historic documents to help study what changed and when. Rainbird implies that many use oral histories uncritically, reconstruct the culture at European contact uncritically (unaware of quality differences in historical sources), and extend the contact pattern back in time, implying that culture was the same for centuries before this. Actually, most archaeologists in these multiyear studies have spent a great deal of time looking at recorded oral histories and historical data and are well aware of data problems. Also, most have constructed models of past times that are not simple extensions of contact culture. Ayres and his students, Bath, and Athens have all used Pohnpeian oral histories in modeling the past. Thomas King and Patricia Parker used such data in Chuukese models. But in testing these models with archaeological data, complex pictures of the past have resulted—based on archaeology, oral history, and history. To give an example from Kosrae, in our research program at Leluh (the ruling center from AD 1400 to the contact era), considerable archaeological work went into reconstructing social ranking and life in Leluh—not blindly accepting contact-era patterns as precontact patterns. Interestingly, in his critiques of work on Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Kosrae, Rainbird also builds pictures of the past using oral histories and historical data, and one could question how critically he uses the sources.

I have no objection to Rainbird’s proposing alternative hypotheses. New ideas are useful in forming and testing hypotheses on the past. I personally do not find Rainbird’s vague symbolic interpretations of cosmology to be “more critical” archaeology than the work that went before. But, I have not yet read his cited articles, which may be more detailed, so it would be unfair to present an opinion here. I do think he needs to be more cautious in critiquing the views of other workers with whom he disagrees.

Despite my concerns with his review of the island histories of Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Kosrae, I believe that Rainbird has done a very nice job of presenting the Micronesian archaeological data. The book reflects a considerable amount of work and is well worth acquiring. I truly hope that this book will be the first of many quality overviews of Micronesian history utilizing archaeological data, as well as oral-historical, historical, and historical-linguistic data.

ROSS CORDY
University of Hawai’i,
West O’ahu

In December 1999, a workshop on “Wartime Japanese Anthropology in Asia and Oceania” was held at the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka. The present volume is an outcome of that workshop. Since the end of World War II, Japanese wartime anthropology has been a field growing...
in stature and credibility, beginning as an outgrowth of Japanese colonization in Asia, as well as colonization by other nations in Southeast Asia. The Japanese army’s invasion of Manchuria in 1931, and soon of other parts of China, was the start of a long period of war involving many people and large areas of land in Asia and the Pacific Islands. After much serious and bloody fighting, the Japanese were driven from Asia and the Pacific by UK and US military forces.

The compilers of this volume contend that wartime Japanese anthropology is a field of its own today. In the first chapter, “Wartime Anthropology: A Global Perspective,” Jan van Bremen looks for general and distinctive traits in Japanese and American anthropology during wartime. He makes the point that, in the case of both nations, anthropology studies coincided with the time the countries were at war. He further asserts that in Japan and America “the history of anthropology ran synchronically with the history of wars for as many decades as anthropology enjoyed a time of peace” (4). These wartime realities significantly affected anthropological craft and technique so as to call now for a singular consideration of wartime anthropology.

The next chapter is “Anthropology and the Wartime Situation of the 1930s and 1940s: Masao Oka, Yoshitaro Hirano, and Eiichiro Ishida and Their Negotiations with the Situation.” In this chapter, author Akitoshi Shimizu considers how anthropologists were involved in the 1930s and 1940s in Japan, and notes how both Americans and Japanese were attempting to redefine anthropology. He refers to the work of the three leading Japanese anthropologists of their time and how they negotiated the changing situations during wartime and the immediate postwar years.

The following three chapters focus on topics concerning anthropological research in wartime and postwar periods in Japan. Kevin M Doak’s chapter, “Nakano Seiichi and Colonial Ethnic Studies,” explains how Nakano Seiichi developed his theory of minzoku, a kind of nationalism that was manifested in the Japanese Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. Doak regards sociologist Nakano Seiichi as the one who filled the gap between speculative and empirical sociology, and thus legitimized the ethnic policies of imperial Japan.

Teruo Sekimoto, in “Selves and Others in Japanese Anthropology,” traces the changing focuses of anthropological interests through an analysis of the work appearing in the Japanese Journal of Ethnology. He demonstrates that the Pacific War was too short for the journal to report wartime research, and also notes that its publication was suspended for two years beginning in 1944.

Atushi Nobayashi’s “Physical Anthropology in Wartime Japan” focuses on the trends and investigations in that discipline, and indicates that the main focus was the Japanese population.

The following five chapters are concerned with regional focuses in Japan’s colonies or in areas overrun during wartime and deal with a variety of topics and academic and non-academic practices. They include Eiichiro Ishida’s researches in South Sakhalin island; Korean folklore in
the case of Akiba Takashi; Korean studies in Japan; Taiwanese folklore; Chinese peasant societies in Japan; and colonial studies in Indonesia.

The last chapter, “Resuscitating Nationalism: Brunei under the Japanese Military Administration, 1941–1945,” by B A Hussainmiya, addresses the development of nationalism in Brunei during the Japanese occupation of that country. Hussainmiya explains that the Japanese occupation policies comprised some measures that contrasted so much with previous British policies that the political and cultural sensibilities of the Brunei people were awakened, resulting in the enhancement of nationalist sentiments.

All told, this is an important volume in the history of anthropology. The authors question the very basis on which social and cultural anthropology has stood in the past: the study of colonized peoples. This relationship in the past has not always been peaceful, but rather was based on colonial rule and military domination. Since this colonial strife and domination is likely to continue for some time to come, the concept of wartime anthropology and its practice is going to be with us, and further refined and defined in the future.

Based on these realities, the organizers of the workshop that is reported in this volume express the hope that broad international workshops can be organized on the topics of life under wartime conditions. Undoubtedly, this will come to pass.

DIRK ANTHONY BALLENDORF
University of Guam

* * *


This book by Mac Marshall seeks to explore the effects of regional and international migration on a small community on the atoll of Namoluk, in Chuuk State, Federated States of Micronesia. The atoll has eight matrilineal clans, the original members of which immigrated to Namoluk from ten other nearby islands: seven in the Mortlocks, two in Chuuk Lagoon, and Polowat Atoll. “This diversity of background is typical of Carolinian atoll communities and is hardly unique to Namoluk” (135).

While Marshall describes the highlights of Namoluk history, its settlement, discovery by Europeans, and colonization (first by Spain, and then Germany, Japan, and finally the United States), as well as its geography, kinship system, and social structure, his main interest is social change, especially that brought about by migratory movements.

Migration is a major catalyst of social change in any society, and Marshall shows this quite clearly in the lives of the Namoluk people. Before European discovery they frequently visited each other across vast ocean spaces, a feat made possible by their deep knowledge of navigation
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