



Title	博物館展示における先住民族との協働：国立アイヌ民族博物館と国立アメリカ・インディアン博物館の比較
Author(s)	小坂田, 裕子; Osakada, Yuko
Citation	境界研究, 12, 93-106
Issue Date	2022-03-31
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/jbr.12.93
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/85038
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	06s.pdf, 英文要旨



Before and after the opening of Upopoy, various people have evaluated the role of the museum and the contents of its exhibitions from various perspectives. However, it is probably not well-known what kind of philosophy the Upopoy have in conducting research, exhibitions, and cultural transmission activities. Therefore, this special issue, entitled “Upopoy Studies or Studies in Upopoy,” aims to elaborate on the philosophy and logic of the exhibitions and activities inherent in Upopoy, which have not been widely reported by the Japanese media. We asked researchers of Upopoy (Shinichi Tateishi, Sakurako Koresawa and Mark Winchester) and an outside researcher, who has done researches on Upopoy after its opening from the perspective of indigenous people's rights (Yuko Osakada), to contribute to this special issue. To know the studies in Upopoy leads us to study the Upopoy itself. In addition, I decided to ask residents in Shiraoi with Ainu roots (Yoshinori Futamata, Naomi Tamura and Kenyu Yamamaru) to write a column, entitled “Upopoy for Shiraoi,” in which they would give their honest opinions about what they expect from Upopoy in the future.

The Development of Collaborative Exhibitions with Indigenous Peoples: A Comparative Analysis Between the National Ainu Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian

OSAKADA Yuko

In 2020, the National Ainu Museum (NAM) was established in UPOPOY, namely the “Symbolic Space for Ethnic Harmony” in Shiraoi, Hokkaido. The special character of its exhibitions is indigenous narrative by making “We as the Ainu” the subjects of its exhibition descriptions. The NAM attached importance to the concept that the Ainu themselves, not the national government or the researchers, introduce their own cultures to the visitors, and respected the involvement of the Ainu in the creation of exhibitions, according to an interview with the director of NAM. However, there are various criticisms of NAM. One of them is that NAM did not respect the Ainu’s proactive participation in developing its exhibitions. This article addresses how such perception gap occurs by comparing collaboration with indigenous peoples in the cases of NAM and the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI). This examination contributes to seeking better collaborative exhibitions with indigenous peoples.

This article reveals that although NAM learned the indigenous narrative for their exhibitions from

NMAI, how these museums collaborated with indigenous peoples is different. NMAI collaborated with indigenous curators who were appointed by the indigenous communities themselves. Indigenous peoples welcomed such collaborations as “shared authority”, or even as the effective implementation of their “cultural sovereignty”. While their exhibitions were, however, not free from criticisms, NMAI overcame these criticisms by creating a new exhibition with indigenous community curators.

On the other hand, NAM collaborated mainly with Ainu people who were considered professional in the Ainu languages or cultures. The members of the Working Group for NAM’s exhibitions were appointed by the Japanese government or the preparation committee of NAM, not by the indigenous communities themselves. Some Ainu people who were excluded from this collaboration process have criticized the way NAM’s exhibitions were created. They might consider that the collaboration with indigenous community curators just like NMAI did is more desirable. This is how the above-mentioned perception gap occurred.

As long as NAM uses the indigenous narrative by making “We as the Ainu” subjects of their exhibition descriptions, Ainu participation in developing its exhibitions is indispensable. The necessity for Ainu participation was consistently recognized through the establishment process of NAM. In addition, the number of Ainu experts in their languages and cultures is limited. Against these backgrounds, this author argues that the option of collaboration with indigenous community curators will become more important for NAM.

However, realizing collaboration with indigenous community curators requires that many difficulties be overcome. NAM and Ainu must confront existing problems, such as the lack of a nation-wide representative organization of Ainu, and the diversity of views among Ainu, more seriously. It should also be noted that such a collaboration will not prevent criticisms against its achievements, that is, their exhibitions.

Ultimately, how to collaborate with indigenous peoples depends on how to consider the role of museums. When it comes to NAM, the problem is how to consider the role of the museum which was established in the “Symbolic Space for Ethnic Harmony”. Different groups see it as a sightseeing facility, an enlightenment facility, a facility for preserving and developing Ainu culture, or even as a facility for realizing the right to self-determination of the Ainu. This issue requires further discussion among the concerned parties, thus the author does not give an immediate answer to this.

In the establishment process of NAM, it was emphasized that “by creating better conditions for the Ainu people to proactively participate in museum activities, NAM will develop its exhibitions through dialogue and interaction with them”. The author will continue to bring into focus how NAM addresses various criticisms by some Ainu people and how it develops its exhibitions. The

author believes that NAM could learn more from NMAI's collaboration experience with indigenous community curators to make its exhibitions better.

A Practical Attempt to Create a Museum as a Forum: The Exhibition Spaces of the National Ainu Museum

TATEISHI Shinichi

The National Ainu Museum (NAM), a core facility of “Upopoy” or National Ainu Museum and Park, opened in Shiraoi, Hokkaido on 21 July 2020. From the time of the establishment of the Preparatory Office for the museum, we considered whether it would be possible to create a museum as a forum. Since its opening, NAM has received various criticisms and been subject to a variety of opinions. The main criticisms include the lack of exhibits concerning the “negative history” of the Ainu, and the subjectivity of the museum. There were also many slanderous and discriminatory remarks against Upopoy and NAM on Social Networking Services (SNS). To address this issue, NAM has set up a “Frequently Asked Questions” section on its website. The museum has also made active attempts to transmit information and opinions concerning its exhibits. The information presented here is information that cannot be covered by the exhibits alone. It can be divided into two points. The first concerns the history and culture of the Ainu people, and the second concerns the characteristics of the museum and the history of its establishment. This article mainly discusses the second. Behind these active attempts lies the special nature of NAM compared to other museums. It can be argued that some of the exhibits in the museum are misunderstood because the special nature of the National Ainu Museum has not been fully communicated. Therefore, in order for the museum to become a “museum as a forum”, it is necessary to show such peculiarities in the exhibition space in order to share its nature with visitors.

Based on the contents of the “Frequently Asked Questions” section, the author, as a representative of the museum, posited two themes for discussion: the history of the opening of NAM and the nature of NAM. NAM made several efforts to help visitors understand the nature and philosophy behind the establishment of the museum. Furthermore, in addition to the permanent exhibition, an entrance lobby exhibition called “National Ainu Museum 2020” was held on the first floor of the museum. This exhibition introduced the history of the establishment of NAM and the history of Lake Poroto,