Contemporary Tradition: Reconfiguring Ainu Culture in Modern Japan

MELISSA KENNEDY

Over the past forty years, indigenous peoples in several first-world nations have made themselves heard, chronicling their sides of national histories of colonisation, and challenging their objectification as ethnological curiosities, in such stereotypes as the noble savage, the backwards and dying race. Despite differences of invasion and settlement patterns, autochthones' experiences of settler colonisation share many similarities. Through the global trend for re-assertion of indigenous culture which has gathered momentum since the 1960s, American Indian, Canadian First Nations and Inuit, Australian Aborigines and Maori of Aotearoa-New Zealand have won respect and recognition. On the national level, acknowledgement has led to significant social, economic and political gains, while international interest in indigenous cultures has stimulated renewed pride in the preservation and continuation of traditions and customs. The history of Ainu resistance in northern Japan shares commonalities with those more well-known in the Anglophone and postcolonial world[1]. Ainu demands for acceptance of their unique culture has followed a similar pattern, with governmental recognition culminating in the June 2008 Diet official recognition of Ainu as an indigenous people possessing a distinct culture, language and religion. While real cultural and economic gains are yet to register, Ainu achievement is remarkable in a national environment dominated by an ideology of cultural homogeneity and harmony, best expressed in the nationalist ideology *Nihonjinron*. Indeed, in other cases of Japanese minority discrimination and mistreatment, including internal Burakumin and Ryukyuan communities, and colonial exploitation and war victimisation of Koreans and Chinese, the government has repeatedly proven reluctant to acknowledge historical fault, much less to apologise or correct the history books. In regards to the Ainu, Japan has long defended its mono-cultural stance by claiming that the modern day Ainu have assimilated, leaving only residual relics in museums and deployed in tourism.

This article outlines two recent examples of Ainu self-representation that demonstrate the contemporary relevance of Ainu cultural traditions in the present. The first case study, of the way Ainu curators display their past in the Poroto Kotan museum in Shiraoi, Hokkaido, illustrates how the momentous and devastating lose of cultural knowledge through generations of assimilationist policy has, paradoxically, enabled

[1] Certainly, there are also many differences between Ainu and indigenous cultures in former British colonies. One major difficulty facing Ainu is that several of the special indigenous traits espoused by the UN and featured in high profile cultures such as American First Nations and Maori, including a profound connection with the land, an emphasis on emotion, and a pantheistic spirituality, are already mobilised as characteristics of Japanese-ness (Clammer 64-66). As John Clammer's nuanced text, *Japan and Its Others* argues, Japanese minorities cannot expect to express their difference from the mainstream by simply adopting Western practices. The unique circumstances that make Japan at once part of modernity without having passed through the keystones of Western modernity (such as Judeo-Christian individuation, the Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, Western philosophy and settler colonisation), and the repercussions of this on culture, citizenship and minority discourses, are worth investigating.

Ainu to avoid their own historicisation. The way in which the past is constantly updated in the terms of the present, realigned or even re-invented in response to contemporary demands and expectations, exemplifies that which Australian critic, Stephen Muecke, terms 'indigenous modernity' (75). The second case study, of a recent and successful initiative into Ainu ecotourism, illustrates the changing dynamics of influence and power that today undermine the hegemony of the nation-state. Ainu interaction with other indigenous peoples, and their participation in international forums such as the United Nations and UNESCO, demonstrate the ways in which globalisation shapes national and local decisions and policy. These two examples of self-expression show Ainu culture to be very much a 'live' culture, constantly evolving in response to changing pressures; translating tradition into contemporary modes of expression which are relevant and of growing interest to Japanese and young Ainu today.

Many postcolonial settler nations recognise their indigenous populations, with varying degrees of legislation addressing such issues as land reparation, improvement of socio-economic conditions, autonomy of representation, and protection and transmission of traditions and customs. On an international level, the United Nations has provided guidelines for the definition, protection and rights of indigenous peoples since the late 1970s[2]. Ainu representatives have participated in the UN Working Group of Indigenous Peoples since 1987, an important support forum through which Ainu have drafted their proposals to the Japanese government. However, the Ainu assertion of a maintained cultural difference from the dominant ethnic Japanese (Wajin) is less clear cut than in colonised nations with distinct arrival narratives of discovery, conquest and settlement. At the same time as Ainu insist on the ongoing existence of their language, religion and customs, despite around a thousand years of recorded contact, Japanese scholars downplay that difference[3]. Unlike other indigenous cultures whose presence clearly predates invasion and settlement, the genetic difference between Ainu and Japanese is also unclear. While the concept of race is rarely evoked in connection with cultural and ethnic difference in Western analysis, in Japan the debate over the origins and movement of Neolithic, proto-Japanese is hotly contested. Certainly, a desire to unearth an archaeological history that is internally cohesive and preferably advanced vis-à-vis other (excluded) Asian civilisations is closely linked with the ideology defined in *Nihonjinron* (Befu 41-44). Furthermore, and as part of nationalism's legitimating impulse, to prove that Ainu and Japanese are genetically related would negate the Ainu claim for indigenous primacy, and thereby legitimate Meiji-era expansion into Ainu territory as lawful rather than as an act of invasion. Indeed, to prove that Japan's ethnic minorities of Hokkaido, Okinawa and Kyushu share ethnic origins with Japanese would free Japan from the negative connotation of colonisation. Drawing on this doubt of difference, Japan officially declared the absence of minority peoples in Japan when it ratified the 1979 UN Human Rights Committee's International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights[4]. While subsequent minority activism has led Japan to partially revoke this stance, as discussed later in this article, labouring the definition of slippery concepts such as ethnicity and indigeneity continues to stymie pro-active legislation for Japan's minorities.

Another reason for Japan's reluctance to accept indigenous difference is that Ainu evocation of colonial abuse sits uneasily with Japan's post-World War Two pledge of pacifism and polite humility, which masks the need to confront guilt and accept responsibility for past injustices. In the context of Japanese

---

[2] Key dates of UN initiatives include the 1982 UN Working Group on Indigenous Peoples (WGIP, later the IWGIA); the 1993 Year of Indigenous Peoples; the 1994 Draft UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; the 2000 United Nations 'Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous Peoples.'

[3] Records of Ainu-Japanese interaction, including battles and trade, date back to the 8th century (Kikuchi 47-48; Sasaki 79-80). From the late-1800s, Meiji-era expansion led to formalised land appropriation, indentured labour and assimilation policies. For a historical overview of Ainu contact history, see Peng and Geiser, 8-16.

[4] Siddle,179.

'historical amnesia' (163) which 'obscur[es] the violence of conquest'(183), Richard Siddle notes:

> The Japanese government, of course, ha[d] no option but to stress the peaceful development of [Hokkaido and the Kurile islands] after the Cairo Declaration of 27 November 1943 called for Japan to be expelled from all territories taken by 'violence and greed.'(238)

Siddle's comment does not take into account the different historical and political contexts of Japan's nineteenth-century development and Second World War expansionist ambitions. Nevertheless, in the post-War redefinition of the nation in *Nihonjinron,* both kinds of colonisation have been sanitised by the processes of forgetting and ameliorating history common to nationalist discourse. For minorities, *Nihonjinron* effectively precludes both their challenges over past injustices and their claims of different cultural identity. While all demands for national or ethnic sovereignty are founded on claims of a unique cultural identity subjugated by a dominating power[5], such assertions by Japan's minorities have faced a deafening silence. The long history of interaction between the ethnic Japanese and Ainu, and the low number of Ainu (estimated at 100,000) proportionate to the dominant population (120 million) make the Ainu voice of minority difference faintly heard within the mainstream.

A further line of argument challenging Ainu culture is the residual colonial attitude that the indigenous culture is no longer relevant in the present. A long history of tourism in Hokkaido, coupled with the typical colonialist view of the indigene as a dying race, a quaint and backwards people outside of modernity, has created an image of Ainu culture relegated to the past, displayed only in staged ceremonies and as relics in museums. Certainly, many Ainu people's efforts to escape discrimination by rejecting or hiding their language and customs have promulgated this impression of a lost culture. More condemning, however, is the lasting legacy of Ainu as objects of study by Japanese and foreign anthropologists, researchers and travel writers. At least since the end of the eighteenth century, Ainu have been performing their traditional rites and producing their folk art for sale to foreigners and Japanese (Dubreuil 336; Siddle 104). Nineteenth-century European travel writers, including Philipp von Siebold, in *Nippon* (1832), and English adventuress, Isabella Bird, in *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan* (1881), fashioned the Ainu in typical Eurocentric style as ethnographic oddities (Fitzhugh 14; Siddle 104). The Western stereotype of the Ainu as doubly marginalised as Orientals and as indigenes, was reinforced in the Ainu participation at the 1904 St Louis International Exhibition. During the same period, Western collectors made excursions to Hokkaido and the Kurile Islands to buy artefacts for museums and curio shops throughout the UK, continental Europe, Russia, the USA and Canada, resulting in more that 12,000 Ainu artefacts currently inventoried in foreign collections (Kotani 146). By contrast with the Western anthropological impulsion to collect[6], Japanese study of Ainu has predominantly focused on the people themselves, particularly their physical appearance. Since the middle ages, the large majority of Japanese paintings and texts depict the northern natives as menacing, hairy and large, their surroundings dirty and their posture, in pictures of contact with Japanese, as subservient (Kikuchi 47-51; Sasaki 79-85). Study of Ainu as objects extended to their bodies as well. In particular, women's tattoos on the hands and face, and men's hairiness was documented in pictures and later photos, with data collected as research for somewhat hazy use in ethnography, medical research and welfare information. Going against the official policy of integration and assimilation of Ainu into the Japanese majority, such research fed rather than palliated long-held prejudices and stereotypes. Both local government surveys and anthropological analyses of the mid-twentieth century defined Ainu as a race-based category, using physical characteristics and kinship ties to identify Ainu blood (Peng and Geiser 17-20; Siddle 154-

---

[5] See Benedict Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Rangers, Anne-Marie Thiesse.

[6] According to Yoshinobu Kotani, the value of Ainu artefacts was not appreciated in Japan until the 1930s (Kotani 147).

158). Also in the name of research, both Sapporo Medical University and Hokkaido University, with the support of local government, led research expeditions up until 1956 to exhume Ainu graves, and Ainu were asked for blood samples as late as the 1970s (Kayano 98-99; Siddle 160).

The above arguments of uncertain racial difference between Ainu and ethnic Japanese, the national reluctance to accept cultural heterogeneity, and the long held perception of Ainu as ethnographic relics, severely obstruct Ainu demands for recognition. Nonetheless, in keeping with the trend of pan-indigenous reclamation of agency since the 1960s, traditional attitudes towards Ainu are changing, promoted by the work of Ainu and sympathetic Japanese academics, independent groups, notably the Ainu Association, and those connected with local government, such as the Hokkaido Ainu Culture Research Center and the Foundation for the Research and Protection of Ainu Culture (FRPAC). In regards to the question of ancestry, compelling evidence in recent studies by eminent Japanese scholars in areas such as archaeology, forensic medicine and geography support the theory of Ainu difference (Ono 1999: 32-35; Sakitani 13-80). Similarly, both Japanese and foreign academics propose a counter discourse to *Nihonjinron* in recent studies of cultural heterogeneity that highlight Japan's 'Others[7].' Ainu protest has also challenged the ingrained attitude that casts Ainu as passive objects of Japanese study. In a local protest in Asahikawa in 1970, Ainu contested a statue of four young Japanese pioneers surrounding a seated Ainu elder, commissioned to commemorate the eightieth anniversary of the city's foundation. The statue's symbolism clearly cast the Ainu as old, frail and subordinate to the young Japanese colonisers (Dubreuil *Bikky* 37-39; Siddle 164-164). Erected in a prominent city park, the statue was blown up two years later in the name of Ainu liberation. Ainu denied involvement in any form of violent protest, and the attack was later attributed to a radical Japanese liberation group which was unrelated to the Ainu cause (Dubreuil, *Bikky* 39). In 1988, Ainu activist Mieko Chikappu won a court case against a Hokkaido University anthropologist's use of photographs of Ainu without permission (Witmer 146-149). The court also indicted the academic for his text's 'general bigotry and inaccuracy' in racialist slurs and unsubstantiated claims about Ainu (149). The case was a landmark victory for Ainu, marking the first official and legal recognition of Japanese discrimination towards Ainu.

Ainu museums are one of the most important interfaces with the general public. As such, the museum's curatorial strategies affect understanding of both the culture's traditions and its visions for the future. Shiraoi's Poroto Kotan, a model village located on the edge of Poroto lake and forest, is one of the major Ainu museum complexes in Hokkaido, run by a team of Ainu and Japanese curators. At first glance, this museum conforms to standard expectations of ethnographic collection, with its displays of traditional daily life corroborating the live performances of singing, dancing and weaving in the model village outside. Certainly, the museum is still contained within the framework of ethnographic collection, a problematic concept that the curators are currently exploring[8]. However, closer inspection of Poroto's displays reveals a much more complex relationship with and vision of the past than first impressions suggest. In particular, each display case assembles a mix of objects with little sense of hierarchy between old and valuable objects, and those that are more recent, copies or specially made for the museum context. For example, a display of the *Iyomante,* the sacred bear-sending ceremony, includes a ceremonial carved prayer stick and bowl, surrounded by newly made *inau,* shaved willow offerings to the gods, and *sapanpe,* plaited headdress. The backdrop to the display sets a print from a Japanese sketch of the ancient ritual alongside a large colour photograph of a more recent ceremony, in which tourists watch on. Such a display undermines the privileging of originality and authenticity which forms the basis of the Western museum ethos, of the kind

---

[7] See, for example, Harumi Befu, John Clammer, Tessa Morris-Suzuki, Richard Siddle, David Suzuki and Keibo Oiwa, Michael Weiner.

[8] Koji Yamasaki, personal communication.

analysed at length by critics, including Tony Bennett, Pierre Bourdieu, James Clifford, Michel Foucault and Andrew Ross. The non-sacralisation of the objects makes this Ainu display strikingly different from the presentation focus of other indigenous cultures. The difference may be best described by way of comparison. In Maori displays, such as at the national museum in Wellington, Te Papa Tongarewa, each artefact's historical background is carefully explained, including the individual and tribal affiliations of the craftsman and owner, and information about where and how the object was used. In addition, symbolism of shape and design is explained at length. For Maori, stories give an artefact its prestige, with symbolism highly important in tying form to function. By contrast, in the Ainu display, the large majority of objects, both new and old, are labelled only by their name and function, and very few are dated. Thus it is difficult for the average visitor to distinguish originals from newer examples, and there is little sense of a piece's individual importance.

It is probable that a key reason for such mixed media, mixed era displays of Ainu traditional culture is the irreparable breakdown of cultural transmission that prevents contemporary Ainu from fully knowing their past. On the other hand, the lack of handed down knowledge has made room for a more hands-on relationship with this past than in other indigenous cultures. In particular, the Maori attitude to tradition is complicated by strict protocols of authenticity associated with *mana,* pride or prestige, and *tapu,* taboo. Restrictions regulate design, process of creation and context for use so that to change traditional practices, or even to attempt certain designs requires appropriate authority or permission[9]. By contrast, in his memoir, Shigeru Kayano, who collected thousands of Ainu artefacts in order to prevent them from being taken by Japanese (100), recalls unravelling a woven mat from his collection so that he and his wife could learn a weaving technique lost to oral memory (119-122). Similarly, Kayano responded to the National Ethnological Museum's request for material for an Ainu display in 1977 with great pragmatism:

> [W]e all worked intently, using the materials and tools of old whenever possible. I thus learned how to make things I had never tried before. [...] Weaving these had been women's work, but there was no longer anyone who knew how to make them. We unravelled old ones in order to figure out how they were put together.
>
> I am pleased that these crafts have been revived in our age. [...] I learned from this that the role of museums is not merely to collect existing artifacts but to revive and propagate forgotten crafts.(149)

In another example of re-learning craftsmanship that had been lost, Utariyan Narita recounts his years of experimenting to achieve a particular smooth, curved woodworking style that had been common in the past. In a long process of trial and error, and his chance breakthrough in discovering the use of green rather than dried wood, Narita effectively re-enacts the natural process of inventing, perfecting and mastering craft techniques that are normally internalised over several generations (Sjoberg 81-83).

The casual perception of treasured artefacts demonstrated in the display structure in Poroto Kotan museum and by Kayano and Narita indicates an interactive relationship with the past. In fact, in the contemporary context of production for tourism and as part of the active revival of traditions, Ainu continue to

---

[9] A large body of analysis exists on difficult concepts of originality, authenticity and authority in the museum context. Particularly problematic is the relationship between the ethnographic display and the visitor, questions of ownership, the contextual gap that changes the object's meaning from its original function to that as a display, and assigning spiritual, symbolic and monetary value to historic objects. The unique contribution that Ainu display brings to these debates is certainly worth analysing in more detail, but is beyond the scope of this paper.

carve and perform ceremonies such as the *Iyomante* today. Thus, the Poroto museum display of this ritual is not confined to a dusty exhibit: the prayer sticks, bowl, headdress and *inau* could be taken off the shelf at any time for use in an actual ceremony. In the opposite direction, a carving or weaving made by Kayano or Narita replicating old techniques may be found in a museum as representative of traditional objects. Hence, Ainu traditional culture is located in the creative processes and practices remembered and reconfigured in the present rather than in the finished products salvaged from the past. This focus draws attention not to what has been lost but rather to the skills and knowledge that have survived. Based on the precept that usage determines authenticity, the fluid relationship with the past validates Ainu culture in the present. Poroto museum reinforces this message at the end of its circuit with a video documentary featuring contemporary Ainu who have carried aspects of tradition into the mainstream. In particular, fashion designer, Tamami Kaizawa, who incorporates Ainu embroidery motifs in haute couture, and Oki Kano, who plays the traditional Ainu instrument, the *tonkori,* remixed as dub and trance music, update and extend Ainu culture in directions relevant to the Ainu, Japanese and international public today.

The second case study, of Ainu ecotourism in the Shiretoko World Heritage Site[10], also illustrates a modernised expression of customary practices, in both content and context. Ecotourism allows Ainu to profit from current public interest in environmental preservation and the perception of indigenous cultures as more sensitive to nature than the exploitative stance of the industrial nation. In both its origins and the techniques it employs, Ainu ecotourism, managed by the Shiretoko Indigenous Peoples' Eco-Tourism Research Union (SIPETRU), exemplifies the changing relationship between indigenous minorities and the nation-state in recent years. Ainu ecotourism was established in response to Japan's nomination of Shiretoko National Park as a World Heritage Site in 2004, which completely disregarded any reference to or input from Ainu. The government claimed that Ainu were of no relevance to the UNESCO application because they no longer live in the area, even though the presence of bear, owl and salmon, which are central to Ainu customs and religion[11], as well as Ainu placenames and archaeological sites, indicate the site's cultural importance (Ono, np). Drawing on almost twenty years experience in international forums such as the United Nations, Ainu delegations were able to mobilise quickly. They bypassed the government and appealed directly to UNESCO for inclusion of Ainu in the Shiretoko nomination, claiming the rights of customary practices and proposing Ainu-led ecotourism as a means to protect and sustain the habitat. The Ainu recommendations were successful, and the World Heritage Site status was granted to Japan, with Ainu as co-managers (Ono np). This is the first case to legislatively include Ainu as a separate entity within an international agreement with Japan. However, the influence of an international ruling on Japan's conduct towards Ainu is not without precedent. Siddle sees the publicity surrounding the 1991 visit of UN chairwoman of the Indigenous Peoples Working Group as a catalyst for the government's first acknowledgement of the existence of national minorities in accordance with the UN Charter (185). Similarly, the 1993 International Year of Indigenous Peoples saw the establishment of a round table committee to negotiate Ainu demands in the Diet (IWGIA Session 10), and, as mentioned above, the most recent government announcement recognising Ainu rights preceded the Kyoto G8 summit in June 2008. Each of these cases suggests that negotiation between the local Ainu and national Japanese is most successful when supported by international awareness. In the contemporary globalised world of transnational communication and movement, Ainu are able to circumvent the nation and take their claims directly to the international forum,

---

[10] My thanks to Professor Yugo Ono, Hokkaido University, for generously sharing information and resources on SIPETRU.

[11] For Ainu, the bear and owl were important *kamuy,* gods, that occupied an important place in cosmology, symbolism, oral storytelling and cultural practices of hunting and mapping seasonal rhythms of nature. The major ceremony of the *Iyomante* which survives today consists of 'sending back' the spirit of an owl or bear to the gods. Shiretoko peninsula is one of the last habitats of the endangered brown bear and Blakiston's fish-owl and is thus of great importance to Ainu (Ono np).

which in turn has more influence in pressuring Japan to conform to internationally agreed standards.

Increased internationalisation provides a new context through which Ainu have been able to promote their culture. Globalisation also affects the content of that cultural expression. It is one thing for Ainu to upstage the national government by tapping into pan-indigenous demands and expectations, but another to have feasible and organised strategies in place in order to benefit from each new concession. Again, Ainu interaction with and support from other indigenous peoples are key. The case of Ainu ecotourism is again illustrative of transcultural exchange that today shapes local—or rather, glocal—decision-making. According to glocalisation theorist Roland Robertson, the modern world is marked less by local-to-national interactions than by international local-to-local relationships. SIPETRU's study of Maori ecotourism, adapted to the Ainu culture and Shiretoko site, illustrates Robertson's argument that locality is globally produced, with each locale uniquely assembling globally available strategies and components (31), that which Wolfgang Welsch calls transculturation, the process of cross-cultural 'entanglement'(198). SIPETRU's current tours of Shiretoko, which have been running since 2005, have developed out of ideas gained from tours of several Maori tourism ventures in Aotearoa-New Zealand, as well as from tours of Shiretoko with Maori and other indigenous visitors[12]. For example, a SIPETRU members' visit to Maurice Manawatu's Maori-tours excursion in Kaikoura, New Zealand, contributed the activity of explaining traditional Ainu use of medicinal plants and offering tourists traditional herbal tea during the Shiretoko tour of the forest[13].

Such globalisation of indigeneity may be criticised for a perceived collapsing of special cultural differences. However, in the specific case of Ainu ecotourism, the success of this initiative and its influence in motivating other Ainu groups to start their own tours, at Poroto Kotan and in Akan, must surely be seen as positive. Indeed, Yugo Ono argues for far-reaching repercussions of Ainu ecotourism:

> Indigenous ecotourism not only creates new jobs (eco-tour guides and park rangers) for Ainu youth, but also enhances the possibility for [*sic*] recovering the rights of natural resource use among the Ainu, including salmon fishing (of critical importance to the livelihood and the culture of the Ainu). Co-management of the World Heritage area is the first step to restoring Ainu governance in Japan. (np)

The headway Ainu have made in the last twenty years, since their involvement with the UN and their interaction with other indigenous cultures, compares favourably with previous Ainu demands to local and national government over the past century, which resulted only in ineffective and poorly implemented welfare policies.

The ways that Ainu portray their culture in the two case studies of Poroto museum and Shiretoko ecotourism reveals complex and nuanced senses of what it means to be Ainu today. The ways these examples package the past indicate the direction Ainu wish to take in the future: by engaging with contemporary issues and expectations, the culture must constantly reconfigure itself. In regards to museum display, current issues facing the way Ainu are represented and represent themselves include exploring ways of escaping the ethnographical frame in order to make the culture more accessible and interesting in a way that young visitors can identify with. The current situation in which Ainu artefacts are spread out in small and incomplete collections around the world is also of pressing concern. Linked with this is ongoing negotiation for the return of human remains, a difficult prospect under current circumstances in which there is not a national Ainu museum which could receive them[14]. In regards to Ainu ecotourism, the venture raises ques-

[12] All information on Maori ecotours kindly provided by Yugo Ono and featured in the 2007 Shiretoko Ecotour DVD.

[13] Ono, personal communication.

[14] My thanks to Koji Yamasaki for this discussion.

tions about the interface between culture and economy, and ethical concerns about marketing culture as corporate business. This in turn raises issues of distributing and reinvesting profit for advancement of the culture and society, as well as concerns over appropriate channels of dissemination, entailing consideration of intellectual property rights and cultural trademarks. Furthermore, Ainu culture does not exist independently of the social situation, in which Ainu have higher rates of poverty, unemployment and educational underachievement than the national norm, and the political situation, in which the government has yet to take a pro-active stance towards dealing with existing discrimination and impoverishment. Nevertheless, the examples of Poroto Kotan and Shiretoko ecotourism strongly argue that Ainu culture is not only surviving, but capable of thriving in contemporary Japan, through its ability to adapt and its openness to input from other indigenous peoples and international forums.

References

Anderson, Benedict (1983), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Befu, Harumi (2001), *Hegemony of Homogeneity: An Anthropological Analysis of Nihonjinron.* Melbourne: Trans-Pacific Press.

Bennett, Tony (1988), The Exhibitionary Complex. *New Formations 4,* Spring, 73-102.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1993), *The Field of Cultural Production.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Clammer, John (2001), *Japan and Its Others: Globalization, Difference and the Critique of Modernity.* Melbourne: Trans-Pacific Press.

Clifford, James (1988), *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Dubreuil, Chisato (1999), Ainu Journey: From Tourist Art to Fine Arts. *Ainu: Spirit of a Northern People.* 335-354.

———. (2004), *From the Playground of the Gods: The Life and Art of Bikky Sunazawa.* Washington DC: Arctic Studies Center, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institute.

Fitzhugh, William W. and Chisato O. Dubreuil, eds. (1999), *Ainu: Spirit of a Northern People.* Washington DC: Arctic Studies Center, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institute.

Foucault, Michel (1975), Surveillance and the Panopticon. In Anthony Easthope and Kate MacGowan, eds. (1992), *A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger, eds. (1992), *The Invention of Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IWGIA Session 10, in *Statements Submitted to the 5th-11th Sessions of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations.*

Kayano, Shigeru (1994), *Our Land Was a Forest: An Ainu Memoir.* (Trans. Kyoko Selden and Lili Selden). Colorado: Westview Press.

Kikuchi, Toshihiko (1999), Ainu Ties with Ancient Cultures of Northeast Asia. *Ainu: Spirit of a Northern People.* 47-51.

Kotani, Yoshinobu (1999), Ainu Collections in North America: Documentation Projects and the Frederick Starr Collections. *Ainu: Spirit of a Northern People.* 136-147.

Morris-Suzuki, Tessa (1998), *Re-Inventing Japan: Time, Space, Nation.* New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Muecke, Stephen (2004), *Ancient and Modern: Time, Culture and Indigenous Philosophy.* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Ono, Yugo (1999), Ainu Homelands: Natural History from Ice-Age to Modern Times. *Ainu: Spirit of a Northern People.* 32-38.

———. Recovering Ainu governance in the Shiretoko World Natural Heritage area in Japan through education and training for the Development of Indigenous Ecotourism. A paper presented to the 7th World Indigenous Peoples' Conference on Education, 2005, Hamilton, New Zealand, np.

Peng, Fred C. C. and Peter Geiser (1977), *The Ainu: The Past in the Present.* Hiroshima: Bunka Hyoron Publishing.

Robertson, Roland (1995), Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity. In Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson, eds., *Global Modernities.* London: Sage, 25-44.

Ross, Andrew (1994), *The Chicago Gangster Theory of Life: Nature's Debt to Society.* London: Verso.

Sakitani, Mitsuru (2007), Les nations et les langues minoritaires dans l'archipel japonais. *Vox Propria* 9, 13-80.

Sasaki, Toshikazu (1999), Trading Brokers and Partners with China, Russia, and Japan. *Ainu: Spirit of a Northern People.* 86-91.

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

Sjoberg, Katarina (1993), *The Return of the Ainu: Cultural mobilization and the practice of ethnicity in Japan.* Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Suzuki, David and Keibo Oiwa (1996), *The Japan We Never Knew: A Journey of Discovery.* Toronto: Stoddart.

Thiesse, Anne-Marie (1999), *La création des identités nationales: Europe XVIIe – XXe siècle.* Paris: Seuil.

Weiner, Michael, ed. (1997), *Japan's Minorities: The Illusion of Homogeneity.* London and New York: Routledge.

Welsch, Wolfgang (1999), Transculturality: The Puzzling Forms of Cultures Today. In Scott Lash and Mike Featherstone, eds. *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World.* London: Sage, 194-213.

Witmer, Robert (1998), *Land of Elms: The History, Culture and Present Day Situation of the Ainu People.* Ontario: United Church Publishing.