



Title	A Case Study on Identity Issues with Regard to Enchiws (Sakhalin Ainu)
Author(s)	Inoue, Koichi
Citation	北方人文研究, 9, 75-87
Issue Date	2016-03-31
Doc URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2115/61294">http://hdl.handle.net/2115/61294</a>
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	09_05_inoue.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

## A Case Study on Identity Issues with Regard to Enchiws (Sakhalin Ainu)<sup>1</sup> Reconsidering B. Piłsudski’s “Draft of Rules for the Establishment of Authority over the Sakhalin Ainu” (1905)

Kōichi INOUE

In March of 1905 Bronisław Piłsudski (1866-1918) prepared a legislative draft of “The rules for organizing the life and administration of the Ainu” that had been requested to draw up by a military governor of the Sakhalin Island in October, 1903. The draft was comprised of twenty-eight articles on socio-political arrangements (Articles I-X), duties and social securities (XI-XIV), storehouses (XV), hunting, fishery and allocated lands (XVI-XVII), measures against alcoholism (XVIII), mutual aid funds (XIX-XXI), medical care system (XXII), education (XXIII-XXIV), exceptional measures in the judiciary procedure (XXV-XXVI), and the responsibility and competence of the officers specially appointed by the governor for indigenous affairs (“*inorodčeskie načal'niki*”), as well as those of the governor himself (XXVII-XXVIII)<sup>2</sup>. The draft covers almost all aspects of Ainu life and is constructed on the principles of autonomy, democracy and humanism.

It is quite sure that the Piłsudski’s efforts represent themselves as the earliest attempt to present a definite modernization strategy for the Enchiw<sup>3</sup>. He wished that the Enchiw should maintain their independent ethnic entity in the society (i.e. the Russian empire), whilst every Enchiw’s becoming an equal member of the given society and fulfilling citizen’s duties—an adequate burden of tax payment in particular. Hence, his modernization strategy may well be applicable to current ethnic conflicts still rampant all over the world. We can safely say that the model proposed by Piłsudski can serve yet as

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented on August 4, 2015, at a Roundtable, entitled “Ainu identity in Hokkaido and beyond — The Past, Present and Future,” of the 9<sup>th</sup> World Congress of ICCEES in Makuhari, Chiba.

<sup>2</sup> Piłsudski 1998c. This is an English translation of the Vladivostok manuscript which was submitted to the Sakhalin governor in June, 1905. There exists another version (the Tomsk manuscript), i.e. the original text of the Vladivostok one. The Tomsk manuscript was discovered in Tomsk and published by V. M. Latyshev at the outset of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Piłsudski 2000; 2001). The title in the above text is taken from the Tomsk version which differs from the Vladivostok one by addition of two underlined Russian words (“...ustrojstve byta i upravlenija...”). There is, however, a fundamental difference in viewpoint between the two English variants of title (of Majewicz and of mine) concerning a Russian word “*upravlenie*”. In my view Prof. Majewicz sees it from a state’s point of view, whilst I would like to perceive it from Ainu eyes with emphasis on autonomy. I have accomplished a Japanese translation of the Tomsk manuscript, which remains unpublished but is preserved as an electronic version. See also my paper (Inoue 2010).

<sup>3</sup> This term is one of two traditional self-appellations (“*aynu*” and “*enciw*” in phonemic description) of the Sakhalin Ainu. In his lecture notes at the University of Tokyo (1914-1943), Kyōsuke Kindaichi proposed a historical transition model of the related terms: \**emchiu* → *emichi/emishi* (蝦夷 エミシ); \**emchiu* → *enzo* → *ezo* (蝦夷 エゾ) on the main island of Japan (Honshū), whilst \**emchiu* → *enchiu* → *enju* (i.e. *enciw*) on the island of Sakhalin (Kindaichi 1960: 2-3). After World War 2, the evacuated Sakhalin Ainu and their descendants began to use “*enciw*” in Japan for their self-appellation, most probably, out of the necessity to distinguish themselves from the Hokkaido Ainu. In 2001 “Sakhalin Ainu Association” was founded by the Sakhalin Ainu descendants (cf. section 3). Although they selected the more familiar term of “Sakhalin Ainu” for naming their association, the members resolved to call themselves the “*enciw*” declaring that both terms should be considered synonymous. Thus this term was built in the very core of their aspiration to establish their own identity. Therefore, following the instruction of Professor Kyōko Murasaki, I will adopt “Enchiw” as an English counterpart of the phonemic form in my description hereafter.

one of effective modernization schemes for minority peoples in general despite the fact that his model itself failed to be implemented when Enchiws came as a whole under Japanese rule according to the outcome of Russo-Japanese war in 1905.

This paper deals with three cases of identity issues with regard to Enchiws: (1) a case of the Past — “Tsuishikari Ainu” in 1875-1905; (2) that of the ethnographical Present for Piłsudski — the Enchiw in his period (1902-1905); and (3) as for the Future — a case of Enchiw descendants in the contemporary Japanese society. The aim of this paper is to demonstrate the multiplicity of forms when ethnic identity emerges, flourishes and decays, as well as that of the roles played by outsiders: e.g. those of administrators, anthropologists and people of the majority society at large.

### 1. A case of “Tsuishikari Ainu”<sup>4</sup>

In September of 1875 part of Enchiws (ca 35%) evacuated from their native soils to the Sōya region, Hokkaido, soon after Japan’s renouncement and transfer of the whole island of Sakhalin to Russia due to the St. Petersburg treaty in May, 1875. These evacuees — according to Japanese sources 841 persons consisting of 108 families<sup>5</sup> — had mostly inhabited the region of the Bay of Aniwa<sup>6</sup>, the southernmost part of southern Sakhalin.

In June of 1876 all of the evacuees were, against their will, brought from Sōya on board two warships to Otaru<sup>7</sup>, from where, twenty days afterwards (on June 23), they were deported to their planned destination, Tsuishikari, a village located at the mouth of the river of Ishikari (now in Ebetsu city next to Sapporo)<sup>8</sup>. There they started a sedentary lifestyle gradually engaging in agriculture on allotted plots as well as in salmon fishing

<sup>4</sup> This term is a current analytical concept for research denoting those Enchiws who left Sakhalin for Hokkaido in 1875. They must have called themselves “Enchiw” or “Ainu”, whilst in Japan they were termed as “former Sakhalin indigenes (*Kyū-Karafuto-dojin*)” or “immigrant indigenes (*Ijū-dojin*)”. “Former indigenes (*Kyū-dojin*)” was the official term for the Hokkaido Ainu then. Sometimes they wrote of themselves down as “Ishikari Ainu” in their documents written in Japanese, since they lived in the Ishikari district including Tsuishikari. The last term is rather misleading and, therefore, “the Tsuishikari Ainu” is introduced for current use.

<sup>5</sup> Tazaki 1992: 39. On the same issue Piłsudski writes: “843 persons (men and women) from Ashevo [sic., i.e. Aniwa] Bay and southern parts of the eastern and western coasts for Japan lured by the Japanese and terrified by rumors about the establishment of prisons and new orders to come” (Piłsudski 1998b: 290). Despite the Piłsudski’s remark they were not refugees in a contemporary sense but rather voluntarily emigrated people since certain Japanese officials had given them a definite idea of their emigration to Japan and at least transportation was offered by the Japanese side (Tazaki: 61-64).

<sup>6</sup> The figure of evacuees from the Aniwa Bay region is estimated at 733 including 376 (from the Nankei [Ōdomari/Korsakov] district), 177 (from the Chibesani dist.), 153 (from the Siranushi dist.), and 27 (from the Minabetsu [Pr’ichie] dist.), whilst 93 from the Nishi-Tonnai [Mauka/Kholmok] and 1 from the Nishi-Shiraroro districts of the western coast, and 9 from the village Naefutsu [Naibuchi] of the Sakaehama dist. of the eastern coast (Tazaki: 88-89). A sum total constitutes ca 35% of the whole population of the Enchiw (2,372 in 1873).

<sup>7</sup> Tazaki: 108-114. The evacuees had a definite desire to settle down on the northern coast of the Sōya region and to continue their traditional pursuits — fishing and hunting. Besides, it is situated in the northern end of Hokkaido from where the southernmost spots of Sakhalin Island are visible on fine days across La Pérouse (Sōya in Jap.) strait. This position could assure them of a secured sense with regard to proximity to their native places on Sakhalin as well as resemblance in ecological settings. Therefore, they resisted to accept the plan to be settled in Tsuishikari.

<sup>8</sup> Tazaki 1992: 114-117. The evacuees were transported once again by force via sea route from Otaru to Ebetsu for Tsuishikari in order to implement the decided plan due to which they were to be transformed from half-settled fisher-hunters to settled farmers. The local government had aimed through this measure to conduct a preliminary experiment for its own Ainu policy — transformation of the Ainu population of Hokkaido into ordinary farmers. This policy was materialized in “The Ainu Protection Law (*Hokkaidō Kyū-dojin Hogohō*)” of 1899.

on nearby banks of the Ishikari river under the protection of the local government (“*Kaitaku-shi*”), which founded for them in 1877 a fishing net production workshop and even an elementary school for their children<sup>9</sup>. In the same year the government secured for them three fishing grounds in the village of Atsuta meant for herring catch. In the beginning they were visiting the fishing grounds for every catch season but a certain portion of them was to become permanent residents therein (Tazaki 1992: 139-152).

In February of 1882 the Japanese government introduced a new administration system (the Three-prefecture régime) to Hokkaido instead of the *Kaitakushi*. The Enchiw colony at Tsuishikari was placed under the command of the Sapporo Prefecture. A self-administration body was organized in August, entitled “The former Sakhalin emigrants’ cooperative association for mutual rescue at the village of Tsuishikari,” under the auspices of the prefectural government<sup>10</sup>. Thus emerged a sort of self-government and autonomy.

In 1886 and 1887 the Enchiw colony met with a big disaster: the epidemic diseases of cholera and small-pox that had prevailed all over Japan, eventually reached Tsuishikari and deprived 358 comrades of their life — 267 in 1886 and 91 in 1887. Hence, the colony lost about one half of its inhabitants whilst another half was infected with either of them. They were so susceptible to infection. The cooperative, too, sustained a great damage by losing approximately a half of its members including executive staffs and experienced workers<sup>11</sup>. Consequently shrank their fishing activities — a main source of income supporting the life of cooperative members. In addition to that, there followed the years of extraordinarily poor catch of fish in 1892-1894 and 1898 (Tazaki 1992: 202, 208).

According to Isamu Tazaki, after the disaster, the cooperative office along with the net production workshop and the school must have been shifted from Tsuishikari to Raisu — one of their salmon catch grounds at the mouth of the Ishikari river, where came to settle in almost all cooperative members as seen from the data of 1889 — 362 persons consisting of 191 males and 141 females (Tazaki 1992: 190).

In due course the Tsuishikari Ainu, particularly their fishermen, had to seek jobs outside the colony, for example, on the Sakhalin seas to where Japanese entrepreneurs were sending their fishing fleets. The official documentation tells that, from 1888 on, such

<sup>9</sup> Tazaki 1992: 138-148. The Ainu school, established in 1877 and officially named “Tsuishikari Gakkō” from 1879 onwards, was a forerunner of those state-run elementary schools solely meant for Ainu children in Hokkaido, which were set forth in 1901. This was also an experimental attempt of the government for Ainu education in Hokkaido. Those who had attended the Tsuishikari Gakkō for several years could acquire literacy in Japanese, and were to become leaders in various fields, like Yasunosuke Yamabe as a member of Japanese Antarctic Expedition in 1910-1912, Tarōji Sentoku as teacher — he was also a member (interpreter) of Sieroszewski-Pilsudski’s Hokkaido Ainu expedition in 1903, etc., particularly after their return to Sakhalin where the overwhelming majority of Enchiws remained illiterate then, both in Japanese and Russian.

<sup>10</sup> Tazaki 1992: 159-170. The cooperative (*Tsuishikari-mura Kyū-Karafuto-imin Kyōkyū Kumiai*) consisting of about 750 persons and 139 households, had in its possessions three herring catch grounds in Atsuta, a common land and five salmon catch grounds in Tsuishikari and its environs, and undertook the main task of implementing profitable fishing operations as well as the maintenance of the net production workshop and the school.

<sup>11</sup> Tazaki 1992: 178-181. The average death rate among the infected was ca 50%. A deficit of labour force was so serious that the cooperative was compelled to hire migrant fishermen from the Akita and Aomori prefectures so as to implement operations.

fishermen were visiting Sakhalin, and that a majority of them eventually remained there<sup>12</sup>. There were two unique cases: having paid a visit to family graves with travel license, the visitors never returned to Japan — 11 persons in 1893 and 74 persons in 1895 (see footnote 12 below; Tazaki 1992: 138-148). Two intellectuals of the Tsuishikari Ainu (Yasunosuke Yamabe and Tarōji Sentoku, see: footnote 9), as being one of the participants of each case — the former for 1893 whilst the latter for 1895, impart to us interesting evidences thereof in their books respectively (Yamabe 1913: 53-65; Sentoku 1929: 31-32. See also Tazaki: 215-221).

When the Russo-Japanese war was over in September of 1905, and Japan gained the southern half of Sakhalin Island under her jurisdiction, the Tsuishikari Ainu perceived it up to their own will to return to their native island, or not. Those who had remained in Raisatsu during the wartime departed for Sakhalin in several groups by October of 1906, most probably a bit more than one hundred persons in total, leaving there only one household (the family of Oyama; Tazaki 1992: 195-196, 251-252).

History did not allow the Tsuishikari Ainu to enjoy a normal life even after their return to the native island. Piłsudski writes: “[L]ife under circumstances as found on the island of Hokkaido proved to be very difficult, and this triggered the return journey of the emigrants resettling in the neighborhood of their closest relatives in various settlements, predominantly on the western coast. At present there are 102 men and 101 women of these prodigal children who returned to their native land” (Piłsudski 1998b: 290). Obviously, the Sakhalin authorities did not permit them to resettle in their native villages, or their former villages had already been occupied by the Russians. Such was the case with returned Enchiws on Sakhalin up to September of 1905.

Here follow discussions on several topics that directly concern the identity issues of the Tsuishikari Ainu<sup>13</sup>.

1) The Sakhalin administration treated the Tsuishikari Ainu as the foreigners temporally staying on Sakhalin Island, because of their Japanese citizenship. Consequently, according to the newly introduced fishing regulation rules of 1900, they were prohibited to work on the indigenous fishing grounds — lent free of charge to applied Enchiw communities from 1901, as employees hired by the separate Enchiw

<sup>12</sup> Tazaki writes that the Tsuishikari Ainu began to visit Sakhalin with Japanese travel license as migrant fishermen or visitors to family graves on Sakhalin from 1888 onwards, who are reckoned up to 171 persons during fifteen years — 1 (1888), 4 (1889), 11 (1893), 74 (1895), 1 (1897), 3 (1899), 1 (1900), 8 (1902), and 78 (1903). He obtained these figures at Diplomatic Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Tokyo (Tazaki 1992: 223-224). There must have also been illegal visitors to Sakhalin, i.e. with no travel license. Meanwhile Piłsudski reports the numbers of those Tsuishikari Ainu who returned to Sakhalin during six years — 92 in total, consisting of 25 (1897), 12 (1898), 11 (1899), 18 (1900), 13 (1901), and 13 (1903). He gathered these data during his fieldwork on Sakhalin in 1902-1905 (Piłsudski 1998d: 341, Table 6, note). A comparison of the both data has revealed a considerable resemblance and a general trend as far as the years 1897-1903 are concerned — 81 persons of Tazaki and 92 persons of Piłsudski. On the other hand, Piłsudski gives a detailed table on distribution of the returned Tsuishikari Ainu on Sakhalin, as of January 1, 1903, summing up to 203, consisting of 102 males and 101 females (Piłsudski 1998d: 339, Table 5).

<sup>13</sup> Piłsudski termed them in his articles as “Iskari Ainu” (“iskarskie ajny” or “iskarcy” in Russian), which might well be translated into “Ishikari Ainu” as did Professor Majewicz in his English translation of Piłsudski’s relating works. Nevertheless, there existed in Hokkaido the Ishikari Ainu as quite another historical entity. See also footnote 4.

fishing cooperative which was to be organized on each fishing ground. Moreover, every violation case was punished with a fine of 100 rubles per person. Therefore, the Enchiw society in Sakhalin was divided between the Ainu and the foreigners (Piłsudski 1998a: 198-199; 1998b: 273; 1998d: 325-326).

2) During the Russo-Japanese war the Tsuishikari Ainu on Sakhalin suffered a great deal. First of all, they were afraid of deportation from the island along with other Japanese residents. Fortunately the case did not take place with them. Meanwhile any outcome of the war might have inevitably inflicted damage on them: “Shall we not be subject to some vengeance or punishment from the possibly victorious Japanese for our renouncement of them, not sharing the miseries which have fallen to the lot of Japanese subjects, including the Ainu living in Japan? And in the case of victory of the Russians will they not demonstrate any rudeness towards them, will not the voices prevail that so often are heard: ‘It is Matsumae [i.e. Tsuishikari] Ainu that should be blamed for the sympathies for the Japanese among the Ainu, it is them that are dangerous and harmful element!’?” (Piłsudski 1998d: 328).

3) In 1903 Piłsudski strived to change the abnormal situation of the Tsuishikari Ainu. Having submitted to the administration a research report on its historical background and current circumstances, he advised them to produce a special petition toward the authorities asking for their inclusion to imperial subjects. Some of them who lived close to him hurriedly submitted petitions. The Priamur governor-general approved these petitions, and all of the petitioners were granted the status of Russian citizenship. They stopped petitioning when the war was declared in February, 1904 (Piłsudski 1998a: 199; 1998d: 328).

4) As far as the identity of the Tsuishikari Ainu in their Japanese years is concerned, it may be reasonable to consider that they must have had the more distinct Enchiw identity in a specific ethnic milieu they found themselves in — daily confrontations with either the Japanese or the Hokkaido Ainu in a foreign land. The Japanese administration in Hokkaido also treated them as an Ainu group different from the Hokkaido Ainu and even made good use of the former as test cases of policy-building for the latter. In terms of ethnic identity their “Enchiw identity” must have reached the height of its existence then — the highest level of consolidation achieved by those Enchiws who had derived from different subgroups, although an overwhelming majority was constituted by the “southernmost” subgroup from the Aniwa Bay region (see: footnotes 6, 17).

Piłsudski bequeathed a meaningful message for their future: “The problem of their ‘to be or not to be’ on Sakhalin will hopefully be discussed on the grounds of a much wider viewpoint seeking causes of the phenomena of social character in the depth of contemporary social life and historical past”<sup>14</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> Piłsudski 1998d: 329. From time to time we can hear from contemporary Enchiw descendants in Japan certain discourses of who are the descendants of the Tsuishikari Ainu among themselves.

## 2. A case of the Enchiw in 1902-1905

According to the population census of Enchiws on Sakhalin which Piłsudski himself conducted in 1902-1905, southern Sakhalin was inhabited by Enchiws (1,362 persons in total, consisting of 713 males and 649 females), scattered over a vast range of the long coastlines on both sides<sup>15</sup>. From historical, cultural and economic points of view they were divided into four subgroups: two on the eastern and two on the western coasts<sup>16</sup>. The Taraika Ainu on the Bay of Patience were considered more independent and esteemed as the bearers of earlier Enchiw culture. Meanwhile a clear east-west division was also established due to the lack of traffic, caused by geographical obstacles. In addition, there had never been any unified leadership ruling over the four (or five<sup>17</sup>, prior to 1875) subgroups, and each one was usually governed by the clan elders headed by a politically nominated leader (the so-called regional headman: *Otona* in Japanese, *oxtena* in Enchiw, *staršina* in Russian). Nevertheless, all of the subgroups were loosely united by those traditional norms of mutual collaboration which were typically seen in traditional festivities like the bear festival (e.g., Piłsudski 1998e). Therefore, it is inferable that every subgroup maintained a distinct self-consciousness which distinguished oneself from the other subgroups.

In 1869 the imperial government in St. Petersburg introduced a prison system to Sakhalin Island (Istorija Saxalina 2008: 359), and from 1875 onwards transformed it into the Prison Island. Prisoners were widely used as cheap but low-productive man powers for Sakhalin colonization. Those who had served prison terms were not permitted to leave the island and remained there engaging in agricultural colonization. By and large these settlers were founding Russian villages where adequate prerequisites for farming were available. Russian villages also appeared in southern Sakhalin appropriating traditional Enchiw territories, such as their dwelling sites (*kotans*), and fishing and hunting grounds as well.

In 1884 a new administration system, directly subordinate to Priamur governor-generalship in Khabarovsk, was introduced to Sakhalin Island forming three administrative districts (“*okrug*” in Rus.): the Aleksandrovsk to the north, the Tymovsk in between, and the Korsakovsk to the south (Istorija Saxalina 2008: 361). The last district roughly corresponded to Southern Sakhalin under Japanese reign, with its administrative centre located at Korsakovsk (Ōdomari in Jap., now Korsakov). Accordingly, Enchiws were as a whole absorbed into the Korsakovsk district, where the Russian military posts,

<sup>15</sup> Piłsudski 1998d: 340-341, Table 6. There were 22 settlements (*kotans* in Ainu) and 95 households (652 inhabitants in total) on the eastern coast, whilst on the western — 49 settlements and 102 households (710 inhabitants). In the text is found a brief description of each *kotan* all through the eastern and western coasts.

<sup>16</sup> On the eastern coast there were the southern subgroup along the Sea of Okhotsk and the northern one on the Bay of Patience (the so-called Taraika Ainu), whilst on the western coast were the southern (in the Mauka region) and the northern (in the Kushunnai-Ushoro region) subgroups.

<sup>17</sup> Up until 1875 there had existed the fifth “southernmost” subgroup, the largest one, in the Aniwa Bay region, from where evacuated 733 persons for Japan (see footnote 6), and, therefore, this subgroup disappeared as a matter of fact.

such as Korsakovsk, Tikhmenevsk (Shisuka in Jap., now Poronaisk), and Vladimirovka (Toyohara in Jap., now Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk), were being developed into urban-type towns as local centres of administration. Those Enchiws who lived close to Russian villages underwent a strong impact of acculturation in terms of subsistence economy, mode of life, and language (Piłsudski 1996: 398-400). Such was the situation of the Enchiw on Sakhalin in 1902-1905 when Piłsudski conducted his field research.

Looking forward to the imminent termination of the penal colony on Sakhalin, and also the inevitable adoption of a local self-government structure analogous to that of the “*zemstvo*” (the regional self-administrative body of czarist Russia since 1864), Piłsudski submitted to the governor his “Draft” proposing an ideal legislation model of sociopolitical and economic reforms assuring a kind of self-government and autonomy for Enchiws. His principal proposals are the following (see also Inoue 2010: 344-358):

According to the “Draft”, southern Sakhalin is to be divided into two halves, the eastern and western sectors, with each half again divided into two parts, northern and southern (“*volost*” — the smallest administrative division of czarist Russia). Every *volost'* has an elected headman (“*staršina*”) and his two assistants, whilst every village has an elected headman (“*starosta*” — the village chief). Each headman is elected for a three-year term so as to execute his duties as a public servant, in principle, with no gratification (Articles I and IV). The governor appoints a special officer for indigenous affairs (“*inorodčeskij načal'nik*” — i.e. a supervisor for the indigenes) to each sector, eastern or western, who supervises jobs of the *staršinas*. An indigenous government office (“*inorodčeskaja uprava*”), consisting of four *staršinas* and eight assistants, in the presence of the two supervisors convenes a meeting in a certain interval and decides all the matters concerning indigenous affairs (II, III, and X). Since the supervisors are fully subordinate to the governor, the latter bears ultimate responsibility for the welfare of the whole Enchiw (XXVIII).

Because of sporadic distribution of small-size Enchiw *kotans*, constantly threatened to be swallowed by Russian villages, he recommends that several *kotans* are to be unified into a larger village located where natural resources allow the development of maritime fishery, animal-raising, and gardening (I). And every Enchiw *kotan* should have a strictly defined allotment of land including hayfield and pasturage, even though it lacks all of them at present (XVI). In order to prepare against calamities he postulates: in every *volost'* there is at least one public (commune) storehouse in which flour, rice and fish are preserved. Otherwise, the *volost'* may decide to collect money and to create a public fund (“*inorodčeskij kapital*”), from which certain sums could be assigned either as loans or as irreclaimable aids to those in need. It is very important that the management of the both is to be entrusted to the *staršinas* (XV).

As for the duties claimable onto Enchiws, he recommends them to pay tax saying: “I am of the opinion that the natural resources of the island fully justify the burdening of its inhabitants with certain liabilities for the benefit of the state. The payment of a direct

tax [...] will also play an educating role” — fostering a sense of citizenship among them (XIII).

Education was a great cause Piłsudski pursued through his life. In 1902-1905 he attempted to teach Enchiw children Russian and arithmetic as a basic foundation for every citizen, by organizing literacy schools (“*školy gramaty*”) in several Enchiw *kotans* on the Okhotsk sea coast (Inoue 2010: 348-361). Based on these experiences he postulates: at least one school ought to be founded in every *volost'*, and the school education is secular in character, practice-oriented, and obligatory for children of both sexes. The schools are also open for Russian children living in the *volost'*, none the less these ought to be located inside the *kotans* so that Enchiws can have an eye on them and consider them theirs (XXIII and XXIV).

If the Piłsudski's “Draft” were to be materialized as such in a real political practice on Sakhalin, the Enchiw situation could have been quite different from what happened in reality. We could have also expected that the Enchiw might have stood for an independent nationality with solid Enchiw identity established in the midst of multi-ethnic Russia. However, Japan's victory over Russia in the war completely prevented both of the above-mentioned from taking place. Meanwhile it is also inferable that Piłsudski might have foreseen a civic society in which every Enchiw can enjoy equal rights and is treated as an even member of the society, even though one's principal identity remains as basing on a local principle, i.e. the *volost'*. Then his modernization strategy may well be termed as a local self-government model built on the *volost'* autonomy.

### 3. A case of Enchiw descendants in contemporary Japan

In 1945-1948 more than one thousand Enchiws evacuated from the island of Sakhalin to Japan, mainly to the island of Hokkaido. Different from the first evacuation of 1875 that had absorbed only 35% of the whole population, this was exactly a literal exodus of the Enchiw from their native island<sup>18</sup>. After their landing on ports of Japan these evacuees dispersed into the Japanese society seeking their individual niches predominantly in cities, towns and villages of Hokkaido. This is generally explained by their hope to avoid various discriminations from which the Ainu in general were suffering, by hiding their Ainu/Enchiw descent in their social life. Hence, parents abstained from handing their traditional culture and Enchiw speech down on their children so that the latter should become authentic Japanese. Consequently, in half a century, those Enchiw descendants who were born in Japan — those of the second and further generations, have succeeded in becoming the authentic Japanese, without any sense of Enchiw identity. It is not rare

<sup>18</sup> They were obliged to involuntarily abandon Sakhalin Island due to their Japanese citizenship along with the other Japanese residents alike. There exists no reliable source concerning the real figure of these Enchiw evacuees. Since Soviet census statistics never referred to Enchiws, it was generally considered that there was no Enchiw population in the Soviet Union. However, as a consequence of the change of passport formulation in Russia, several Russian citizens came out to be of Enchiw origin, not only on Sakhalin but also in Kamchatka. In 2011 we could also meet a newly discovered Enchiw family in Gornozavodsk on the western coast of Sakhalin.

that they live a Japanese life with no knowledge of their Enchiw descent (Inoue 2013: 194-195). It appeared as if the Enchiw identity might have been completely lost among these Enchiw descendants in Japan.

Accordingly, it was a great surprise to hear that “Sakhalin Ainu Association” was organized at Wakasakanai<sup>19</sup> in the environs of Wakkanai (the northernmost city of Hokkaido) and started functioning on January 2, 2001, putting up two tasks — recovery of the Enchiw identity and succession of the Enchiw cultural heritage (*ibid.*).

Mamoru Tazawa (the initiator and present president of the association) was born to an Enchiw family in Wakasakanai in 1955 and lived there by his graduation from a local high school.

His father was a well-read erudite and one of the leaders both in Sakhalin and Hokkaido, and, what is more, in a sense also an authentic Japanese. He educated his children in conformity with the classical Japanese ethics and required each of them to become an “exemplary Japanese”. And therefore, he never tried to hand either the tongue or the culture and worldview of Enchiws down on them. Mamoru says that he obeyed his father while he was in Wakasakanai. It is most remarkable that he was never discriminated against by the Japanese, particularly by his Japanese play and school mates, because of a relative majority of the Enchiw population in the village life of Wakasakanai (Inoue 2013: 195).

In 1974 Tazawa started his professional life in Sapporo and eventually found carpentry as his life’s work. Following his father, he also took part in the activities of “Hokkaido Ainu Association (*Hokkaidō Utari Kyōkai*)”. However, he repeatedly found himself in an awkward situation where he had to endure discriminative treatments from both sides — the Japanese and his fellows, i.e. the Hokkaido Ainu. It was the first discriminations he ever experienced in his life. Motivated by a sense of alienation from the both, he set out on a journey in quest of “his own” and finally reached, against the father’s will, the Enchiw identity (*ibid.*).

His first visit of Sakhalin in 1992 — a group tour of the former residents visiting their family graves — considerably drove him toward the Enchiw identity. He could obtain plenty of detailed information on Enchiws and their culture from his grandmother

---

<sup>19</sup> The settlement of Wakasakanai was constructed in 1949 on virgin soils, cleared up by joint efforts of the Japanese and Enchiw evacuees from the village of Hirochi with Tarantomari (now Kalinino) included therein on the western coast of Sakhalin, in other words, by the former members of Hirochi Fishing Cooperative. The founders of the fishing cooperative newly created at Wakasakanai were nobody else but the former leaders of the Hirochi Cooperative. The community of Wakasakanai reached a zenith of its existence in the early 1950s, consisting of 120 households and 650 inhabitants of whom Enchiws constituted approximately one half. This proportion was kept more or less stable. Apart from a rare phenomenon — friendly and stable collaboration of the Japanese and Enchiws who shared a settlement — the uniqueness of this community also resided in the following: 1) It was the single case in Hokkaido of Enchiws getting together forming a certain colony; 2) they secluded themselves avoiding outsiders’ access to them for many years. It was only three decades ago that they began gradually lifting the ban on the access to themselves. Therefore, very little is known to us yet concerning the realities of their past (Inoue 2013: 194-195).

who accompanied him. When they were in their homeland, the former *kotan* of Tarantomari, her every narrative of the past days, given on the very spot, literally brought about a new discovery of homeland for him. Therefore, Tarantomari turned into an inexhaustible wellspring for his identity formation (*ibid.*).

In August of 2011 the Sakhalin Ainu Association ventured the second field survey on Sakhalin. Tazawa was able to pay a third visit to Tarantomari, where he traced the devastated Enchiw cemetery on the top of a nearby mountain. In Gornozavodsk (Naihoru in Jap.) on the western coast, the association could accept four Russian citizens as the first foreign members — the Enchiw family of Watanabe that had remained on Sakhalin after 1948. In Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Tazawa asked for a meeting with the Governor of Sakhalin Province. Although the meeting did not take place, Tazawa could manage to submit written questions to the governor<sup>20</sup>.

Here follows the text:

Dear Governor of Sakhalin Province, we would like to hear of your answers to the following:

- 1) What will be your official view on our Sakhalin Ainu Association? Or, do you acknowledge the presence in contemporary Japan of the descendants of those Sakhalin Ainu who were born on Sakhalin but forced to leave their homelands in post-war turmoil, and emigrated to Japan?
- 2) What measure can be undertaken by the authorities if someone from the members of our association will want to live in the homeland of his/her parents and forebears? Will it be possible that this person shall enjoy the status of free residence on Sakhalin preserving Japanese citizenship?
- 3) What kind of actions will be taken by you if someone of our members will wish to ask the government of Russia for repatriation to his/her historical motherland? Is it possible that the member of our association shall be accepted as a repatriate?
- 4) Is there any possibility for us, in both cases, to inherit the patents for the land and the water of Sakhalin Island which were possessed by our parents and forebears up until the end of World War 2?

The association has not yet received any answer from the governor ever since. It is not very clear how the recent change of governor in Sakhalin will affect his stance on this matter, either positively or negatively. Be that as it may, but once it happened that the Enchiw evacuees returned to their native island, why not the same be repeated in the future?!

<sup>20</sup> Inoue 2013: 195. The subsequent text is found on p. 196 thereof.

On October 12, 2011, in Sapporo, the same inquiry in the form of an association's official letter addressed to the Sakhalin Governor, A. V. Khoroshavin, was also handed over to A. A. Kutovoy — Representative of the Sakhalin Province Governor in Sapporo, Hokkaido.

At present the Enchiw identity is shared by a little over fifty association members — however small in number, they represent both the western and eastern coasts, and the Tsuishikari Ainu as well. In order to attain the desired end they are looking for adequate action plans for the near future. Incidentally it seems rather evident that Piłsudski's proposals as such are not straightly applicable to the contemporary Enchiw situation due to a century's time difference and, moreover, to the fact that they have already been "modernized". Therefore, a more appropriate alternative strategy should be elaborated basing on the legacy of Bronisław Piłsudski.

In conclusion the present author feels it irresistible to quote here once again the Piłsudski's meaningful bequeathal:

"The problem of their 'to be or not to be' on Sakhalin will hopefully be discussed on the grounds of a much wider viewpoint seeking causes of the phenomena of social character in the depth of contemporary social life and historical past."

## Bibliography

Inoue, Kōichi

- 2010 Bronisław Piłsudski's Endeavours on Ainu Education and Self-government, in: K. Sawada & K. Inoue (eds.), *A Critical Biography of Bronisław Piłsudski*, volume 1: 337-366, Saitama
- 2013 Asociacija saxalinskix ajnov i jejo perspektivy, in: *Istorija i kul'tura korennyx narodov Dal'nego Vostoka*, 194-196, Južno-Saxalinsk

Istorija Saxalina

- 2008 *Istorija Saxalina i Kuril'skix ostrovov s drevnejšix vremen do načala XXI stoletija*, Južno-Saxalinsk: Saxalinskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo

Kindaichi, Kyōsuke

- 1960 Aino or Ainu? (Lectures on Ainu linguistics, Part I, Chapter 1: 1-5) in: K. Kindaichi, *Studies on the Ainu Language* [金田一京助「アイノかアイヌか」(「アイヌ語学講義」第I編「序説」、第1章)、『金田一博士喜寿記念 アイヌ語研究』(金田一京助選集I)三省堂]

Piłsudski, Bronisław / Pilsudskij, Bronislav

- 1996 Predvaritel'nyj otčet o pojezdke k ajnam o. Saxalina v 1902-1903 gg. B. Pilsudskogo, *Vestnik Saxalinskogo muzeja* № 3: 398-403, Južno-Saxalinsk: Saxalinskij oblastnoj krajevedčeskij muzej
- 1998a B. O. Piłsudski's report of his expedition to the Ainu and Oroks of the island of Sakhalin in the years 1903-1905 (translated by A.F. Majewicz), in: A.F. Majewicz (ed.), *The Aborigines of Sakhalin (The Collected Works of Bronisław Piłsudski*, volume 1): 192-221, Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- 1998b An outline of the economic life of the Ainu on the island of Sakhalin (translated by A.F. Majewicz), in: *The Collected Works of Bronisław Piłsudski*, vol. 1: 271-295

- 1998c A draft of rules for the establishment of authority over the Sakhalin Ainu, with short explanations on particular points (translated by A.F. Majewicz), in: *The Collected Works of Bronislaw Pilsudski*, vol. 1: 296-310
- 1998d Selected information on individual Ainu settlements on the island of Sakhalin (translated by A.F. Majewicz), in: *The Collected Works of Bronislaw Pilsudski*, vol. 1: 311-345
- 1998e On the bear festival of the Ainu on the island of Sakhalin (1914, 1909) (translated by A.F. Majewicz), *The Collected Works of Bronislaw Pilsudski*, vol. 1: 438-561
- 2000 Projekt pravil ob ustrojstve byta i upravljenija ajnov s kratkimi ob"jasnenijami otdel'nyx punktov, *Izvestija Instituta nasledija Bronislava Pilsudskogo* № 4: 41-61, Južno-Saxalinsk
- 2001 Projekt pravil ob ustrojstve byta i upravljenija ajnov s kratkimi ob"jasnenijami otdel'nyx punktov, in: A.F. Majewicz and T. Wicherkiewicz (eds.), *Bronislaw Pilsudski and Futabatei Shimei — An Excellent Charter in the History of Polish-Japanese Relations: Materials of the Third International Conference on Bronislaw Pilsudski and His Scholarly Heritage*, 125-149, Poznań
- Sentoku, Tarōji
- 1929 *Collected Stories on the Sakhalin Ainu* [千徳太郎治『樺太アイヌ叢話』市光堂、【復刻版】『アイヌ史資料集』6巻『樺太編』分冊所収、北海道出版企画センター、1980]
- Tazaki, Isamu
- 1992 Documentation of the Sakhalin Ainu forcibly deported to Tsuishikari (the chapter 2: 37-291, in: Association for the Study of Sakhalin Ainu History (ed.), *Monuments of Tsuishikari*) [田崎勇「対雁強制移住樺太アイヌの記録」、樺太アイヌ史研究会編『対雁の碑—樺太アイヌ強制移住の歴史』第2章、札幌：北海道出版企画センター]
- Yamabe, Yasunosuke
- 1913 *Ainu Stories* [山邊安之助『あいぬ物語』博文館、【復刻版】『アイヌ史資料集』6巻『樺太編』分冊所収]

エンチウ（樺太アイヌ）のアイデンティティ状況に関する事例研究  
— B・ピウスツキの「樺太アイヌ統治規程草案」（1905）を再考する —

井上紘一

樺太島の原住民族であったエンチウ（樺太アイヌ）のアイデンティティ状況が、(1) 1875～1905年の「対雁アイヌ」、(2) 1902～1905年のサハリンにおける「エンチウ」、(3) 現代の日本における「エンチウ」の3事例をめぐって考察される。

「エンチウ・アイデンティティ」は、萌芽状態にあったにもかかわらず異郷での特殊状況に対応する中で、北海道では最高水準に達したと想定される（第1例）。20世紀初頭にはピウスツキの「近代化戦略」の実践を通して、同アイデンティティは開花するかに見えたが、日露戦争によって挫折する（第2例）。第2次大戦後に日本へ総移住したエンチウとその末裔は、同アイデンティティの否定という道を選択したが、2001年に創設された「樺太アイヌ協会」は、エンチウ・アイデンティティの零からの再構築を謳っており（第3例）、その成否・動向が注目される。