

ARCHAEOLOGY, COLLECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS, AND SOCIAL HOPE IN JAPAN

Makoto Ishibashi

Visiting Research Fellow
Third World Studies Center
University of the Philippines

1. INTRODUCTION

In November 6, 2000, the front page top headline news of three major national newspapers in Japan¹ reported an archaeological scandal involving Shinichi Fujimura, the then Vice Director of Tohoku-Kyusekki-Bunka-Kyenkyujo (Institute for Palaeolithic Age Culture in the Tohoku Region), a non-profit making academic organization established by non-professional archaeologists.

According to the reports by these newspapers, Fujimura fabricated about 90 stone implements from the two most recently excavated, important early Palaeolithic Soushifudouzada site in Hokkaido and Kamitakamori site in the Miyagi Prefecture; especially the stone implements of the Kamitakamori site expected to be about 0.6 million years old before present, making them ‘the oldest’ stone implements in the early Palaeolithic Age in Japan.

From the outset of the 1980s up to this scandalous issue, Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan had celebrated ‘the age of glory’, as almost every year new archaeological sites from the Palaeolithic Age were found, and stone implements that appeared from these sites always pushed the record for the oldest stone implements in Japan. Although Fujimura is neither a theorist, nor a professional archaeologist, he participated in almost

¹ Mainichi-shinbun, Asahi-shinbun, and Yomiuri-shinbun.

all significant excavations as a volunteer excavator, and ‘excavated’ almost all stone implements, which later ironically became the objects of serious suspicion.

The various reactions to the Fujimura scandal took on the form of a most drastic and dramatic human comedy: 1) the secretary for the Ministry of Education, Sciences and Technology ordered Burachou (the Agency for Cultural Affairs) to conduct a rigid re-examination of Palaeolithic archaeological sites in Japan. 2) the National Museum of Tokyo immediately removed from the display room for re-examination 30 stone implements found at an excavation Fujimura had participated in. 3) The publishers of a school textbook on Japanese history immediately called emergency meetings with the textbook authors, with the result that some of them decided to rewrite descriptions of the Palaeolithic Age in Japan. 4) Several local government units decided to end their financial support of Fujimura’s institute. 5) Toshiaki Kamat, the Director of Fujimura’s institute, resigned from his position as a member of the executive committee of the Japan Archaeological Association. Moreover Fujimura and his institute gave back his Aizawa Tadahiro Memorial Prize, a prestigious price that honored him as a foremost investigator on the Palaeolithic Age culture in Japan.

This article aims to examine the significance of archaeology in a certain society through an introduction and examination of the Fujimura fabrication scandal. Chapter 2 will research social backgrounds and cultural foundations of the Fujimura scandal. Chapter 3 will introduce the past, present and future prospects of Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan. Chapter 4 will try to compare the condition of archaeology in Japan and in the Philippines, and then suggest lessons that have been learned from which Philippine archaeology could benefit.

Although the writer is not an expert in archaeology, he majored in Japanese ancient history, which has a deep relationship with archaeology. Moreover, his university in Japan, Kokugakuin University, has been the main supplier of frontline archaeologists in Japan, thus he has had many classmates who became archaeologists. In addition, he has practically studied anthropology, and is now a major in sociology in the University of the Philippines. Consequently, he thinks he can spotlight the issue from various perspectives of the social sciences.

2. SOCIAL BACKGROUND AND CULTURAL FOUNDATION OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SCANDAL

I have already introduced the core story of the Fujimura fabrication scandal. In this chapter, I am going to research the social background and cultural foundation of his conduct, which I regard not so much as a story of a too ambitious swindler, but rather a tragic drama of a serious Japanese, who became the victim of the social-cultural system in his home country.

In order to understand Mr. Fujimura's tragedy, one has to know the special status of archaeology in Japan, where historical sciences, particularly archaeology, are enjoying a privileged position in the concerns and interests of people and Japanese society in general, which is expressed in the mass media. The investigation process of the Fujimura fabrication scandal can clearly show us this.

The Fujimura fabrication issue became the biggest news through the scoop of the Mainichi-shinbun on November 5 because the newspaper conducted a special investigation of Mr. Fujimura's daily activities. Although Mr. Fujimura had the nickname 'God's hands' by his extraordinary 'excavation' skill, there were already several voices of doubt raised about his achievements. Hence, Mainichi-shinbun organized the 'Palaeolithic Age Archaeological sites investigation Team' in order to watch Mr. Fujimura's archaeological activities.

As a result, the above-named newspaper's special investigation team was able to record strange activities of Mr. Fujimura at the Kamitakamori site on September 5. According to Mainichi-shinbun, Mr. Fujimura entered the excavation site in the early morning to work alone, and then dug a hole in the ground down to the expected level of stratum of the early Palaeolithic Age, around 200 thousand years before present. He finally placed in the hole some stone implements which he had bought with him, which he had probably fabricated and collected somewhere, before burying the items. He repeated this questionable procedure at the Kamitakamori site in the early morning of October 22, and was again recorded on video camera by the special investigation team. Mr. Fujimura eventually admitted fabrication to Mainichi-shinbun on November 4, and then called a formal press meeting at the governor's office of the Miyagi Prefecture on November 5.

Following the above story, I hope the readers of the article would understand the particular status of archaeology in Japan. Can one imagine the same story taking place in the Philippines? For instance, do you think it likely for the Philippine Daily Inquirer to organize a special investigation team to observe the daily activities of a researcher of the UP Archaeological Studies Program?

Archaeology is enjoying a privileged status in Japan. Mass Media are therefore always watching and reporting on archaeological activities all over the country. This was, in my view, the general background of the scandalous Fujimura fabrication issue.

But why do the Japanese bestow upon archaeology such a privileged status? This must be our next question.

The first answer to the question concerns the area of national identity. Generally speaking, I believe the first mission of the historical sciences is to provide a certain source of identity for a nation. Archaeology should therefore be viewed as a sub-discipline of the historical sciences: archaeology in Japan is not a sub-discipline of anthropology, but is part of the discipline of history. Although it was never manifested clearly, I am very sure that one of the most important social functions of archaeology in Japan is giving the notion of cultural dignity and confidence to the people through discovering antique sites. If archaeological sites are very old and extraordinary, for large or unique instance, people can be very happy, as this allows them to say they can feel, "Our ancestors were such great people." And then it can be a source of confidence for the nation. Therefore, in my view, archaeology has a profound relationship with questions of national identity.

Based on this nature of archaeology, there are many archaeology lovers in Japan. This provide a second answer for the privileged status of archaeology in Japan. Archaeology enjoys great interest, love and support in Japan. As a result, reports of archaeological surveys always become news scoops. In my personal experience in Japan, one can find such a 'scoop' on an 'extraordinary' site reported on by several representatives of the mass media, and this happens almost every month, sometimes even every week. The Japanese mass media are therefore always seeking newly discovered, extraordinary archaeological sites. Thus, in my view, fabrication of stone tools in Palaeolithic Age

conducted by Mr. Fujimura, and the special investigation carried out by Mainichi-shinbun, must be two sides of the same coin. These were abnormal articulations of a certain collective consciousness concerning archaeology in Japan, which is always seeking amazing finds.

Third problem, which one has to highlight in the case of the scandal we are discussing, is the large expectations of the people and local administration in the Tohoku Region. As I mentioned above, the institute Mr. Fujimura belonged to was a non-government organization, but some local governments units used to give financial support to the institute's independent archaeological survey. In addition, Mr. Fujimura held a press meeting attended by representatives of the mass media in the governor's office of Miyagi Prefecture. These facts indicate the importance of Mr. Fujimura's archaeological activities to the Tohoku Region.

The Tohoku Region, the Northeastern part of Honshu Island, the main island of Japan, remains today the most backward region in Japan in terms of economic condition. From the outset of Japan's modernization process, the region has been the main source of domestic labour migration in the country. Although the region has several rich rice cultivation areas, many people still have to work in far-flung big cities during the winter each year. By contrast, the Tohoku Region has had a long history of socio-cultural as well as political struggle against the central authorities of the Japanese nation. The region has therefore a rich and remarkable cultural heritage, and the people in the region possess great pride.

Based on these social elements, archaeological survey in the Tohoku Region, especially the study on Palaeolithic Age culture, carry particular significance. The first, the archaeological sites of the early Palaeolithic Age in the Tohoku Region are promoting the sense of self-confidence of people, and the love of 'Ora-ga-Machi' (my hometown). The second, some local government units are drawing blue prints of local development plans based on archaeological sites of the Palaeolithic Age. They therefore supported independent surveys of Mr. Fujimura's Institute. Moreover, the third significance, some minor local businessmen are already running some businesses related to existing archaeological sites of the early Palaeolithic Age in their hometowns. In other words, in my view, archaeological sites of the early Palaeolithic Age in the Tohoku Region have been providing social hope.

Mr. Fujimura has been involved in these confused and complex social situations for many years. He has moreover become the key person of argumentation on the Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan among professional archaeologists. I believe that a number of professional archaeologists had had too heavy expectations of Mr. Fujimura's 'excavation' luck for a long time.

I therefore hold the scandalous Fujimura fabrication issue not to be a story of an ambitious swindler, but a tragedy of a serious Japanese man, who had to carry out too heavy a task.

I have tried to point out in this chapter that the Fujimura fabrication issue was not a personal scandal, but one which has deep and wide roots in the culture and society of Japan.

3. PALAEOLOGIC ARCHAEOLOGY IN JAPAN, PRE-SCANDAL AND POST-SCANDAL

In chapter 3 I have discussed the social-cultural aspects of the scandalous Fujimura issue. This chapter will reflect on the history of the Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan. I will then attempt to examine the academic impact of the scandal, and would consequently like to present the future prospects of Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan.

I would like to begin by reflection on the Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan from the introduction of a contribution by a non-professional archaeologist, Mr. Tadahiro Aizawa. As I mentioned above, he was the first investigator of the Palaeolithic Age culture in Japan. In order to be an archaeologist, however, he had never received any particular education in any college or university. In addition, he had never belonged to an academic institution. Aizawa was really a 'self-made' man, and had taught himself to be an excellent archaeologist, who conducted and financed independently the archaeological survey of an important archaeological site of the late Palaeolithic Age, the Iwajuka site in Gunma Prefecture.

Mr. Aikawa began to study the Iwajuku site soon after the end of World War II, and then tried to inform the archaeological society of its notable significance. The response from the academicians at the time was, however, quite cold, as hardly any professional archaeologists in Japan had imagined the existence of a Palaeolithic Age culture on the islands of Japan. They therefore considered Aizawa as a miserable, mentally sick person, who had become a prisoner of his own imagination.

Only two professional archaeologists - Chosuke Seriza, who became Professor of archaeology at Tohoku University, and Terua Esaka, who became professor of archaeology at Keio University – understood the importance of the Iwajuku site, and supported Aizawa's isolated struggle against institutionalized archaeology. The story of Aizawa is very impressive, and in my opinion must be one of the most beautiful stories of intellectual struggle against an oppressive authority dominated by academicians.

Anyway, today, no-one can doubt the existence of a Palaeolithic Age culture in the islands of Japan. Later, and too long a period of neglect, Aizawa, the person who was suspected of insanity, became one of the greatest intellectual heroes of 20th century Japan.

Aizawa's passionate heroic effort, however, ironically paved the way for another dramatic story of the Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan, the Fujimura fabrication scandal. Based on reflection of the case of Aizawa, professional archaeologists in Japan, especially Palaeolithic Age archaeologists, approach non-professional archaeologists with modesty.

Moreover, as introduced above, archaeology enjoys great popularity in Japan. Archaeologists therefore, who are interested in the Palaeolithic Age culture in Japan, especially Serizawa, called the broad attention of archaeology-philes, and organized excavation projects in co-operation with these people. These movements were the origin of Mr. Fujimura's Institute. As a result, many Palaeolithic Age sites were discovered in the Tohoku Region since the beginning of the 1980s. One could for that reason say the development of the Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan owed its remarkable development to a kind of people's movement. I personally regard this as a good example of how professional archaeologists can work productively with people. But this unique people's movement also has to face a big challenge and serious criticism in the shape of

the Fujimura fabrication scandal. This is the first point of the crisis of Palaeolithic Age culture.

As I mentioned above, no doubt remains as to the existence of a Palaeolithic Age culture, or at least the existence of a late Palaeolithic Age culture, in the Islands of Japan. As a result of the Fujimura fabrication scandal, however, strictly speaking, even the study of the late Palaeolithic Age culture in Japan cannot escape from suspicious criticism. This is, I consider, the second point of the crisis of the Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan.

Because of Serizawa, the first co-worker of Aizawa was the informal intellectual teacher of Fujimura. In the series of excavations of the early Palaeolithic Age archaeological sites in the Tohoku region, Serizawa played the role of theoretical leader, and he gave certification to Fujimura's 'excavations'. Along this way, Serizawa became the 'duke' of institutionalized academic archaeology. Moreover, his university, the Tohoku University, which now ranks as the second-best university in Asia according to Asia Week, also became the excellent center of archaeology, which has a faculty of so-called highly developed technological analysis. The Fujimura fabrication issue, however, might seriously call into question Serizawa's ability as an archaeologist as well as the faculty of the Tohoku University. And then, if one doubts the ability of Serizawa, one must also question the contribution of Aizawa and significance of the Iwajuku site. I think this is the natural logic of a 'domino effect'.

Happily or unhappily, however, according to reports by newspapers in Japan, there is no such voice of question yet. Simply because, I suspect, too many victims of the 'intellectual domino game' would be affected.

As I am pointing out here, the archaeology of the Palaeolithic Age in Japan now has to face a serious crisis, and only a few months ago it was celebrating its 'age of glory'. In order to examine the academic impact of the Fujimura fabrication issue, I would like to introduce such a situation.

Fujimura's most amazing 'excavation' was the discovery of so-called 'buried reservoir sites of stone implements'. According to the reports, Fujimura 'excavated' several sets of stone implements in the condition composing a flat plan at the same level in the stratum of the early Palaeolithic Age. This condition of stone implements, however, is a very rare

appearance, even at Neolithic Age sites. Especially in the case of the early Palaeolithic Age, there were several long glacial periods. Thus Japanese archaeologists had to be more careful about Fujimura's 'excavations'.

By contrast, some archaeologists in Japan interpreted those 'buried reservation sites of stone implements' as follows: "The Pithecanthropus put stone implements in the soil in order to keep them, and then they used them again."

According to major opinion on human evolution, which was based mainly on a survey held in western parts of the Euro-Asian continent, human behaviour, began only about 50 thousand years before present. But Fujimura's 'buried reservation sites of stone implements' were found in stratum between 200 thousand years to 600 thousand years before present.

Thus the interpretation of Fujimura's questionable 'excavation' was already very close to be the foundation of a new theory on the evolution of mankind. According to several archaeologists, who interpreted the excavations in such a manner, the Pithecanthropus of East Asia was more intelligent than the Pithecanthropus of the Western European region. It was a challenge to the theory of archaeology and anthropology, which were mainly developed by Western scientists. In this way, Japanese archaeology of the early Palaeolithic Age had celebrated an 'age of glory'.

On the other hand, in the academic society of the West, the so-called 'Out of Africa' theory, which holds the direct ancestor of present mankind to have originated somewhere in the African continent about 200 thousand years before present, has become increasingly influential among both academicians and the mass media over the past 10 years. No fossil, however, has ever probed this theory, which is based only on results of DNA analysis.

In this meaning, a strict re-examination of stone implements, which were 'excavated' by Fujimura, must be really important, as this will change the direction of argumentation regarding the evolutionary theory of mankind.

Even before the recent disclosure of fabrication, there were some archaeologists who radically criticized the 'excavations' by Fujimura. For instance, in 1986, Fjio Oda and

his group had already written a critical article about the study of the early Palaeolithic Age culture of the islands of Japan. In 1998, Toshiki Takeoka, who completed his graduate study at the 6th University of Paris, wrote a completely negative and radically critical article about Fujimura's 'excavations'. A major point of his criticism was that the so-called stone implements of the early Palaeolithic Age, which Fujimura 'excavated', seemed to be no different from stone implements of the Joumone Jidai (Neolithic Age in Japan). But, as I mentioned above, also the excellent techniques of stone implements, which Fujimura had 'excavated', supported the creation of an image of an intelligent *Pithecanthropus*. Thus, ironically, as with Aizawa, Takeoka's criticism had to face almost perfect neglect from the archaeological society.

Two interconnected technical problems provide the background of this phenomenon. The first problem is the feature of strong acid soil on the islands of Japan. Present-day Japan still has many active volcanoes, producing volcanic ash, which turns to acid soil, which composes the strata associated with the Palaeolithic Age. Hence one could not expect the excavation of fossilized remains of the *Pithecanthropus* on the islands of Japan, and so the excavation of stone implements became the focal point of archaeological survey of Palaeolithic Age culture in Japan. The second problem is the methods of estimating the epochs of stone implements. Although there are various methods of estimating the epochs of other archaeological relics, provided by the natural sciences, these methods cannot actually determine the exact epochs of stone implements. Consequently, the recent fabrication issue of stone implements disclosed a weak point of modern archaeology in Japan.

Even Takeoka, however, has never doubted the existence of the early Palaeolithic Age culture on the islands of Japan. According to him, there were a few genuine stone implements in the early Palaeolithic Age among Fujimura's 'excavated' stone implements collection. In addition, he says that there are several stone implements that belong to the early Palaeolithic Age culture, found at archaeological sites located in the Iwate Prefecture of the Tohoku Region. Fujimura did not participate in the survey of that site, Takeoka is very sure about the existence of early Palaeolithic Age culture in the Tohoku Region.

Anyway, in short words, strict re-examination of stone implements in the Palaeolithic Age in Japan must be the starting point of reconstruction of Japanese archaeology. In

order to accomplish such a task, Japanese archaeologists have already begun to hold special meetings.

In Aizuwakamatsu City in the Fukushima Prefecture of the Tohoku Region, on December 23 and 24, a large gathering of archaeologists from all over the country held a special meeting on the re-examination of stone implements of the early Palaeolithic Age in Eastern Japan. There was a panel discussion after a two-and-a-half hour examination of the stone implements, which included almost all ‘stone implements of the early Palaeolithic Age’ in Eastern Japan. Shuji Harunari, one of the most influential archaeologists in Japan and a professor of the archaeology department of the National Museum of Japanese History and Folklore, has radically pointed several questionable points on stone implements, which Fujimura ‘excavated’. As a result, he has presented a completely negative evaluation of the so-called ‘buried reservoir sites of stone implements’. He believes all of these sites to be the results of Fujimura’s fabrication. In that case, the image of the ‘intelligent Pithecanthropus’ as a fruit of the early Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan in the ‘age of glory’ must be a total illusion.

Although the existence of the early Palaeolithic culture on the islands of Japan could be a certainty, according to Harunari, the image of the ‘intelligent Pithecanthropus’ must be seriously questioned. By contrast, however, two German archaeologists who attended the ‘Forum on the early Palaeolithic culture’, which was held in Chichibu City, Saitama Prefecture on November 11, presented a similar image of the ‘intelligent *Pithecanthropus*’. Basing their stance on the results of their archaeological survey in Germany, they presented the following views: 1) the *Pithecanthropus* could conduct detailed work with stone, 2) they also conducted organized hunting, consequently 3) the *Pithecanthropus* could act with a certain program, and they held quite an excellent faculty for cognition. Thus this report basically suggested the survival of the ‘intelligent *Pithecanthropus*’ on both sides of the Euro-Asian continent. In this case, the theory of the human evolution must be totally re-written. As I pointed out earlier, Fujimura’s archaeological activities suggested this issue, thus he and other colleagues of his have a really heavy responsibility in the quest for the truth of human evolutionary theory.

Anyway, what I have pointed out in this chapter is the profound influence of the Fujimura fabrication issue on the academic world. The reconstruction of the early Palaeolithic Age archaeology will therefore require a very long time as well as great efforts. To be frank,

however, I am very optimistic about the result of the Fujimura fabrication issue. I strongly believe that genuine remarkable development of the early Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan will be known sooner or later. Simply because, as I mentioned earlier, in Japan, there are so many social elements, which affect the development of archeology.

4. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

In chapter 1, I introduced the core story of the archaeology scandal brought about by Fujimura Shinichi. The fabrication of stone implements of the early Palaeolithic Age in Japan. In the context of Japanese society, it was not only a cultural affair, but one which also became a social political issue, which seriously affected many concerned people. In chapter 2, I tried to examine the social-cultural meaning of this scandalous issue. As a result, I suggested that the issue was not Fujimura's private crime, but that it had deep and wide roots in Japanese society, which gives a privileged status to archaeology. In chapter 3, I reflected on the academic history of the Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan, and discussed the scientific impact of the Fujimura fabrication issue. By the issue, radically speaking, Palaeolithic archaeology in Japan has to return to its starting point, which must be a strict re-examination of stone implements of that age. As a result of these efforts, the study of the Palaeolithic Age culture in the islands of Japan will hopefully contribute to the scientific study of human evolution. Although the way will not be easy, the writer of this paper strongly believes in the revival of the Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan, because of the large number of social-cultural elements in Japan which can assist the development of archaeology.

Based on the above discussion, in this chapter, I am going to compare the condition of archaeology in Japan and in the Philippines, and then attempt to suggest lessons which can be learned from it and which may benefit archaeologists in the Philippines.

The first point, which I would like to discuss, is the legal framework of archaeological affairs in Japan. The Japanese person has not only been nicknamed 'economic animal', but also 'archaeological animal'. Because of the logic of the legal system, archaeological survey is given priority in Japan rather than economic development. The Laws in Japan stipulate archaeological survey before any kind of development project. If developers

find any archaeological artefact, or site, they have to report it to administration, and conduct an academic survey at their own expense before continuing their project. This is actually very troublesome for the developer, this I have heard several rumours of developers destroying archaeological sites secretly to avoid archaeological survey. These are really violations of the law, and therefore criminal offenses. I think, however, generally speaking, that the ordinary Japanese usually maintain the spirit of these laws. As a result, due to increasing development projects in Japan, the social need of archaeologists has become immense.

This has actually been the main cause of quantitative development of archaeology in Japan since the 1970s. This phenomenon has two faces, both positive and negative.

The first face is negative, because in most cases developers continued projects after archaeological survey, which means many sites now only exist as 'archaeological survey reports'. Thus archaeologists promoted destroying archaeological sites in Japan. This is the negative aspect.

On the other hand, it also contributed to the discovery of many meaningful archaeological sites and relics. These new facts promoted the qualitative development of archaeology as an academic discipline. Moreover, some of those important sites were saved by people's movements, and became historical monument parks. These are really contributing not only to science and education, but also to national identity and regional development. In addition, these processes promoted archaeology to be a privileged science in both mass media and in cognition among the general population. This is the positive aspect.

I would therefore like to say that archaeology and economic development have a deep interaction. Along the way of economic development, it will not only contribute to the quantitative development of archaeology, but also affect archaeology as a genuine science. Thus archaeologists have to prepare for these complex situations.

As a national strategy, the Philippines is shifting direction toward rapid economic development. I am quite sure it will totally change the situation of archaeology in the Philippines. The mission of Philippine archaeologists must be very demanding. I think their first agenda point must be the establishment of a certain legal framework, which can promote the development of archaeology in their country.

The second point, is the necessity of the support of archaeology by the general population. In chapter 2, I already discussed this aspect of archaeological activities in Japan, thus I will not repeat the details, but in order to call people's attention to archaeology, archaeologists have to consider the importance of public relations. In this way, the contemporary activities of the National Museum of the Philippines, which is trying to organize people interested in archaeology, are significant. In my view, however, efforts to achieve public cognition of archaeology are not yet enough in the Philippines. All archaeologists in the Philippines have to carefully consider the necessity of public relations. In the case of Japan, frontline archaeologists always call public exhibitions of excavation sites, if these are really important. I believe Philippine archaeologists also need to develop and conduct these kinds of activities.

The third point, which I would like to suggest, is of course the need to awake archaeologists themselves. As you know archaeology is not treasure hunting or an activity of rich people for killing time. Moreover it is not only a genuine science to search for useless antiques, but also a sociol-political and economic issue, as I have demonstrated in this paper. It has to play an important role in a certain society. It has to promote the people's pride of their hometowns. And then, archaeology of course has academic aims, which contribute to the progress of human knowledge. In short, archaeologists have to carry the heavy burden of their missions and their great responsibility to their society. This is also a source of happiness to an archaeologist as a person. With the help of the consciousness I described above being awakened, I believe Philippine archaeologists can spend a more meaningful academic life as more useful scientists. And then they can provide social hope to the people in the Philippines.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

In this paper, I did not use any English materials, thus native English speakers who do not read Japanese may have no way of accessing basic materials. In addition, since I am in the Philippines at present, I could not conduct a complete survey and cross-check the materials concerned. Thus I had to depend on my personal memories in some instances. Although it cannot be perfect, I would like to add some bibliographical notes here for readers who want to pursue further study.

Since Mainichi-shinbun conducted their special investigation and scooped their story, the basic source of the Fajimura fabrication issue must be found in Mainichi-shinbun, especially the November 2000 issues. Due to the above, however, I could use only very limited reports on Mainichi-shinbun, as I had no access to the newspaper in the Philippines. I used Asahi-shinbun as the main source of my discussions in this paper. Below are the following references of Japanese newspapers.

- 1) Mainichi-shinbun, November 6, 2000, morning edition
- 2) Asahi shinbun, November 6, 2000, morning edition
- 3) Sports Nippon, November 6, 2000
- 4) Mainichi shinbun, November 6, 2000, evening edition
- 5) Yomiur shinbun, November 6, 2000, evening edition
- 6) Asahi shinbun, November 7, 2000, morning edition
- 7) Asahi shinbun November 8, 2000, morning edition
- 8) Asahi shinbun, November 9, 2000, morning edition
- 9) Asahi shinbun, November 10, 2000, morning edition
- 10) Asahi shinbun, November 11, 2000, morning edition
- 11) Asahi Shinbun, November 12, 2000, morning edition
- 12) Asahi shinbun, December 25, 2000, morning edition
- 13) Asahi shinbun, December 25, 2000, morning edition

I have based on Chousuke Serizawa's Nippon Kyusekki Jidai (Palaeolithic Age in the Islands of Japan) [Iwanani shinsho, Iwanani sboten], as the principal source of the history of Palaeolithic archaeology in Japan. The readers can find detailed story of Tadahiro Aizwa in this book. Since I am in the Philippines at present, my description in the paper based on my personal memory. I hope I did not make a mistake.

I did not mention other fields of Japanese archaeology in the paper. In my view, however, condition of other fields of Japanese archaeology especially condition of Jomon Age archaeology, have strong interaction with condition of Palaeolithic Age archaeology in Japan.