Difference, Representation, Positionality : An Examination of the Politics of Contemporary Ainu Images

Difference, Representation, Positionality:
An Examination of the Politics of Contemporary Ainu Images

TAKASHI KINASE

Tokyo University

The essentialistic images of "people together with the nature" have been formulated in the contemporary representation of the Ainu. Such imagery, originating the discourse of the dominant (ethnic Japanese, or '*Wajin*'), was used in a negative sense, connoting a state of primitiveness or savagery. However, the Ainu themselves have positively re-contextualized this image, reflecting some peripheral movements. In this process, the imagery is used or manipulated, mirroring the divergence and the multi-centralization of 'positions of narration', and reversely the convergence of ethnic images ideated from diverse positions. This process has become especially evident since the 1970s. It can be understood, through this examination of the nexus between the dominant discourse, and the Ainu discourse of distinctiveness, that this process is not a 'polyphonic' posture, in which alternative 'voices' are acquired in opposition to the dominant narratives, but as 'heterophonic', in which a single representation issues from diverse positions while taking on different styles and meanings.

INTRODUCTION

The essentialist image of 'people together with nature' has been current within both the domestic (Japanese) and international discourses concerning indigenous peoples since the 1980s. It is present not merely in the context of movements but also in representations in the popular media. The stereotypical narrative on the Ainu as a 'hunting-and-gathering' people who are close to 'nature' originated from the discourses developed in past Ainu Studies, which, in a sense, supported the assimilation policies and authorised scientifically the negative viewpoint of the dominant society [KINASE 1997]. However, the values associated with these representations have been reversed among the Ainu themselves, and thus they have developed an alternative discourse of self-imagery.

It is sometimes said that the turning point in the Ainu indigenous movement was in the 1960s to 70s [HANAZAKI 1996]. Ainu images were also reversed in this period; in a general way, it could be expressed as a 'compromise with assimilationism to awakening and recovery of difference or dignity'. It is quite a simple scheme, but is it true? The positionality of the narratives as to Ainu images and the disposition of the 'cultural' or 'ethnic' representations in the discourses have to be examined. I discuss these problems in

this paper with the 1960s to 70s as a reference point.

DISCOURSES OF 'ASSIMILATION': BEFORE THE 1960s

The image of the Ainu as a hunting-and-gathering society goes far back into history. But the notion of Ainu being represented as 'people together with nature' in a positive light is, needless to say, a fairly recent phenomenon. Before the 1970s, the image of being with 'nature' carried the negative nuance of being 'primitive'. These images had existed in the self-presentation narratives by the Ainu for a long time.

The Ainu, as the colonial policies of the Meiji government proceeded, became deprived of their resources and livelihood, and their serious poverty came into question in the 1880s. In the next decade, legislation to 'protect' the Ainu was discussed and eventually the 'Hokkaido Former Natives Protection Act' (Hokkaido Kyūdojin Hogo Ho) was enacted in 1899. According to this Act, land for farming (no more than 15,000 *tsubo*, 49,590 m² per household) was 'granted' to the Ainu who engaged or wished to engage in agriculture. But the lands granted were often unsuitable for farming. Even if not so bad, they should be confiscated unless cultivated after 15 years from the date of grant, and moreover selling or transferring the lands was restricted. Affiliated with the Protection Act, the 'Rules of Education for the Children of the Former Natives' was enacted in 1901. These Rules were programmed to 'endow' the Ainu children with Japanese 'Imperial' education, although separately from Japanese children. The schools founded according this policy were called 'Kyūdojin Gakkō' (Former Natives' School); education was more simplified than that of Japanese children and had a tendency to vocationalism. The Ainu were sometimes described in many documents, whether official or officious, as 'unenlightened' and following an irresistible course of 'the survival of the fittest'. Therefore it goes without saying that these policies were in essence discriminatory.

It was in the late 1920s to 30s that Ainu people came to present self-images more frequently and strongly. Some Ainu people had already published several works written in Japanese. Through the education policy, the educational participation of Ainu children had already been heightened to a considerable degree; the enrolment rate turned up to 90 percent or above in the early 1910s [OGAWA 1997]. An official report in 1929 said, 'there are few people who use Ainu language at the present day; the young in general don't know it' [HOKKAIDO-CHO GAKUMU-BU SHAKAI-KA 1980 (1929): 3]. Some comparatively young Ainu, such as Chiri Yukie, Iboshi Hokuto, Batchelor Yaeko [following the Japanese custom, personal names are written with the family name first], adopted poetic Japanese for the styles of their writings and presented their self-expression as 'Ainu' through their 'Japanese literature'.

The organisation of the Ainu group was also characteristic of this age. The Hokkaido Ainu Association (Hokkaido Ainu Kyōkai) was founded under the control of the Hokkaido government in 1930 and issued '*Ezo no Hikari*' (The Light of Yezo) as its organ. In these publications, assimilation and amalgamation into a 'Japanese nation' was advocated by the Ainu themselves under the name 'virtue of self-discipline', and the discriminatory treatment against the Ainu under the Protection Act was vehemently denounced. Some activist groups,

such as the 'North Seas Regeneration Group' (Hokkai Shōgun Koseidan), mightily affirmed identification of themselves as 'subjects of the Emperor' with a spirit of 'Japanese' nationalism. This era in the history of the Ainu movements is often defined as the age of 'exaltation of identity and devotion to fascism' [KAIHO 1992: 127]. The Protection Act was largely revised in 1937: the limitation of transferring the lands was loosened and Kyūdojin Gakkō were abolished. The revision was partly the fruit of Ainu movements, while the government maintained that the assimilation policies had been 'accomplished'.

The assimilation of the Ainu seemed to have been almost 'accomplished' by then, but this was not exactly true. Now we should understand that the concept of 'assimilation' and that of 'autonomy' were not contrastively represented in these discourses. It seems contradictory, but indeed for them, their affirmation of 'assimilation' was a conscious expression of 'autonomy' in itself. Morris-Suzuki has discussed, with the example of the discourse written on 'Ezo no Hikari' by Konobu Kotaro of Shiranuka, that their advocacy of 'self-improvement' was really aimed at 'the name of the Ainu themselves'. It reflected the idea retained by the Ainu that self-creation as part of the Japanese nation would 'fertilise' their sense of ethnic identity [MORRIS-SUZUKI 2000: Chap. 5; KONOBU 1994 (1930)]. This was quite different from the plot framed by the dominant society, which purposed to transform the Ainu into 'Wajin' (i.e. ethnic Japanese).

When the discourses surrounding the Ainu of this period are reviewed generally, it can be observed that both the activist Ainu and the dominant society superficially seemed to co-operate in constituting the same narrative. Both discourses had a common tendency to 'differentiation', paradoxically, through the narrative of 'assimilation'. However, they implied diametrically opposed termini. The narrative of the Ainu emphasised self-dignity through 'seeking assimilation', while the advertisement of 'fruition of assimilation' which had been constantly framed by the dominant society accented the image of Ainu difference. This variance can be regarded as an important factor that aroused the images of difference in later periods.

Nevertheless, the representation of a 'cultural' difference of the Ainu was seldom demonstrated in a positive sense. This can be attributed to the fact that the main paradigm through which the Ainu were envisaged and represented was not a 'culture' or 'ethnic group', but a 'race'. Narratives of self-representation by the Ainu also included the viewpoint of 'racial equality', by which the Ainu were regarded as people who had 'equal ability' to that of the Wajin (ethnic Japanese). This idea urged the Ainu to identify themselves not with 'the past Ainu'—the words of Chiri Mashiho, an Ainu linguist born in 1909—but with 'the Ainu of the present and the future', who 'directly inherit the Japanese culture, breaking through the shell of tradition which brings contempt and dishonour' [CHIRI 1981(1937): 167].

This trend continued for a long while. In 1946, The Hokkaido Ainu Association restarted as a corporate group in Sapporo, but it was a prolongation of the pre-war organisation. Soon it came up against the doldrums. The Land Reform legislation (1946) brought about the loss of approximately 40 percent of the arable land owned by Ainu. The Association lobbied for excluding their land from the application of the reform, but failed. Since then, almost no record of the activity of the Association was left until April 1960,

when the general assembly for 'reestablishment' of the Association was held. It was in 1961 that the Hokkaido Ainu Association was renamed the 'Hokkaido Utari Kyōkai'—utar means 'the same group'—, because of a widespread anxiety among the Ainu that the word 'Ainu' might arouse further discrimination.

THE DIVERGENCE AND THE MULTI-CENTRALISATION OF POSITIONALITY

Since about the 1970s, there have emerged diverse movements among the Ainu, which aim to establish self-dignity. In 1968, when the centennial of 'the Opening of Hokkaido' (Hokkaido Kaitaku) was observed, a movement was stimulated among the emerging Ainu groups against praise for 'development' and concealing the existence of the Ainu. The success of the Centennial was an incentive also for some movements that arose later.

Those movements were, however, pursued with different, or individual styles and meanings, and each of them came soon to have its own centrality, independent of the older ones. Such divergence and multi-centralisation of positionality began to crystallise when the abolition of the Protection Act was suggested at the conference of all the mayors of Hokkaido in June 1970. Against this suggestion, the Hokkaido Utari Association general assembly voted for the continued existence of the Act, from the viewpoint that it could be utilised as grounds for claiming special welfare policies. Later this became the source of the movement for a new law, which would in turn lay down new government policies concerning the Ainu. There lay behind this trend the heightening dissatisfaction with the measures which had been taken for the Ainu, including 'Utari Welfare Programme' (Utari Fukushi Taisaku) launched in 1974.

On the contrary, however, the Asahikawa Ainu Conference (Asahikawa Ainu Kyogikai), which was founded in November 1972, declared its position for the abolition of the Protection Act, with the notion of sweeping all discrimination from the general 'Japanese nation'. Monbetsu Kaoru, the leader of the Conference of the day, remarked that the abolition of the Act was a different kind of problem from one of economic aid for the Ainu, and that the Ainu should stand with the position of fundamental human rights proclaimed in the Constitution [Monbetsu 1973: 2]. He meant that the recovery of Ainu dignity should not be linked with claims for special welfare measures. The opinion for the abolition of the Protection Act had been the mainstream among Asahikawa Ainu people because the provision of lands according to the Act was not normally executed there. It was also the mayor of Asahikawa City who proposed in the conference mentioned above that the Act be abolished.

The Welfare Programme was an offshoot of a welfare programme for the discriminated 'Burakumin' ('Dowa Taisaku Jigyo Tokubetsu Sochi Ho' [Special Measures Act]), enacted in July 1969. The link with the Buraku Liberation movements can be partially recognised in the Ainu movements of the pre-war days [Osaka Jinken Rekishi Shiryokan 1993; Ogawa and Yamada 1998]. That was sometimes the case in the post-war period, too. For example, after the Hokkaido Utari Association was re-organised in 1960s, some Ainu leaders attempted to co-operate with the Buraku movement in order to share similar goals with government-funded projects [Sugawara 1966: 219]. The alignment with some movements

outside the Ainu, whether democratic or socialist, had been mainly made to derive new measures from the government, to pull the living standard of the Ainu people up to the same level as *Wajin*.

Newer forms of alignment with various movements, such as labour movements or ecology movements, arose one after another and accelerated the divergence of various Ainu 'narrating positions' in 1970s. Ainu people with an 'Ainu flag'—designed by Sunazawa Bikki, an Ainu artist born in Asahikawa—voluntarily participated in the May Day parade in Sapporo in 1973. Also, the Date branch of the Hokkaido Utari Association, independently of the central organisation, launched a counter-movement against the construction of Date Thermal Power Station, which had been planned since about 1970 [ANUTARI AINU KANKOKAI 1973a]. Besides, Ainu people living in urban areas began organising at this time: the Young Ainu Society (Peure Utari no Kai) in 1965, the Tokyo Ainu Association (Tōkyō Utari Kai, later Kanto Utari Kai) in 1972, the Ishikari branch of the Utari Association (later the Sapporo branch) in 1971, and so on. The newspaper *'Anutari Ainu'* (We Ainu) came out in June 1973, and the Yai Yukara Ainu Research Group (Yai Yukara Ainu Minzoku Gakkai) was founded in November of the same year. Younger people and women began to take part in these movements; this trend remains current today.

Varied social experiments emerged, and these were not always under the influence of the older movements. Most of the leaders of the Hokkaido Utari Association had their roots in rural communities, and in some cases, had succeeded economically in the dominant society. These 'successful' Ainu were almost without exception male, and of the older generation [SIDDLE 1996: 172-173]. The motives of the older people often did not coincide with those of the new movements of the 1970s; it reflected the divergent interests of the respective groups, many of which were based on non-rural and trans-regional networks. At the general assembly of the Hokkaido Utari Association in July 1973, some disagreement erupted about the question whether or not the name of the association should be returned to Hokkaido 'Ainu' Kyokai. Another disagreement was about whether the activities of the association should apply to the Ainu who were living outside Hokkaido, etc. [ANUTARI AINU KANKOKAI 1973b]. Especially for the groups that were eager to assert their ethnic identity and to create extended solidarity among themselves, the character of the Hokkaido Utari Association at that time, which pretended to avoid political problems, was nothing but an object of criticism.

The plural political stances among the conflicting movements, however, cannot be dismissed only as antagonism between the radical and the conservative; the former would affirm ethnic difference, and the latter retained some tendencies toward assimilation into the mainstream of the dominant *Wajin* society. Such an 'either/or' interpretation does not reflect accurately their differences. On the contrary, the self-presentation and identity of the Ainu involved some slippage between the dominant category 'Japanese nation *(Nihonjin)*', and the particular category 'the Ainu'. Each movement aimed at its own 'dignity', which they imagined existed at the boundary between the two. This kind of diversity was created not so much by any internal factor of Ainu people themselves as by an external one and the general context of Japanese society.

THE CONVERGENCE OF ETHNIC REPRESENTATIONS

While diverse movements emerged and set forth their ethnic dignity in different styles, there came into existence among the active Ainu some motives for the general alignment of the various positions. The *Zenkoku Ainu Kataru Kai* (Pan-Japan Ainu forum) in January 1973 reflects such an orientation. Despite the variety and the unconformity of social and political stances, they began to assemble under the common flag of 'Ainu dignity'. According to this trend, the ethnic representations that various movements were producing began to converge, a trend seemingly contradictory to the divergent and multi-centric situation.

In the 1970s, eagerness to present an 'essential' or 'authentic' Ainu culture was heightened, and the representation of 'culture' (not 'race') became more important in projecting a positive self-image of Ainu people. Condemnation of the 'Ainu Kankō' (Ainu tourism) was pronounced more strongly than before, because tourism treated Ainu culture as entertainment and spectacle, far from 'authentic'. At about the same time, some movements emphasised the value of being conscious of tradition and preservation of the Ainu culture. The generation that had inherited traditional Ainu culture as *habitus* had already grown old then, and the anxiety about succession to the ethnic heritage heightened. In connection with this trend, the revision of the 'Cultural Heritage Protection Act' (Bunkazai Hogo Ho) in June 1975 brought about the adoption of traditional Ainu dances as non-material heritage of folk culture (Mukei Minzoku Bunkazai). In the same year, Kayano Shigeru was given the Kikuchi Kan Award for his achievements in preserving the oral traditions of the Ainu. Some indications of appreciation of Ainu culture could be detected in this period.

Over and above, however, the paradigm shift of the anti-establishment movements, though they were exterior to the so-called 'Ainu problem' itself, should be taken into consideration as a background of new forceful narratives concerning the Ainu culture. For minority movements, one of the most important foci of strategy is how to draw the understanding and the sympathy of the majority. On this account, it is essential that the factors on the side of the dominant society, receiving the presentation of the minorities issue, be examined in detail.

The leftist movements in Japan until the 1960s had some limitations, characterised as they were by universalism, evolutionism, and anti-American nationalism. These had prevented them from questioning the epistemic framework of modernism and the general idea of the homogeneity of '*Nihonjin*' (Japanese nation), and therefore from touching on the actual problems surrounding the Ainu. Assimilation and amalgamation of the Ainu into a 'Japanese nation' had never been disputed. In the 1970s, however, when the anti-establishment movements came to a critical turning point, some groups connected with a new *problématique* appeared. These included ecologism and Third World-ism, reflecting the contemporary global situation. Agitation by Ota Ryu, a *Wajin* writer born in 1930, was one of those queer variants. He had been a Trotskyist at the beginning and later put forward 'Ainu Revolution', namely a 'retreat' into the world of arch-communism. He also called it 'Yukara Sekai ' (Yukar World)—Yukar is the most famous epic of the Ainu, and sometimes, even now, used as a symbol of the Ainu culture, especially its spiritual aspect [Ota 1973].

On one hand, Ota's agitation influenced some ultra-leftists, who were mostly *Wajin*, into becoming committed to the 'Ainu Kaiho Undo' (Ainu Liberation movements) and indulged in bomb terrorism. As a whole, most Ainu did not accept these movements. Or rather, there arose great anxiety among the Ainu that the Ainu movement in general might become stigmatised. On the other hand, however, the new trend of leftist movements did not reside merely in such 'extremists'. Movements such as soft-shelled reformism, following the slump of the leftists, presented the concept that Ainu culture could be appreciated as an alternative life-style to relativise modern civilisation. Ota was just an opportunistic agitator even when the bomb affairs arose, and soon also became famous for advocating fanatic ecologism after the declination of leftists. He and his comrades founded the 'Ainu Culture Association' in Shizunai and attempted to practice an organic diet and to learn an Ainu life-style, which they supposed was essentially symbiotic with 'nature' [PON HUCHI 1992 (1980)].

Yuki Shoji, one of the most radical Ainu at that time, forming an alliance with Ota at the inception, organised the Ainu Kaihō Dōmei (Ainu Liberation League) and later became antagonistic to Ota. The influence of the post-60s movements can be found especially in Yuki's terminology. Above all, the term '*Ainu Moshiri (Mosiri)*'—Mosir means land or world—, which Ota and his followers used repeatedly in their slogan 'the liberation of *Ainu Moshiri* and the creation of the Ainu Republic', has become established as a common term in the discourses of various movements surrounding the Ainu after the 1970s. Here was developed a new connotation of 'the Mother Earth', where the Ainu people have lived in 'harmony with nature' and without any alienation. Yuki played an important role in the diffusion of such a nostalgic representation [SIDDLE 1996:176; YUKI 1997].

Here we can see an aspect of conversion in which the idea of 'race' retreated and in its place 'culture' appeared as the paradigm of knowledge about the Ainu. The image of 'people symbiotic with nature', which Yuki repeatedly proposed, had functioned until then as a strangling discourse which transfixed the Ainu people in the image of 'primitive hunter-gatherers'. This image was supported by an essentialist idea that the difference between the Ainu and 'Japanese' was quite 'natural' and innate, and that therefore it would never be changed; it is the very idea of 'race'. Countering this 'racialised' image [MILES 1989; 1993; cf. YOSHINO 1997: chap. 6], the attempt to regain the position of narrating their own culture and to seat it in the context of positive values can be explained as 'de-racialisation', to shake off the yoke of the disvalued semantics of the dominant society.

Herewith, it is important to take into account the studies of Ainu culture as a factor in formulating and authorising such essentialist images. The discourses of these studies had been organised under the apprehension that Ainu culture was in the process of assimilating and therefore 'dying' into the *Wajin* society. It was natural that the 'imperialist nostalgia' [ROSALDO 1989: 68-87] moved some scholars—such as Kindaichi Kyosuke—to concentrate their interest on 'vanishing' culture: usually, on idyllic folklore or literature such as Yukar, rather than on social or political aspects. Such discourses de-contextualise the representation of Ainu culture from the contemporary 'dailyness' in which they exist as a 'Japanese nation'. The reality of Ainu people has often been concealed with nostalgic and otherworldly narratives, which have transformed 'Ainu culture' into objectified symbols that were

appropriated for fragmented and context-free discourse [KINASE 1997: 8-9].

The idea of '*Ainu Moshiri*' as Mother Earth, which Yuki and his followers presented, sounds like the nostalgic and essentialist discourses of Ainu Studies (by '*Wajin*'). But the values given to such a representation were reversed, and the images of the Ainu culture were re-contextualised in the self-presentment of the Ainu. They were presented as the difference, which would shake the roots of the identity of '*Nihonjin*' as a homogeneous 'nation'.

Contrastively, it is more noteworthy that such a context-free representation has various meanings in the respective contexts where it would be presented or imagined. The symbol of 'culture' can be appropriated beyond the diversity of political stances. One example is the recent Asahikawa case . The Asahikawa Ainu Conference had objected to the new legislation (so called 'Ainu Shimpo') that the Utari Association had demanded since the 1980s, because some leaders of the Conference insisted that any claim for economical privilege be refused in order to recover Ainu dignity. However, the proposal for legislation was adopted at the general meeting of the Utari Association in May 1984, including the establishment of 'The Ainu Independence Fund' as well as the elimination of discrimination and the promotion of Ainu culture and education. In the end, 'An Act for the Promotion of Ainu Culture, the Spread of Knowledge Relevant to Ainu Traditions, and an Education Campaign' (so called 'Ainu Bunka Ho' or Ainu Culture Promotion Law) was enacted in 1997, which did not include an article on the fund. The Asahikawa Conference abandoned their stance of objection to the new Act, and took the stance that they could accommodate it because the legislation was limited only to 'culture'.

Moreover, the so-called 'ordinary' Ainu people, who are not so interested in political matters and lead their daily lives as 'ordinary' Japanese, give the represetation of 'culture' a different connotation from the radical Ainu; that is a domestic difference within the category of the 'Japanese nation'. In the case of ordinary Ainu, the symbol of 'Ainu' or 'Ainu culture' would be manipulable as a part of the personality of the individual Ainu; it exists in each imagination and does not conflict with his/her actual life or *total* identity. This may be interpreted as a process of creative 'acquirement' rather than 'discovery' of a pre-given existence. Thus the representation of Ainu culture as an ethnic symbol became shared among many Ainu, who give various meanings to its representation.

CONCLUSION

I have discussed the development of the divergence, the multi-centralisation of positionality and the convergence of ethnic images ideated from these diverse positions, which crystallised since about 1970s in the politics of Ainu identity. Narratives presented by minorities seem to be apprehended as a 'polyphonic' posture, in which the alternative 'voice' is counterposed against the dominant narratives. If this scheme were applied to the historical conjuncture of the Ainu, it could be taken, as mentioned in the introduction of this paper, for a change 'from compromise with assimilationism to awakening and recovery of difference or dignity'. It is based on the mythical notion of a unilinear development of enlightenment. Instead, from the prospect on the nexus between the discourses narrated by the majority and the presentation of difference by the Ainu, we should understand it to be 'heterophonic'.

Like the heterophonic music of Yukar, a single melody/representation is expressed by plural speakers with different styles. The minorities appropriate the dominant representations that the majorities produce, even though the positionality is not shared. In such a context, what should be questioned is, strictly speaking, not 'what they narrate' at all, but the socio-political structure that arouses the whole conjuncture of discourses.

The movements which the Hokkaido Utari Association have pursued in the context of cultural representation since the 1970s may be assessed as having been successful in rallying its members, who had diversified standpoints according to their political and economic backgrounds [cf. SIDDLE 1996: chap. 7]. Indeed, the global alliance with the international movements of indigenous peoples, especially in the United Nations after the 1980s, has fortified the convergence on the Ainu image that they are 'an ethnic group which possesses its own tradition and culture different from the majority Japanese (*Wajin*)'. This position is given support by some progressive *Wajin* domestic groups, and also coincides with the rhetoric of 'the indigenous people', who are entitled to a certain right of self-determination.

Nonetheless, creation of ethnic images through the symbol of culture does not always solidify people of various positions. For example, the arrangement for re-labelling the Utari Association the 'Hokkaido Ainu Kyokai' on the occasion of the enactment of the Ainu Culture Promotion Law was cancelled because of disapproval expressed by many members of the association. This was due to anxiety against deep-seated discrimination associated with the term 'Ainu'. Such a case implies that critical politics lies yet in the phase in which images of ethnic difference are represented. This conjuncture after the enactment of the New Law is in progress even now.

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

ANUTARI AINU KANKOKAI（アヌタリアイヌ刊行会）

1973a Don't Pollute the Sea of Usu!: Ainu Fishermen against Date Thermal Power Station. *Anutari Ainu: Warera Ningen* (Sapporo: Anutari Ainu Kanko Kai) 1: 1-2.（「特集・座談会 有珠の海を汚すな！──伊達火力発電所建設に反対するアイヌの漁民たち」『アヌタリアイヌ われら人間』（アヌタリアイヌ刊行会）1: 1-2.）

1973b Feature of the General Assembly of the Utari Association: We are Still Far Away from Alignment and Solidarity. *Anutari Ainu: Warera Ningen* (Sapporo: Anutari Ainu Kanko Kai) 3: 1-2.（「特集・ウタリ協会総会 連帯と団結への道は未だ遠く」『アヌタリアイヌ われら人間』（アヌタリアイヌ刊行会）3: 1-2.）

CHIRI, Mashiho (ed.) （知里真志保編）

    1981(1937) *Ainu Folktales*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. （『アイヌ民譚集』東京：岩波書店.）

HANAZAKI, Kohei （花崎皋平）

    1996   Recovery of Ainu Moshiri: The Indigenous People of Japan and Governmental Measures Concerning the Ainu. In S. Inoue, et al. (eds.), *Contemporary Sociology Vol. 15: The Sociology of Discrimination and Symbiosis*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. pp. 93-108. （「ア イヌモシリの回復――日本の先住民族アイヌと日本国家の対アイヌ政策」『岩波 講座 現代社会学15 差別と共生の社会学』（井上俊ほか編）東京：岩波書店. pp. 93-108.）

HOKKAIDO-CHO GAKUMU-BU SHAKAI-KA （北海道庁学務部社会課）

    1980(1929) General Conditions of the Natives. In M. Kono (ed.), *Collected Materials on Ainu History* Vol.1. Sapporo: Hokkaido Shuppan Kikaku Centre. （『土人概要』『アイヌ史資 料集』第1巻（河野本道選）札幌：北海道出版企画センター.）

KAIHO, Yoko （海保洋子）

    1992   *Modern History of the Northern Regions: Ainu People, and Women*. Tokyo: San'ichi Shobo. （『近代北方史――アイヌ民族と女性と』三一書房.）

KINASE, Takashi （木名瀬高嗣）

    1997   Representation and Politics: A Sketch of Anthropological Discourses Surrounding the Ainu. *The Japanese Journal of Ethnology* 62 (1): 1-21. （「表象と政治性――アイヌを めぐる文化人類学的言説に関する素描」『民族学研究』62 (1): 1-21.）

    1998   The Heterophony of Otherness: A Prospect on Contemporary Ainu Images. *The Japanese Journal of Ethnology* 63 (2): 182-191. （「他者性のヘテロフォニー――現代のアイヌ イメージをめぐる考察」『民族学研究』63 (2): 182-191.）

KONOBU, Kotaro （小信小太郎）

    1994(1930) Urging the Awakening of Our People. In Hokkaido Utari Kyokai (ed.), *Ainu History: The History of Activities of the Hokkaido Ainu/Utari Association*. Sapporo: Hokkaido Shuppan Kikaku Center. pp. 30-32. （「同族の喚起を促す」『アイヌ史 北海道アイヌ 協会／北海道ウタリ協会活動史編』（北海道ウタリ協会編）札幌：北海道出版企 画センター. pp.30-32.）

MILES, Robert

    1989   *Racism*. London and New York: Routledge.

    1993   *Racism after 'Race Relations'*. London and New York: Routledge.

MONBETSU, Kaoru （門別薫）

    1973   What Have the Authorities and the Administration Done? *Anutari Ainu: Warera Ningen* (Sapporo: Anutari Ainu Kanko Kai) 4: 1-2. （「権力と行政は何をしてきたか」『アヌタ リアイヌ われら人間』（アヌタリアイヌ刊行会）4: 1-2.）

MORRIS-SUZUKI, Tessa （モーリス－鈴木、テッサ）

    2000 『辺境から眺める――アイヌが経験する近代』東京：みすず書房. （*Viewing from Periphery: The Modernity the Ainu Have Experienced*. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobo.）

OGAWA, Masahito （小川正人）

    1997   *A Study on the Modern History of the Education for the Ainu*. Sapporo: Hokkaido Daigaku Tosho Kankokai. （『近代アイヌ教育制度史研究』札幌：北海道大学図書刊 行会.）

OGAWA, Masahito and Shin'ichi YAMADA (eds.)（小川正人・山田伸一共編）

    1998   *Documents on Modern Ainu People*. Tokyo: Sofukan.（『アイヌ民族 近代の記録』草風館.）

OSAKA JINKEN REKISHI SHIRYOKAN (ed.)（大阪人権歴史資料館編）

    1993   *Modern Japan and Ainu People*. Osaka: Osaka Jinken Rekishi Shiryokan.（『近代日本とアイヌ民族』大阪：大阪人権歴史資料館.）

OTA, Ryu（太田竜）

    1973   *On Ainu Revolution: 'Retreat' to the Yukara World*. Tokyo: Shinsensha.（『アイヌ革命論──ユーカラ世界への＜退却＞』東京：新泉社.）

PON Huchi（ホン・フチ）

    1992(1980) *Roads to Ureshipa Moshiri*. Tokyo: Shinsensha.（『改訂版 ウレシパモシリへの道』東京：新泉社.）

ROSALDO, Renato

    1989   *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.

SIDDLE, Richard

    1996   *Race, Resistance and the Ainu of Japan*. London and New York: Routledge.

SUGAWARA, Kosuke（菅原幸助）

    1966   *The Contemporary Ainu: Romantics of a People in Transition*. Tokyo: Genbunsha.（『現代のアイヌ──民族移動のロマン』東京：現文社.）

YOSHINO, Kosaku（吉野耕作）

    1997   *The Sociology of Cultural Nationalism: The Direction of the Identity in Contemporary Japan*. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.（『文化ナショナリズムの社会学──現代日本のアイデンティティの行方』名古屋：名古屋大学出版会.）

YUKI, Shoji（結城庄司）

    1997   *Arguments: The Posthumous Works of Yuki Shoji*. Tokyo: Sofukan.（『結城庄司遺稿──チャランケ』東京：草風館.）