YANGJIN PAK and HYUNG IL PAI both explore the tensions within the practice and politics of Korean archaeology. South Korea is, of course, accessible and very conscious of its past, even though much of this is physically beyond the modern territorial boundaries. PAI discusses how the creation of modern Korean identity is bound up with archaeological activities, and PAI explores two early states on the Korean Peninsula. Intriguingly, the shared heritage and history of the two Koreas forms an unbreakable link, in spite of the modern political divide. The west is becoming increasingly aware of the richness of Korean cultures, as shown by the exhibition in the British Museum last year on the Painted Tombs of Koguryo, which highlighted the deplorable conservation of these treasures.

FUMIKO IKAWA-SMITH'S concluding paper draws out some of the common themes which highlight the links between the national heritages in this disparate region. In comparing the five papers, she identifies four useful common points of reference: the nature of archaeology in east Asia; the role of national identity and origins; the management of cultural heritage and tourism; and the development of concepts of national identity, the 'other' and cultural origins.
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Since 1992, on-going excavations of the Early to Middle Jomon period Sannai Maruyama site (3500–2000 BC) have uncovered the large size and complexity of this prehistoric hunter-gatherer settlement. Sannai Maruyama, furthermore, has become the first Jomon site in Japan to attract the attention of not only archaeologists, but also the media and the public. This paper argues that Sannai Maruyama's popularity is due to

1 the recent increased visibility of Jomon archaeology,
2 the dissemination of excavation results by site archaeologists,
3 the pride of local people in the site,
4 the use of archaeology by the local government to promote tourism, and
5 links drawn by Japanese intellectuals between modern Japanese and their supposed Jomon ancestors.

The Sannai Maruyama site

The Sannai Maruyama site is a large Jomon period settlement located in Aomori Prefecture, Japan. The site dates primarily from the middle of the Early Jomon period to the end of the Middle Jomon period (c. 3500–2000 BC). Archaeological excavation at Sannai Maruyama has revealed an enormous site containing over 700 pit-dwellings, approximately 20 long houses, about 100 remains of raised-floor buildings, approximately 250 adult grave pits and 800 burial jars for infants or children, several
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large middens and mounds containing garbage such as potsherds, stone tools, food remains and backdirt from houses (Okada 1998). In addition, over 40,000 boxes of artefacts including stone tools, potsherds, clay figurines, bone tools, clay, stone and bone ornaments, wood artefacts, rush and bark baskets and lacquered plates, bowls and combs have been uncovered, catalogued and stored for analysis (Okada 1994; Okada & Habu 1995; Okamura 1995).

When, in 1994, excavations by the Board of Education of Aomori Prefecture revealed the vast size, complexity and richness of the site, Sannai Maruyama became a focus of public attention. Finds and interpretations of the site were published in Japanese newspapers and magazines and reported on television news programmes. More than a million tourists have visited the site to see excavated artefacts and features. Sannai Maruyama, furthermore, has been the topic of many academic and semi-academic conferences.

This paper asks how and why archaeological, popular and mass media representations of Sannai Maruyama have presented this Jomon period site as a key to understanding Japanese cultural identity. Such an understanding is significant because, until the 1990s, the Japanese public and mass media did not focus on sites from the Jomon period (c. 10,000–300 BC) as sources of knowledge about the origins of the Japanese people and culture. Rather, in the popular imagination, the roots of the Japanese people, culture and nation were linked to the process of state formation associated with the Yayoi (c. 3rd century BC–AD 3rd century) and Kofun (c. 4th–7th century) periods. The past two decades have seen:

1. new expressions of Japanese nationalism, including a search for Japanese identity in the prehistoric past,
2. the discovery of rich Jomon sites and
3. increased acknowledgement of the possibility of cultural diversity in Japan.

In the 1990s, these factors have resulted in the possibility of an intense and sustained focus on Jomon archaeology as a source of knowledge about Japanese cultural origins.

**Archaeology in contemporary Japan**

Japanese prehistory and proto-history have traditionally been divided into four periods: the Palaeolithic, Jomon, Yayoi and Kofun (Aikens & Higuchi 1982; Barnes 1993; Imamura 1996; Pearson 1992). Developing from the lithic-based Palaeolithic, the pottery-producing Jomon is characterized by the presence of large settlements and shell-middens, dependence on a hunting, gathering and fishing economy, sophisticated technologies and complex ritual. In contrast, the Yayoi period is characterized by reliance on rice agriculture, the use of metal tools and ritual objects and clear evidence of social stratification. The following Kofun period represented ancient state formation, and saw the construction of large burial mounds, many of which were built in a characteristic 'keyhole-shape'.

The number of archaeological sites excavated annually in Japan has risen rapidly since the early 1960s, as Japan developed into a major world economic power. In 1996 alone, approximately 11,000 site excavations were carried out throughout the Japanese archipelago (Okamura 1997). The vast majority of these excavations were rescue projects conducted by administrative archaeologists prior to the construction of public or private development projects. Japanese archaeology enjoys wide publicity through the mass media and considerable public encouragement and support.

**The construction of Japanese ethnic and national identity in the historic and prehistoric past**

Although we will never know with certainty if people living in the Japanese archipelago during the Kofun period shared an ethnic identity, present-day Japan is one of the only modern industrial states that has not consciously distanced itself from its ethnicity (Porter 1997: 107). In Japan, as in some other Asian nations, nationalism and ethnicity go hand-in-hand. As several authors have pointed out, for most Japanese, to be a national implies that one speaks the Japanese language, shares physical characteristics with other Japanese nationals and has a Japanese cultural background (Befu 1993b; Mouer & Sugimoto 1986; Oblas 1995; Sugimoto & Mouer 1989).

The process of nation-building and the construction of the modern Japanese ethnic and national identity can be traced to the decades spanning from Meiji restoration of 1868 until the Japanese defeat in 1945. This process was the result of conscious cultural policies created and implemented by political élites.
The focus of Japanese nationalism in the years leading up to and during World War II was the ideology of *tennosei*, or emperor worship. The politics of pre-war emperor worship, furthermore, made the interpretation of archaeological artefacts in terms of peoples, including the ancestral Japanese people, difficult. This was because archaeologists had to avoid interpretations of archaeological evidence that would question historical interpretations based on assumptions about the sanctity of the imperial lineage. These assumptions were found in the *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*, ancient Japanese textual sources compiled during the 7th and 8th centuries. To avoid these ideological and political problems, archaeologists produced detailed and apolitical typological studies of artefacts as the focus of their work (Bleed 1989; Edwards 1997b; Fawcett 1990; 1995; 1996; Fawcett & Habu 1990; Habu 1989; Ikawa-Smith 1982).

After Japan’s defeat in 1945, its nationalist focus shifted abruptly away from the emperor. This was when the discipline of archaeology began to contribute to the creation of a new Japanese national identity for individuals and groups of very different political persuasions. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, the interdisciplinary investigation of the Yayoi period Toro site and, several years later, the excavation by archaeologists and local villagers of the Kofun period Tsukinowa Tomb excited public interest (Edwards 1991; 1997a; Fawcett 1995; Kondo 1985; Wajima 1973). Academic, media, political and public interest in the Toro site drew on populist images of Japan as a rice-farming nation, creating a common sense of Japanese identity linked to the ancient agrarian Yayoi past (Edwards 1991). Using the Tsukinowa Tomb, Marxist-oriented archaeologists stressed the importance of using archaeological excavation and analysis to make a new history by and for the Japanese common people (Fawcett 1990: 107; 1995; Kondo 1985; Wajima 1973).

Kaner (1996), who remains unread by most Japanese, and to a lesser extent Ikawa-Smith (1995) see archaeologists as partly responsible for perpetuating the idea that past and present inhabitants of the Japanese archipelago were ethnically homogeneous. Japanese archaeologists, however, are largely concerned with trying to understand the lifeways of people in the Japanese archipelago, rather than determining their origins. Kaner considers this latter aim to be both naïve and impossible (1996: 47). He concludes that there needs to be a change of focus from Japanese origins and the definition of contemporary Japanese ethnic or national identity towards an archaeology examining diversity in the archaeological record of Japan. Ikawa-Smith (1995) argues that this sense of homogeneity has profoundly influenced the interpretation of Japanese archaeology since archaeologists have focused their efforts on understanding the creation and development of the Yamato state, and put cultural continuity at the centre of their description of Japanese prehistory and history. This has occurred in books aimed at the general public, even though most archaeologists are conscious of the cultural and physical diversity of the peoples who inhabited the Japanese archipelago in the past (Ikawa-Smith 1990: 68).

**Nihonjinron**

A concept that helps us understand the relationship between Japanese archaeology, ethnicity and nationalism is *nihonjinron*. *Nihonjinron* is a discourse on Japanese identity that focuses on describing and understanding the unique qualities of Japan, the Japanese people and Japanese culture. Much of it was produced by Japanese and foreign intellectual élites since the 1970s and was transferred into the popular realm through the mass media and business leaders eager to internationalize the Japanese work-force (Befu 1984; 1993a; Mouer & Sugimoto 1986; Yoshino 1992; 1997).

Scholars have criticized the two fundamental elements of *nihonjinron*: that Japanese people, culture and society are unique and that Japanese people are homogeneous in terms of race, language and culture (Befu 1984; 1993a; Mouer & Sugimoto 1986: 99; Sugimoto & Mouer 1989; Yoshino 1997). Befu (1984; 1993b) and Mouer & Sugimoto (1986), furthermore, consider *nihonjinron* to be a subtle form of post-war Japanese nationalism which negates the true racial and cultural heterogeneity of Japanese society and de-emphasizes social and class conflict, thus maintaining the established social order. Yoshino (1992), in contrast, argues that *nihonjinron* can be viewed as problematic when it creates barriers of chauvinism and misunderstanding, but can also be perceived as advantageous when it allows the Japanese people to construct a positive sense of themselves.
Since 1945, archaeological research has become an important way of constructing Japanese national identity (Fawcett 1996: 74). Popular presentations of archaeological work by specialists and non-specialists inform nihonjinron when they stress what excavated materials tell researchers about the origins of the Japanese people and the development of the Japanese state. This post-war archaeology has been invaluable in creating a renewed understanding of, and pride in, the accomplishments of the people who lived in the ancient Japanese archipelago. It has encouraged the Japanese public to consider the important influences of mainland Asian peoples and culture on Japan's development. Conversely, archaeological results have been used to bolster a sense of Japanese ethnic homogeneity and uniqueness. For example, in the 1970s and 1980s, Asuka Village, an area in Nara Prefecture with large numbers of archaeological sites dating from the mid 6th to early 8th century, was preserved through special legislation and developed as an archaeological tourist centre. Billed as the 'hometown of the Japanese heart' by the government and corporate sponsors, Asuka Village has been used by business and government elites to link the modern Japanese to their nation's ancient past (Fawcett 1990: 170; 1996: 62).

The Sannai Maruyama preservation movement

Before the excavations of the Jomon Sannai Maruyama site in 1992, the main media and public focus was on Yayoi period and later sites as keys for understanding the origins of Japanese people and culture (Edwards 1991: 3; 1997b). In July 1994, the discovery of a feature associated with six large pits containing wooden posts at Sannai Maruyama was widely reported on television and in newspapers. Thereafter thousands of people visited the site. The archaeologists encouraged public visits to Sannai Maruyama and voluntarily explained various site features to visitors (Okada & Habu 1995). Although these archaeologists did not believe they had enough political influence to save Sannai Maruyama on their own, and they wanted the Japanese public to appreciate the importance of the site and provided organized tours. In short, while archaeologists did not organize a preservation movement themselves, they educated the public about the significance of the site. Soon individuals living in Aomori Prefecture wrote letters to newspapers and lobbied the prefectural government to fund the site preservation. Part of the impetus for this spontaneous and unplanned movement was the public's knowledge about the importance of archaeological remains, a knowledge cultivated by the mass media. Their efforts bore fruit when, two weeks after media reports appeared of the discovery of a six-post feature, the governor of Aomori Prefecture announced that Sannai Maruyama would be preserved. Archaeologists responded by organizing a two-day public interpretation program at the site attended by 8000 people (To'o Nippo Sha 1997). Throughout the summer and the autumn 'Sannai Maruyama fever' swept the nation. Archaeologists, the excavators and various media groups (Okada et al. 1996) organized academic symposia and public lectures about Sannai Maruyama involving Jomon specialists. Articles appeared in newspapers and on television specials. In March 1997, Sannai Maruyama was designated a National Historical Site (Kunishiseki). By July 1997, more than 1 million people had visited the site (To'o Nippo Sha 1997).

The media, tourism and the public: the cultural context of the Sannai Maruyama 'boom'

The popularity of the Sannai Maruyama site can be explained in terms of a combination of factors. First, the large number of sites excavated over the past several decades (Habu 1989: 40; Tanaka 1984; Tsude 1995) and extensive coverage of these excavations by the mass media (Fawcett 1990: 260–63; Oblas 1995) have engendered public interest in archaeological discoveries. The first Japanese archaeological site to receive extensive media coverage was the Takamatsuzuka Tomb (7th–8th century) in Nara Prefecture, which became famous when archaeologists announced that it contained wall-paintings showing clear resemblance to those discovered in continental Koguryo tombs (see Yangjin Pak, this volume). This discovery suggested that the Japanese imperial court might have had close ties with state-level societies on the continent. In 1972, front-page newspaper coverage of the site throughout Japan resulted in large numbers of non-specialist visitors (Sako 1996). Pundits and archaeologists alike dubbed Takamatsuzuka an 'archaeological
boom’. From then until the early 1990s, several other sites, including the intact 6th-century Fujinoki Tomb in Nara Prefecture and Yoshinogari, a Yayoi period moated settlement and burial site in Saga Prefecture, made front-page headlines in Japan (Edwards 1996). Media and public interest in these sites provided insights into Japanese ancient history at the time of state formation. Unlike its predecessors, however, Sannai Maruyama, the latest Japanese ‘archaeological boom’, extends public interest back to the pre-state Jomon period.

Secondly, archaeologists felt a professional responsibility to inform the public about the size, quality and importance of Sannai Maruyama. Before the site was saved they did this largely through on-site presentations. After site preservation was assured, they worked with the media to publicize excavation results at a series of symposia and lectures as well as through articles in newspapers and magazines. While the presentation of some of this information was academic in tone, archaeologists also wrote non-specialist articles and even created comic-strip explanations of the site for children.

Third, the people of Aomori Prefecture took regional pride in the site, their most important historical symbol. They visited Sannai Maruyama themselves, advertised the site as a reason why tourists from other parts of Japan should visit Aomori, and some of them acted as volunteer tour guides at the site (Okada et al. 1996: 201). Sannai Maruyama put Aomori on the Japanese map.

Fourth, the prefectoral government was anxious to promote Sannai Maruyama as a tourist site that would attract visitors to the undeveloped rural area, located at the tip of the main island of Honshu, 600 km north of Tokyo. At the site on 19 July 1998, the governor of Aomori Prefecture declared cultural tourism to be a new focus for prefectoral development. In his declaration, the governor pointed out that Sannai Maruyama added temporal depth to Aomori’s natural beauty and traditional cultural assets. Furthermore, he stated that Aomori Prefecture, which he called ‘the hometown of the Japanese nation’, was one wing of international society. He also declared Aomori Prefecture to be a cultural and tourist centre (Kimura 1998). Kimura’s statement symbolically links Aomori Prefecture to the Japanese nation and the international sphere beyond Japan’s borders.

Finally, Sannai Maruyama demonstrates a new tendency among some intellectuals and members of the Japanese public to think of the Jomon period as a time when core and fundamental aspects of Japanese culture first appeared. For example, Takeshi Umehara, an influential Japanese intellectual, suggests that the roots of the Japanese culture and Japanese character can be found in the Jomon and Ainu cultures (Umehara 1995; cf. Ikawa-Smith 1990: 60–61; 1995: 53). He also argues that the ‘spirit of the Jomon culture’ (Jomon no seishin) can still be found in modern Japanese culture, particularly in the Tohoku region (Umehara 1995). Tadao Umesao, another well-known Japanese intellectual, also sees a distinct link between the Jomon culture of Sannai Maruyama and contemporary Japanese culture (Umesao et al. 1995). The articulation of these ideas by respected thinkers has encouraged the public to consider the Jomon period as part of their ancestral heritage.

Discussion and conclusion
In the previous section, we argued that the Sannai Maruyama ‘boom’ resulted from several interrelated factors. These include: the increased prominence of Jomon archaeology over the past two decades; the desire of archaeologists working at Sannai Maruyama to disseminate widely the results of their work; pride felt by the Aomori people in the historical importance of their area; the Aomori Prefectural government’s decision to use Sannai Maruyama to promote Aomori as a tourist destination and the tendency of influential Japanese thinkers to see in Sannai Maruyama evidence of the importance of the Jomon period in the development of modern Japanese culture.

We suggest that the Sannai Maruyama phenomenon described in the previous section is significant for several reasons. First, although Japanese scholars have since the 1950s discussed the possibility of the Jomon being the foundation of Japanese culture, prior to the Sannai Maruyama ‘boom’ popular understanding had traced Japanese cultural origins to the rice-producing and socially stratified Yayoi and Kofun periods. Rice cultivation and social stratification were seen as so central to Japanese culture and identity (Edwards 1991: 15; Ohnuki-Tieman 1993) that the possible location of Japanese origins in the ‘primitive’ society of Jomon hunter-gatherers was not actively discussed. The Sannai
Maruyama ‘boom’ brought to the public’s attention the complexity of the Jomon culture.

This new understanding of the Jomon allowed a paradigm shift toward public acceptance of it as key to understanding the development of Japanese culture. The idea that the Sannai Maruyama excavation demonstrated the complexity of the Jomon culture for the first time has been largely created by the mass media. Since the 1960s, archaeologists have argued that Jomon hunter-gatherers often lived in large settlements, possessed a sophisticated material culture and had a high population density and complex social organization. In other words, archaeologists have long recognized that the Jomon people were far from being ‘barbarous wanderers’. The image of the Jomon people as impoverished and primitive nomads has been perpetuated largely by the media.

Secondly, the Sannai Maruyama ‘boom’ is significant because it had regional support. Although one of the themes used to promote Sannai Maruyama was the site’s importance in understanding the life of the Japanese people’s ancestors, much of the impetus for site preservation and development has come from the Aomori people and prefectural government. By making Sannai Maruyama a symbol of their region, the people and leaders of Aomori constructed a regional identity based on their links to nature through their Jomon past. Aomori Prefecture is not the only region of Japan to develop local identity using a Jomon site. In the southern Japanese prefecture of Kagoshima, the prefectural government has used newspaper advertisements featuring artefacts excavated from the Initial Jomon Uenohara site to present an image of their region as an innovative and progressive place worth visiting.

Finally, Sannai Maruyama is important because non-academic, public discussions of the site are not so much part of the discourse of nihonjinron, which emphasizes the uniqueness of the Japanese people and culture, as part of nihonbunkaron, a related discourse that stresses the development and characteristics of Japanese culture. This is significant because, although physical anthropologists (e.g. Hanihara 1991) have discussed the genetic relationship between the Jomon people and modern populations of the Japanese archipelago (including both the Ainu and the ethnic Japanese), until the discovery of Sannai Maruyama links between the Jomon and modern Japan were not emphasized by the mass media. Recent popular fascination with Jomon period archaeology results from the realization that Jomon culture, as seen at Sannai Maruyama, is highly sophisticated; not only is the site large, but it contains the remains of complex living and ritual structures and artefacts. Because of Sannai Maruyama, the Japanese public and the media have begun to contemplate a relationship between themselves and the Jomon people.

In conclusion, we suggest that the recent use of Jomon sites such as Sannai Maruyama as models of Japanese ethnicity can be explained in two ways. First, the appeal of these sites may have to do with their role in the reification of the traditional ideology of Japanese linguistic, cultural and biological homogeneity by pushing the origins of Japanese seishin (spirit or essence) further into the prehistoric past. This is a conservative and reactionary position that upholds the political and social status quo of modern Japan. In contrast to this view, one could argue that current interest in Jomon sites might provide a broader framework for a re-examination of Japanese ethnicity. Recently, the marginalized Ainu and Ryukyuan people, who live primarily in the regions of Hokkaido and Okinawa respectively, have been vocal in their demands for political, legal and social recognition (Hanazaki 1996). Broad public acceptance of a prehistoric cultural and biological link between the modern ethnic Japanese and the Ainu and Ryukyuan could result in a new paradigm of the archaeological past which would focus on prehistoric diversity rather than homogeneity and would provide space for a modern-day acceptance of ethnic diversity within Japan.
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