humankind from a variety of perspectives. Consider Ichikawa’s statement below:
This organisation (African Area Studies of the Kyoto University) consists of people from a variety of backgrounds, and we respect this multiplicity. It is necessary not only to have collaboration with people from a variety of backgrounds, but also to go beyond one’s academic field. In other words, we need to develop a trans-disciplinary approach in order to understand areas which are the junction of nature, culture and history (Ichikawa 2005; my translation).

There are at least two main objectives of Kyoto ecological anthropology: (1) to elucidate the evolution of human society; (2) to study the totality of people who heavily depend their life ecology on natural environments. Ichikawa (2004: 106) points out that ‘the behaviour patterns and societies of early human beings have not been left behind in the form of fossils. In order to understand them, we need to gain some clues from the life of existing hunter-gatherers as well as from the contemporary primates proximate to humankind’. For these reasons, the early Kyoto ecological anthropologists focused on hunter-gatherers of Eastern and Southern Africa, namely the San, Mbuti Pygmies, and Hadza in order to elucidate the evolution of human society. On the other hand, they also focused on pure ecological anthropology, especially the ecological and technological aspects of human-nature relationships: inter-relationships between natural environments and economic activity, social changes, material culture, ethnobotany, and ethnozoology. In the 1980s, ethological studies became
the trend in the Kyoto school, which were mainly conducted by scholars whose background was in primatology (Akimichi et al. 1995). This approach is called ‘internationalism’ or ‘the international school’ and was developed under Itani’s influence (Sugawara 2003b: 58). In particular, Kazuyoshi Sugawara, Koji Kitamura, Masato Sawada and Daiji Kimura are the main figures. These scholars focused on social interactions of the San hunter-gatherers, Turkana pastoralists, and Bongando agriculturalists, especially on their proxemic behaviour (e.g. grooming), greetings; communication (e.g. conversation and gesture), and songs to study a variety of micro-interactions which are significant in the human cognition.

In sum, these examples clearly show that there is a diversity of interests and approaches within Japanese ecological anthropology. Specifically, Ichikawa points out: ‘we wanted to try something new on the basis of first-hand data that we had gathered in the field’ (ibid: 107). Now let us examine the details of Japanese studies on the San hunter-gatherers.

5.4. Japanese Studies on San hunter-gatherers

According to Sugawara (2004b: 115), the Japanese approach in the central Kalahari is characterised by three main features: (1) ‘a positivistic methodology based on direct observation of behaviour (including speech acts)’; (2) ‘an interest in the relationship between people and their natural environment’; and (3) ‘the pursuit of a synthetic theory of the evolution of
human society'. In this section, I shall examine how these features are evident in Japanese studies on the San hunter-gatherers. First, I will begin with the history of Japanese studies on the San hunter-gatherers. Secondly, I will focus on Tanaka’s (1971) ecological studies on the people and compare this with Silberbauer’s (1981) perspective. Finally, I will look at the different interpretations of the history of the San hunter-gatherers between Nishida (2004) and Wilmsen (1989).

5.4.1. History of Japanese studies on San hunter-gatherers

Japanese studies on the San hunter-gatherers (i.e. G/wi and G//ana) have a forty-year tradition, which has been continuing since Jiro Tanaka first started investigations in 1966. Tanaka’s study was the first challenge among Japanese scholars to clarify aspects of subsistence ecology and social organisation of the existing hunter-gatherers through fieldwork (Sugawara 2004a: 4). In 1966, Tanaka participated in the Kalahari expedition of the Hokkaido University, which was offered by Tomikawa who had just come back from his fieldwork among the Datoga, Tanzania. After conducting the group project for approximately three months, Tanaka individually went back to the central Kalahari to further continue his fieldwork. He had conducted three periods of fieldwork: the first one was for sixteen months between 1966 and 1968; the second one was between 1971 and 1972, as a participant of the ‘Harvard University Team’, which was organised by R.B. Lee and I. DeVore; and finally, he conducted the
third one in 1974 for only two months. The outcome of his early investigation was first published in 1971, of which the title is Bushman: seitaijinruigaku teki kenkyuu ('Bushmen: A Study in Ecological Anthropology'), and the English version was published in 1980, titled as The San Hunter-Gatherers of the Kalahari: A Study in Ecological Anthropology.

After seeing the rapid social change of the San in 1980, Tanaka recruited two young researchers, Osaki and Sugawara, to begin research on the social change of the San in 1982. It was their first collaborative-research project (Sugawara 2004a: 7-8). Behind this, Tanaka felt a sense of crisis that the traditional lifestyle of the San was seriously threatened by the Remote Area Development Program (RADP), which was conducted by the Government of Botswana in 1974. The purpose of the RADP was to treat the San as citizens of Botswana and to improve their education, health, and welfare. Under the leadership of the Ministry of Local Government, the RADP provided general assistance to people in remote areas, developing wells, schools, and medical centers. Moreover, it introduced agriculture, pasturage, stores and sales organization of folk crafts (Tanaka: 1986). The RADP enforced the authority over the San, accelerating change in their social system. In particular, the San settlement and involvement with the monetary system had critically damaged their ecological equilibrium as well as their grounding in an autonomous social system (ibid). According to Tanaka, the new monetary system contributed to the development of
alcoholism among the San. The rate of violence and theft, which are considered as the worst things among them, increased and these factors accelerated the decline of social morality. Tanaka indicates that the price of the RADP, which denied the entire ecological life of the San, was incalculable.

Since 1982, the research members of Japanese Kalahari team have increased, including Hiroyuki Akiyama, Kazunobu Ikeya, Kaori Imamura, Junko Maruyama, Hiroshi Nakagawa, Kenichi Nonaka, Hitomi Ono, and Akira Takada. Barnard (1992: 101) states that the strength of recent Japanese fieldworkers is ‘their concentration on the minutiae of cultural details’. The topics which they have covered are various, including: the change of the hunting method and its influence on egalitarianism (Ikeya and Osaki); the gathering activities and the social behaviour (Imamura); the social change and livelihood (Tanaka and Maruyama); face-to-face interaction (Sugawara); linguistic anthropology and zoology (Nakagawa and Sugawara); and religion and sexual relationships (Imamura and Sugawara). (See more details in the English article of Sugawara [2004b].)

The recent publication, Nomad (Tanaka et al: 2004), shows their current studies on the San hunter-gatherers. Here I shall briefly describe them. Ikeya studies a history of socio-economic relationships between the San and the Kalahari agricultural-pastoralists to contribute to the Kalahari debate. Osaki focuses on a life history of John, who is a mixed parentage of
Naro Bushman (San) and British, to reconstruct the Naro history. Imamura makes use of G/wi narratives to study the dynamic organisation of the nomadic life of the G/wi. Sugawara describes the lost male ritual of the G/wi to examine a relationship between narratives and representation of the ritual. Nakagawa focuses on a particular type of linguistic activity of the G/wi to investigate the phonological structure of the poem. Ono demonstrates in detail that the G/wi kinship structure is classified in the fifth type which seems to be impossible in the world kinship system. Nonaka quantitatively describes a variety of everyday social behaviour among the G/wi and G//ana to investigate how their social life is organised through a process of social change. Akiyama describes the everyday social behaviour of the G/wi and G//ana children, such as the school life and games, in the sedentary community of Xade. Takada focuses on the G/wi and G//ana mother-infant social interaction, particularly gymnastics, to extract their socio/cultural characteristics in comparison with some other groups of the Southern African hunter-gatherers, such as the Ju/'hoansi or !Kung. Finally, Maruyama describes the everyday social practices among the G/wi and G//ana at the sedentary community of New Xade to look at their efforts to overcome adaptation to the new social environments.

In sum, the San studies, which were initiated by Western researchers in the 1950s, are now dominated by Japanese researchers. These studies show a diversity of academic backgrounds of the members of the Japanese Kalahari team, covering a number of topics from ecological anthropology
to linguistics. Another feature of their study is that most of the scholars make use of both qualitative and quantitative methods in order to study the totality of the San. As long as the political situation allows, Japanese researchers have a great advantage in continuing their studies of these people in the future. Now let us examine the nature of the Kyoto primatological approach in Tanaka’s (1971) ecological study on the San hunter-gatherers.

5.5. Tanaka’s study on San hunter-gatherers

In the beginning of *The San Hunter-Gatherers of the Kalahari*, Tanaka explicitly explains the aim of his first investigation on G/wi and G//ana as follows:

focusing on the hunting and gathering society of the San, which is still at the simplest structural level, to elucidate the original configuration of human society in order to discover the relationships between subhuman primate societies and human societies’ (Tanaka 1980: xi).

First, Tanaka focused on the relationships between the people and the natural environment, especially on their dietary life. Making this a central topic, he tried to describe the food-centered activities of the San, raising questions of ‘how they live’ and ‘how they manage to live’ (ibid: xii). He found that the environment of the central Kalahari provides a variety of
foods, including seventy-four kinds of vegetable foods and more than forty kinds of animal foods. The majority of G/wi and G//ana depended on vegetable foods and they gained ninety percent of their water supply from vegetables, especially melons and the roots of plants (ibid: 88). Tanaka also found that their working hours were less than what could be assumed, and the average of daily working hours per person was 4 hours and 39 minutes. As a result, Tanaka stressed the importance of their adaptation to the harsh environment and the connection between the natural environment and their dietary life.

Next, Tanaka looked at the group structure of the G/wi and G//ana. Given the fact that G/wi and G//ana did not have rank, status or social class structure, Tanaka pointed out that egalitarianism is a general principle for the society, in which every man and woman has an equal chance to participate in their social life (except for sex-linked tasks). For them, sharing and cooperation are key factors in order to maintain the principle of egalitarianism. He considered this type of social system as ‘generalized reciprocity’ (Sahlins: 1965; cited in Tanaka 1971: 98). Moreover, Tanaka stressed that G/wi and G//ana’s hunting and gathering life is fluid in essence, and they constantly shifted their campsites and they frequently changed the members of the groups. As a result, he rejected the concept of ‘band’ for G/wi and G//ana. Alternatively, he defined the basic-unit group of the San as a family, and he saw the agglomeration of families as ‘a functional unit in everyday life’ (Tanaka 1980: 95).
In the final chapter of *The San Hunter-Gatherers of the Kalahari*, Tanaka (1971: 135-44) examined the origin of human society, comparing the San with Eastern and Southern African hunter-gatherers, and chimpanzees. First, focusing on the San behavioural patterns of gaining water supply, Tanaka compared this with Ju/'hoansi, who were studied by Lee and Devore (1968). Tanaka argued that the environmental difference between the habitat of G/wi and G//ana and that of the Ju/'hoansi is crucial in determining their behavioural patterns as well as the amount of labour work. Secondly, considering that for the Hadza of East Africa and the Mbuti Pygmies of Zaire their mode of living largely depends on the gathering-based economy, Tanaka argued that hunting cannot be a primal mode of living for the ancient residents of Africa. Although he did not doubt that the role of hunting was important in the process of hominisation, he argued that the basic mode of living for pre-human societies was based on gathering activity. Tanaka stated that the habituation to hunting was due to 'the attractiveness of meat' (Tanaka 1980: 151). Finally, Tanaka compared the fluidity of the San with that of the chimpanzees. According to Itani (1966; 1967; cited in Tanaka 1971: 140), chimpanzees make a 'basic social unit' (Itani 1993: 148) which consists of a group of males and females, frequently changing their members. Itani and Suzuki (1965; cited in Tanaka 1971: 140-41) found that chimpanzees made an agglomeration of basic-unit groups whose structure was not random. Moreover, each basic social unit frequently aggregated and dispersed under the structure of the
large unit group. Given this, Tanaka argued that the social structure of chimpanzees is similar to that of the San, in respect of their loose social organization and the formation of fluid groupings. As a consequence, he supported Itani's hypothesis that the structure of family came after the formation of the band, which can be typically found in chimpanzee societies.

5.5.1. Tanaka vs. Silberbauer

Tanaka's (1980) study of the San hunter-gatherers was reviewed by George Silberbauer (1982), who had carried out ethnographic studies in Ghanzi and the central Kalahari region as a Protectorate administrative officer from 1958 to 1966. Silberbauer's review shows clear contrasts between the Japanese and Western perspectives, namely the direct observation of behaviour vs. Western theory (Barnard 1992: 102). As far as Silberbauer's review is concerned, his puzzled and disparaging attitude towards Tanaka is obvious. He states as follows:

My reaction on first reading it was dismay and disappointment. We contradict each other on almost every point which is considered to be significant in Western social anthropology and, indeed, on the very question of what is of importance (Silberbauer 1982: 803).
One of the main contradictions between Tanaka and Silberbauer is their findings on San social organisation. Silberbauer, who emphasised the band ideology, took a position that the social organisation of the G/wi and G//ana has discrete bands and defined band territories. Considering the first part of chapter four of the *Hunter & Habitat in the Central Kalahari Desert*, where he cites Murdock’s (1949) theory of the *Social Structure*, it is clear that Silberbauer was strongly influenced by Western theory. Consider his statement:

A G/wi band is a community (see Murdock, 1949: 79) occupying a defined territory and controlling the exploitation of the resources of that territory’ (Silberbauer 1981: 138).

By contrast, Tanaka, who paid more attention to the movement of individuals, stressed the highly fluid group formations of the G/wi and G//ana, which do not have territorial boundaries. In fact, according to Tanaka (2004: 42), the San hunter-gatherers make a cluster of families, which consists of strong parent-child, and brother-sister relationships. Moreover, the components of daily life are temporarily made up by a single family or several families throughout the process of group fusion. Thus, the concept of the band, which represents a corporate group which has a certain territory, cannot be applied (ibid: 42). As a result, Tanaka adopted a neutral term ‘camp’, rather than ‘band’ (see also Sugawara 2004b).
5.6. Traditionalist vs. revisionist perspectives

Studies on ecological anthropology have revealed that the so-called ‘simple’ societies achieve equality and freedom at a high level which cannot be seen in so-called ‘civilized’ societies. This discovery was sensational for anthropologists in terms of history and evolution. In particular, the revisionist debate of the San hunter-gatherers is well known. The traditionalists, R.B. Lee and Devore (1968), and Tanaka (1971), argued that the San hunter-gatherers historically have managed a self-sufficient life, and the core of their social life is based on egalitarianism. On the other hand, the so-called revisionists (Wilmsen, 1983, 1989; Wilmsen & Denbow, 1990) claimed that the traditional perspective lacks any focus on historical, political and economical aspects of the hunter-gatherers. According to Osaki (2001), this debate seems to settle down in the international conference on hunting and gathering societies which was held in 1999, where Lee accepted some aspects of revisionists’ view, especially the influence of Tswana politics and economics on the San.

However, the attempt to understand hunter-gatherer societies in comparison with Western societies breaks down because this perspective cannot escape from its own historical view (Nishida: 2004). In particular, Nishida argues that the revisionist perspective is based on the ethnocentric view that every
society in the world has been formed under the historical influence of civilisations. Consider Wilmsen’s statement below:

The current status of the San-speaking peoples on the local fringe of African economies can be accounted for only in terms of the social policies and economies of the colonial period and its aftermath. Their appearance of the foragers is a function of their relegations to an underclass in the playing out of historical processes that began before the current millennium and culminated in the early decades of this century. The isolation in which they are said to be found is a creation of our view of them, not of their history as they lived it. This is as true of their indigenous material systems as it is of their incorporation in wider spheres of political economy of Southern Africa (Wilmsen 1989: 3; emphasis added).

This single historical view shows particular power relationships, namely Western superiority over the other. Accordingly, this logic of hegemony only tells the historical/political/economical relationships between the two parties from the Western historical view (Nishida: 2004). Moreover, revisionists argued that egalitarianism of hunter-gatherers is a secondary property which emerged under the process of their adaptation to harsh environments. However, Nishida (2004: 64) claims that egalitarian social relationships are the primal human property, stating that ‘behind the revisionist perspective, there is a historical myth that the modern Europe achieved the spirit of freedom’. By contrast, the Kyoto approach tries to
explain egalitarianism from the perspective of evolution, considering evidence found in non-human primate societies.

5.7. The origin of human equality

Itani (1986) claimed that ‘the most important task for anthropology was to understand the phylogenetic grounds of human equality in the context of the social evolution of non-human primates’ (Sugawara 2004b: 126). Itani tried to demonstrate the origin of ‘fear of civil inequality’ among African hunter-gatherers, ‘slash-and-burn’ cultivators, and pastoralists in non-human primate societies. He explains the transition from a system based on ‘the inequality principle’ to that of ‘the equality principle’. According to Itani, the inequality principle refers to the social rank order (e.g. superior vs. inferior), while the equality principle is the non-social rank order. The inequality principle works to control members; to realise each individual’s social status and identity; to achieve coexistence between individuals. By contrast, the equality principle is deviant from the idea of rank order. That is, in situations where various inequalities (e.g. social rank) exist, the superior individual acts (e.g. play and food sharing) to the inferior individual as if such inequalities do not exist (Itani 1986: 368). In more detail, Itani defined the pre-stage of egalitarianism, which is found in hunter-gatherer societies, as ‘conditional equality’ (ibid: 1986). Itani stated that chimpanzee societies are more based on the ‘conditional equality principle’ in which food sharing behaviour among members, which never
occurs in Japanese monkeys, is observed. Paying attention to the fact that begging individuals are free from the social order, Itani argued that this behaviour would be 'the origin of economic flow of goods' (Itani 1988: 149), emphasising that 'their recognition that one’s favourite food is another’s favourite food too, is a mentality related to sympathy and objectification' (ibid: 149). As a result, Itani argued that the egalitarianism found in current hunting-gathering people is 'a product of the evolutionary elaboration of its counterpart found among the chimpanzees' (ibid: 149). See details in the English article of Itani (1988).

In sum, the main characteristics of Kyoto ecological anthropology are: direct observation of behaviour, and the inter-disciplinary approach. First, Japanese are free from theoretical prejudices (see Tanaka vs. Silberbauer in section 5.5.1.). Secondly, unlike Wilmsen (1989) who tries to understand the San hunter-gatherers from the Western historical perspective, Kyoto anthropologists try to approach the San from an evolitional perspective, considering evidence found in non-human primate societies. While the Western approach to hunter-gatherers cannot escape from certain cultural/historical prejudices, the Kyoto approach is more positive, providing a consistent basis for future research.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This paper has shown a diversity of interests and approaches of the current Kyoto school of anthropology through its historical and theoretical development. It has also demonstrated that the Kyoto approach is not mere a product of Imanishi’s thought, but the fruit of efforts made by a variety of Kyoto scholars. Now, I shall discuss the following three topics: (1) the advantage of the Kyoto approach; (2) the future direction of the Kyoto school; and (3) tasks for future research.

6.1. Advantages of the Kyoto approach

The advantages of the Kyoto approach are characterised by positivism and multiple perspectives. In the first instance, Japanese give first priority to what they can see, but not models or theories. Even when they build hypothesis, empirical facts must be presupposed. This attitude is apparent that Kyoto anthropologists try to find clues of the evolution of the human society in non-human primates as well as people who heavily depend their life ecology on natural environments. The method they adopted was the direct observation of behaviour in order to describe their social/cultural organisations as they are. For example, Tanaka (1971) would not come up with the idea to compare the fluid grouping of San hunter-gatherers with that of chimpanzees if these empirical facts would not be supported. By contrast, Westerners generally provide a particular model or hypothesis to
look at a particular kind of species. For instance, R.B. Lee (1979) tries to explain the economy of San hunter-gatherers from Marxism. In a similar way, Wilmsen (1989) tries to situate the San in the larger political and economical perspective of Southern Africa. It seems clear that some Westerners never doubt about their ‘universal’ explanation, even though it is not always applicable to every society in the world. The so-called ‘Western universality’ is politically and economically influential, in many ways producing a number of problems in remote areas of the world. Especially, this issue is frequently discussed in development studies as well as medical anthropology (e.g. Green 1988; Haram 1991). This particular Western view is quite opposite of the Japanese. Consider Tanaka and Sugawara’s statement below:

We do not believe that the persistent effort to understand more thoroughly the uniqueness of the San must lead to the alienation of them into Others. We hope that we ourselves will be changed by this understanding (Tanaka & Sugawara 1996: 6; cited in Sugawara 2004b: 127).

The second advantage of the Kyoto approach is its multiple-perspectives which situate a variety of things in a relationship. For instance, the concept of the Kyoto primatological approach, namely its view to see the continuity between non-human primates and humankind, is multiple. Imanishi argued that similarity and difference is a relationship which is ultimately
continuous to the origin of the one source. Also, Sugawara (2002a) focuses on the structure of face-to-face interaction which consists of more than two persons to look at emotion which appears in the other’s mind, but not in the self. Sugawara’s study also shows its combinations of theories which include Merleau-Ponty, Imanishi, sociobiology, and so forth. Finally, Kyoto scholars combine both qualitative and quantitative methods in their studies in order to understand more fully the totality of a particular society.

In sum, Japanese researchers are highly skillfulled in synthesising Western thoughts according to their original views, and they have much potential to provide a more positive and consistent basis for future research. In particular, Sugawara’s phenomenological approach is seminal. His theory of emotion transcends the concerns of empiricism and intellectualism. Pursuing this trans-disciplinary approach, it would be possible for us not only to understand a variety of others, including non-human primates, but also to reveal the reality of lived experience of humankind, which is based on the body. Sugawara (2002a) argues that which theory or thought we believe is a significant aspect of our daily social practices. It seems clear that as long as anthropologists take advantage of their knowledge of ‘others’ just for their satisfaction, such knowledge would not have any meaning for a majority of people.
6.2. The future direction of the Kyoto school of anthropology

In my opinion, the future direction of the Kyoto school of anthropology will be more and more focused on three main directions: (1) the evolution of the human society; (2) social interaction; and (3) ecological anthropology in general.

First, under the leadership of Kyoto scholars, especially those who belong to 'The Origin and Evolution of Humanity' research group, Japanese scholars have been trying to develop the inter-disciplinary approach between the sciences and the humanities to approach humankind from a variety of perspectives. Although scholars who seek to develop the Kyoto primatological approach are not numerous, as they discover further evidence on socio/cultural details of non-human primates, in particular chimpanzee and bilia (bonobo), these clues will provide them to further contribute to their theoretical formations. Recent publications of Hominisation, and Origin and Evolution of Humanity clearly show this trend of research. For instance, Enomoto (2001) focuses on a variety of non-human primate social interactions concerned with 'memberships'. He suggests a possible direction to sophisticate Japanese structural approach, reconsidering the limitations of the Neo-Darwinian explanation. Especially, paying attention to the fact that we are not entirely free from anthropomorphism to describe non-human social acts, he suggests that there is a need to model the periodical patterns of social acts of a particular
kind shu-shakai. On the other hand, Kitamura (2003) reconstructs Lévi-Strauss’s kinship theory with deep insights of non-human primate social/cultural organisations to solve the question of the origin of human family. He hypothesises that the structure of the pre-human society would have similarities with that of gorillas, chimpanzees, bonobos, and human. Particularly, focusing on the common feature among these societies that maturing females of a particular group transfer to another one to avoid incest, Kitamura argues that incest prohibition would be the main device which makes it possible for pre-human to recognise a particular sexual relationship between male and female. Finally, Furuichi (2003) approaches pre-human from comparing social structures of ape species. His approach is inter-disciplinary which covers Japanese and Western structural/ecological approaches, including paleoanthropology. On the basis of empirical facts, he provides a hypothesis to answer the question of a process through which pre-human adapted to dry areas, reconsidering Western views of food dispersion and copulation rates on ape species. He argues that in order to survive in the harsh environment, pre-human would need to have a temporal base camp where they can leave their children for hunting and gathering activities. For this reason, he states that it would be inevitable for them to have a spouse system which establishes a particular sexual relationship between male and female. Moreover, to specify a particular couple, copulation rate must be as lower as humankind.
These examples provide us some important aspects to look at the future direction of Kyoto anthropology. In particular, there are several different approaches distributed in the Kyoto school because of the members' diversity of academic backgrounds. In other words, the Kyoto school of thought has been inherited and developed in a variety of directions. For instance, the approach of Juichi Yamagiwa, Takeshi Furuichi, and Tomoo Enomoto seems to be characterised by Itani's structural approach. On the other hand, Toshisada Nishida and his followers more support the Neo-Darwinian perspective. Finally, Kazuyoshi Sugawara's approach strongly reflects Imanishi and Itani's emphasis on the first hand experience. This academic diversity also shows that these members are the second and the third generations, and there seems to be no charismatic leader after Imanishi and Itani. Nevertheless, there are some common features among the members. First, they do not entirely reject the Neo-Darwinian explanation, but reconsider the limitations and adapt it according to the need for their own perspective. Secondly, they give first priority to ethnographic evidence, rather than hypotheses. Given this, the Kyoto approach is more and more becoming an integrated approach between the East and the West, namely toward the Neo-Kyoto school. I believe that these diverse academic environments provide Kyoto anthropologists to continuously create unique and original perspectives toward the future.

On the other hand, several researchers and graduate students whose backgrounds are on primatology, anthropology, and linguistics, try to
pursue advanced research on social interaction, especially, those who belong to the Natural History of Communication and the Interaction Research Group. The trend of research is more focused on micro-social interaction and embodied experience. One of the characteristics of their study is to overcome dualism (e.g. subject/object). For instance, Sugawara (1996) extracts G/wi everyday conversation in which frequent over-rapping is identified to reconsider coder and decoder dualism. He provides an alternative perspective, namely language as a bodily gesture. Recently, Michio Nakamura (2003) and Noriko Ito (2003) show their attempt to describe various chimpanzee social behaviours through their embodied experience. These two studies show the strong influence of the traditional Kyoto primatology as well as Sugawara's phenomenological approach. In addition, some scholars focus on 'acquisition' of a particular social/cultural practice. For instance, Kitamura (1996) describes a process of negotiation between a group of young men and elderly people of Turkana pastoralists to extract the nature of their 'sense'. Nonaka and Takada (2004) study the navigation practice among the San hunter-gatherers. They try to look into how the cultural meaning and knowledge of the people is inherited through the social practice.

Lastly, as for the San studies, it seems that young scholars are not interested in the primatological approach, but focusing on 'the minutiae of cultural details' (Barnard 1992: 101). It might be the reason that there is not any young scholar who has primatology in their academic background. A
recent trend of the Japanese Kalahari team is that Ikeya and Osaki concentrate on creating a broader vision of the San, reconstructing the G//wi and G//ana history. Through investigating the details of socio-economical contacts between the San and Kalahari agricultural pastoralists, they try to contribute to the revisionist debate. As long as the political situation allows, they have much potential to further explore San society into the future.

6.3. Tasks for future research

Due to time limitations, I must admit that I could not review the whole of Kyoto anthropology, but focused on some limited aspects. Especially, I omitted the details of ethnographic studies on the Central African hunter-gatherers, pastoralists and ‘slash-and-burn’ cultivators of Eastern Africa. Here I would like to describe two tasks for future research to further understand the dynamic organisation of the Kyoto school of anthropology. First, there is a need to look at academic communications between Kyoto and Western scholars. For instance, several Western primatologists and ecological anthropologists, such as Frans de Waal, have spent sabbaticals at the Kyoto University. A Kyoto ecological anthropologist, Akira Takada, spent some semesters at the Center for Language, Interaction and Culture of the University of California, Los Angeles. These examples would further shed light on the theoretical formation of the Kyoto school. Secondly, there is a room to compare the history of the Kyoto school of anthropology with some other schools, such as the Manchester school of anthropology. This
direction of study would further provide perspectives to understand a complex mechanism of academic organisation and its historical and theoretical developments.

Finally, I have tried to reveal the Kyoto primatological approach and how it compares to Western perspectives. However, some Kyoto scholars, in particular, Kazuyoshi Sugawara, indicated that the topic of the dissertation on which this occasional paper is based sounded like 'orientalism' (K. Sugawara; personal communication). In other words, focusing on the 'peripheral approach', my attempt would give a clear distinction between the East and the West. However, I believe that my attempt, introducing the uniqueness of the Kyoto approach, will not alienate it from the West, but contribute to the academic communication between the East and the West.
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