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FOREWORD

The volume contains selected papers from the XIXth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA) in Seoul in 2010, titled *Expanding the Frontiers of Comparative Literature*, held from 15 to 21 August in the Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Korea.

Part I of the volume consists of the outcome of the Workshop, *Intellectual Interactions in East Asia in 1920s and 30s — Poetry, Art and New Utopianism*—organized by Tôru Haga, Professor Emeritus, Tokyo University, and former Vice-President of the ICLA-AILC (*International Comparative Literature Association, Association internationale de littérature comparée*).

Part II includes papers presented in the Panel, *The Noguchi Legacy: Artistic Vagabondage of Yone and Isamu Noguchi — Between Patriotism and Internationalism in Conflict between the East and the West: From Poetry to Sculpture*—organized by Shigemi Inaga, Professor at the International Research Center for Japanese Studies, Kyoto, Japan, and currently member of the Executive Committee of the ICLA-AILC.
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PART I. Workshop

Intellectual Interactions
in East-Asia in the 1920s and 30s:
— Poetry, Art and New Utopianism —
Part I workshop

Intellectual Interactions in East Asia in the 1920s and 30s: Poetry, Art and New Utopianism

Organizer: Tōru HAGA 芳賀 徹
Professor Emeritus, University of Tokyo, Ex-Vice President, ICLA

Purport of the Workshop:

The 1920s and 30s, the years between the two World Wars (1914-1918 and 1940-1945), were a period of deceptive calm, so to speak, in East Asia. The region had not yet witnessed an all-out war. Even then, it was a period of constant upheaval in Japan, China and colonized Korea, brimming with the rapid progress of heavy industry, the steady advance of Japanese expansionism and the rise of the countermovement in Korea and China, as well as with the increasing influx of American and European post-War cultures rivaled by that of the new Soviet Communist ideology.

In spite of, or rather because of, this social upheaval and growing conflict of national interests, a number of poets, writers, artists and scholars in Japan, Korea and China strove, often in collaboration, for a better understanding of each other’s culture and a stronger grasp of their Asian identities. They traveled to and fro, met each other, discussed, studied and thought about the means of overcoming the threat of the social and political crises in East Asia.

Socialism, New Village Movement, Esperanto, European modernism in art and poetry, Bahaism, Folk Crafts (Mingei) Movement, reforms in education, new Asian Utopianism, in short, were the main objects of their common search and struggle.

Most of their idealistic pursuits were doomed to fail and collapse at the outbreak of the Second World War. After this “last night of Asia”, however, couldn’t their vision survive to encourage us to overcome today’s sterilizing globalization of cultures?
In the following pages, members of the Workshop report and discuss on these different and common dreams of poets, artists and intellectuals of pre-War Asia.
‘New Village’ Movement: From Mushanokoji to Mao Zedong

Tōru Haga

When Emperor Meiji deceased on July 30, 1912, a majority of the Japanese people went into deep mourning, grieving the loss of their greatest leader of modernization. But there were some young men and women with a rebellious spirit who felt rather relieved at the news, secretly expecting liberation from the imposing rule of Meiji Government. Yamakawa Kikue, a student of Tsuda Women’s College of Tokyo, was such a girl: she recollects that at that beautifully moon-lit night she felt rather cheerful like a little girl who was looking forward to next day’s school excursion. (*Onna Nidai no Ki*, p.149)

Her presentiment was not betrayed. Soon after the much mourned death of Emperor Meiji, many reformers and reformists in big cities started forcefully calling for “change”, for “kaizo”, for re-programing of social systems of all sorts of old Japan. It went to such an extent that when Yamakawa Kikune, married to a leading scholar of socialist-Marxist theory, Yamakawa Hitoshi, gave birth to their first boy in 1917, they quarreled about the name to be given to their baby. While the husband Hitoshi insisted on naming him Sosaku (创作 Creation) or Kaisaku (改作 Reform) or even Kaizo (改造 Reconstruction), the wife Kikue opposed it, finding these names to be ideologically very crude. After quarrelling for a few days, the boy was finally named Shinsaku (振作 Promotion, Encouragement). Shinsaku later became a biologist and a senior colleague of mine at the University of Tokyo.

In fact, many progressive monthly magazines were launched around this mid-Taisho period (1910’s) each carrying a name very similar to that of Yamakawa’s boy. For instance in 1919, the year of the March
1st Independence Movement in Korea and the May 4th anti-colonialist Movement in China, several magazines were started: Warera (『我等』We) in February, Kaizo (『改造』Reconstruction) in April, Kāibo (『解放』Liberation) in June; all these were led by liberal scholars and opinion leaders. Shakai-mondai Kenkyu (『社会問題研究』Studies in Social Problems) and Shakaishugi Kenkyu (『社会主義研究』Studies in Socialism) followed them in the same year, edited by groups of more leftist writers.

If we go through these leading magazines of the time, it is an amazing, bustling parade of essays, eagerly urging “reforms” in almost all sectors of Japanese society and culture: clique controlled party politics, universal suffrage, social welfare, school education, women's life conditions, love and marriage, labor of eight hours a day, freedom of labor union, urbanization and life in rural communities, reduction of naval force, Japan’s colonial government, and even Japan's state structure. Hasegawa Nyozekan, Oyama Ikuo, Yoshino Sakuzo, Abe I soo, Yamakawa Hitoshi and Kikue, Yosano Akiko, Yamada Waka, Yanagi Muneyoshi and even a Kantian philosopher of the Imperial University of Tokyo, Kuwaki Genyoku, were the most well known of critics, professors, poets and writers contributing to these monthlies, directly and indirectly influenced by the Russian Revolution and post-War American, European and Asian political developments.

It was from among this enterprise of reformist leaders that emerged in 1918 a group of Utopian pioneers of the ‘New Village’ led by a 33-year-old writer, Mushanokoji Saneatsu (武者小路実篤, 1885-1976). As his name suggests, Mushanokoji was born in a family of very old court nobles and educated at Gakushu-in (School of Peers). Together with his classmates, Shiga Naoya, Nagayo Zenro, et al, he was one of the founders and chief editors of the anti-naturalist literary magazine, Shirakaba (『白樺』, 1910) which had a wide-ranging and deep influence on young intellectuals and artists of the Japan of the 1910’s and 1920’s. What led this young, prolific writer of aristocratic taste to throw off his own well-settled life and renown in order to put into practice his Utopian dream of the New Village in 1918 is not an easy question to answer. The prevailing thoughts of the time and the exuberance of those who demanded change and reforms certainly influenced the very sensitive mind of Mushanokoji. He knew fairly well of
the recent developments in Communist Russia which he had even foreseen several years before it came to the fore with the call for liberating people's life from capitalist exploitation, though he could never accept the idea of a bloody class-strife.

Mushanokoji probably also learnt something of the Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin's theory of "mutualism" as well as European Utopianism from Thomas More, Tommaso Campanella to William Morris's *News from Nowhere*. At the same time, he was a life-long admirer of the fervent lives of Vincent van Gogh, Paul Gauguin, Cézanne and Auguste Rodin and was one of the first art critics to introduce them to the studious public of the 1910's Japan through his *Shirakaba*. But the strongest push toward a radical action of creating a real Utopian village on earth came to him when, as a student, he started seriously reading Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910). He was so much fascinated by this great Russian novelist that he said that whenever and wherever he noticed the Japanese letter 'To' his face blushed instantly from emotion. The so-called Tolstoian humanitarianism – pacifism, egalitarianism and abolition of private property – took deep root in Mushanokoji's mind, together with the Shirakaba idealism of the full realization of individuality. He says also that he had constant pangs of conscience, a sense of original sin, so-to-speak, of being born and educated in a privileged family of aristocracy and of living an easy life without knowing any hardships of physical labor.

Urged by this intellectual and emotional complex, Mushanokoji set about his adventure of pioneering the New Village in early November 1918 on a small, half-wasted land of only 8 acres (about 8,500 *tsubo*), located in the remotest mountain area of the South of Kyushu Island (Miyazaki Prefecture, Koyu County, Kijo Village, Ishikawachi, Jo 宮崎県児湯郡木城村大字石河内字城). It may not be relevant to enter into the details of the founding history of the Village. Mushanokoji was the chief of the village and the leader-mentor of the first 17 villagers, including his wife and adopted daughter; he was as well the main financial contributor to the village budget. Many expected and unexpected difficulties awaited these inexperienced farmers of the barren land. There were for some years no hospital, nor post-office, nor school in the village. They had only poor
huts for dwelling, some pens for chicken, sheep and horses, but they had a common dining hall and peach-blossom-spring like beautiful views of hills, woods, bamboo groves and a rapid river encircling the village on its three sides. The nearest station of stagecoach, the only transportation facility to a town, was located at a distance of 12 kilometers beyond a steep mountain pass to be crossed only by foot. There soon arose inevitable disputes, quarrels among Utopian brother and sisterhood, and even a love affair around the village chief himself.

In spite of these inconveniences and troubles and against sneering criticism coming from the Tokyo intellectuals, for instance that of socialist Yamakawa Hitoshi saying very rightly that a spot of oasis could never turn a desert to a green, fertile land, Mushanokoji stood firm, self-confident and remained for ever the optimist and dreamer, plowing himself the field of vegetables and barley during the daytime and writing in the evening many essays, reports of village life, novels and dramas to be published in journals and literary magazines in Tokyo. In a half-novelized report from the New Village published in Kaibo (Liberation) in the third year of village life, he wrote: “What are we going to do here? We are intending to inaugurate a new society from here. In this community all inhabitants work for fixed hours a day when it is possible. Free from all care of food, clothing and dwelling, they will pursue to accomplish their given individuality and their mandate from Heaven, enjoying total freedom of mind in this place where no money is needed. Can such a dream be realized? Yes, of course!”

The memorial day of inauguration of the New Village was decided to be November 14th, the date which coincided with the birthday of Auguste Rodin. Villagers named a huge, rugged stone standing up out of the river “Rodin Rock”.

It is almost miraculous that such an aristocrat by nature, such a Tolstoian utopist as Mushanokoji could endure and overcome difficulties of a farmer's life for seven years. He finally quit his Hyuga kolkhoz in late December 1925, leaving the management to the villagers who stayed back. Though minimum in scale and in the number of inhabitants, the Utopian experimentation of the New Village had a strong impact more outside of Japan than within. The first positive response came from China: it was
Zhou Zuoren (周作人, 1885-1967), the younger brother of Lu Xun (魯迅, 1881-1936) and then Professor of Literature at Peking University, who was a subscriber of Shirakaba from its earliest issues (special issue on A. Rodin) and who paid the one-year subscription fee of 1 yen 20 sen quickly responding to the request of the Society of New Village of Tokyo in October 1918. Zhou Zuoren felt as if his own long-kept secret expectation was made explicit and realized in the courageous deed of the Japanese novelist he admired.

Zhou Zuoren’s response was quick, and he published next spring an essay titled “New Village of Japan” (日本的新村) in an influential monthly of Beijing The New Youth (『新青年』) of March 1919 (Vol.6, No.3). In this essay, he wrote: “The New Village Movement started recently in Japan is a remarkable event on contemporary world scene. Until now dreamers of Utopia were not few certainly, but very often they remained simple dreamers or, even once set to work, they disappeared soon for many reasons of difficulty. Tolstoy’s high experimentation “No bread without labor” was put in practice. His idea however could not be perfect because he insisted too much on physical labor, excluding mental work and he proposed an extreme altruism while oppressing the rights of the individual. The New Village Movement on the other hand pushed one step forward: carrying out one’s duty toward the mankind, one should lead a communal and collaborative working life by all, while paying high respect to one’s individuality and freedom. This is an idealism acutely needed and realizable, a new, universal gospel for the mankind.”

Zhou’s strongly sympathetic support was made frequently public from 1919 to 1920 and on his second journey to Japan in 1919 he even visited the village of that very remote corner of Miyazaki Prefecture and stayed there for five days in early July to the greatest joy of Mushanokoji and his brotherhood. Upon his return to Beijing, he wrote a very interesting report of his farming experience in the village (『新潮』, Oct., 1919) and finally he accepted to make his home the Beijing Branch of the New Village. Tens of his students of Beijing went to Kyushu to visit the village in May 1920 and there were many letters and visits to him from different provinces and cities of China.
Learning from Mushanokoji’s village through Zhou Zuoren, various forms of Utopian community were experimented here and there in China around 1920: Young China Society (少年中国学会), Mutual-aid Association for Working and Learning (工读互助团) or New Men’s Society (新人会). Though short lived, they shared the same impulse and impatience as in contemporary Japan for reconstruction, for change of current social institutions, curiously in spite of the fact that the anti-Japan Movement of May 4th was going on through 1919.

Here appears the name of Mao Zedong not as a terrible old dictator of Cultural Revolution, but as another young romantic promoter of the New Village movement in Hunan Province. Graduating from the Hunan Normal School in 1918, Mao at his age of 25 traveled to, and stayed in Beijing and Shanghai from summer 1918 through spring 1919. There he must have read the famous articles of Zhou Zuoren and heard much about the reformist movements in China, Russia and Japan. Upon his return to Changsee (长沙), he wrote a most interesting article on the Program of Building a New Village at the foot of Mt. Yuè lù shan (岳麓山) near Changsee. The result of a long-cherished dream, he says, the essay was titled “Students in Action” (学生之工作) or “Works of Students” and published in the monthly Human Education in December 1919.

Reshaping the old is never enough, Mao Zedong insisted, if one wants true progress in family life and society; but a strong will power for creating the new is indispensable. Only a new pragmatic education at a new school system will provide open minded students who, returning to their home land, are alone capable of changing the dark, old, oppressive family life, stagnant provincial, rural government as well as the polluted national election system. The creation of a new school and the enforcement of new education must be closely related to creating a new family and a new society. Young Mao Zedong was as much a Utopian and optimist as Mushanokoji and made even a plan of division of hours of sleeping, learning, playing and working of one day followed by a detailed curriculum of practical learning through farming labor. In this new village, there will not only be new public schools, public day nursery and kindergarten but also public library, bank, collaborative farms and factories, park, theater, hospital and museum. When
all these new institutions joined together, there will be a New Village. He knew there were “model states” such as France and Russia and “model cities” such as Berlin and Paris. But these “models” were still too far and too high to be a target of his compatriots; a “model village” was much more secure and much easier to be started in Hunan. To encourage himself and his comrades, Mao was cosmopolitan enough to mention the forerunners of the Russian Narodnik movement, the Japanese youth’s recent “New Village” movement and the Learning through Working Movement in the United States and in the Philippines.

From this dream of Yuè lù shan New Village, Mao will soon leap to a vision of a Hunan Independent Republic arguing that China is too vast and too much multi-racial to be ruled under one central government. This was his other bigger dream of 1920, just one year before he joined the inaugural meeting of China’s Communist Party in July 1921 in Shanghai.

Mushanokoji’s New Village in Kyushu was rather a feeble experimentation limited in a very narrow space and in a short duration of time. But probably because it was a tentative approach towards practicing a new way of laboring life envisaged by a literary visionary himself, it could have an impact, much broader and deeper than expected, on the new intellectual leaders of contemporary China who shared the common East Asian background of Tolstoian pacifism, respect of physical labor, fraternal mutual aid, cosmopolitan egalitarianism and humanitarianism. The movement looks today like a day dream dreamt in the lull of post-War world, to be soon crashed by the earthquake of 1923 in Japan and by the Bolshevik-nationalist conflicts in China. Still, the New Village Movement of the 1910’s and 1920’s in East Asia held out as a lasting vision for us, similar to that of the Peach Blossom Spring (桃源郷) of ancient China.

Tōru Haga
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The Quest for “Modern Love” in 1910–20s’ East Asia Through the Reception of Ellen Key’s Works

Noriko Hiraishi

“Modern Love” was a sensational topic discussed in the East Asian literary scenes during the early decades of the 20th century. It is intriguing that a groundswell of interest in the quest for Modern Love arose in the East Asian countries in this period and that their discussions shared an interest of a Swedish feminist writer Ellen Key (1849–1926). In this paper, I would like to explore the various forms of East Asian intellectuals’ pursuit of “Modern Love” by focusing on their reception of Ellen Key’s works.

Ellen Key in the 1910s’ Japan: Hiratsuka Raichō and Honma Hisao

Before examining the East Asian discussion of Modern Love, we outline Ellen Key’s thoughts.

Ellen Key, an educator and feminist writer, was born into a wealthy family in Sundsholm, Sweden. Her father was a liberal politician and her mother came from an aristocratic family. She received a progressive education at home, which led her to explore various places in Europe in 1875. In 1880, she began to teach at a private school for girls in Stockholm.

Apart from teaching, her main interest lay in literature. Soon after she moved to Stockholm in 1869, she became acquainted with the editor of Tidskrift för hemmet (Home Journal) that carried her first article in 1874. Besides teaching, Key contributed to feminist journals in the 1880s. In the speech “Missbrukad kvinnokraft (Misused Female Power, 1896),” she emphasized women’s motherhood. She quit teaching and started to earn
her living as a writer and lecturer. Her main works are *Barnets a rhundrade* (*Century of the Child*, 1900) that was highly acclaimed in Germany and *Lifelinjer* (*Lifelines*, 1903–1906).

In her second book, *Lifelines*, Key emphasizes the need for relationships based on love and the importance of motherhood. Having studied Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer, the theoretical basis for Key’s feminist ideas rests in the 19th century evolutionism. The first part of *Lifelines* was translated into eleven foreign languages, including the English version *Love and Marriage*, published in 1911. The ideas of these works based on love, sex, marriage, divorce, and motherhood were widely debated, and it became an important text in East Asia in the early 20th century.

As she always focused on women in limited “domestic work fields,” Key was critical of the women’s rights movement in Sweden, and was criticized by other feminists as well. Although she claimed sexual and political freedom for women, she limited the female labor market to teaching and nursing professions. For these reasons, German feminist Hedwig Dohm cited Key as an anti-feminist in her book *Die Antifeministen* (*The Antifeminists*, 1902).

Soon after Key’s work was first mentioned in a Japanese educational journal in 1905, her name began appearing in comments and essays on literature. In 1907, Tobari Chikufū (1873–1955), a critic specializing in German literature, predicted the following: “The freedom of love, claimed by Swedish female scholar Ellen Key, will soon be advocated by our women.”¹ It is notable that in this article Key was mentioned with Ibsen, the Norwegian dramatist, whose works had a significant influence all over East Asia. In Japan, the female characters in Ibsen’s plays impressed Japanese intellectuals as controversial characters. Ellen Key began to be considered as a representative of ‘New Women’. In 1911, Kaneko Chikusui (1860–1938) introduced Ellen Key’s thought in the September issue of *Taiyō* (*The Sun*), where he stated: “The core of Ellen Key’s thought is that true love and true marriage will lead us to the ideal evolution of the human race.”²

---

This interest in the literary world stimulated Japanese ‘New Women’. Hiratsuka Raichō (1886–1971), who founded Japan’s first women’s literary magazine, *Seitō* (青鞜, Bluestocking) in 1911, was impressed by Kaneko’s article. In fact, the words “true love” and “true marriage” in Kaneko’s article became catchwords among the ‘New Women’, who sought women’s independence in love and marriage. Raichō found in Ellen Key’s works the notion of “Modern Love” as the modern view of individual freedom, particularly with regard to love and marriage.

Raichō published the translation of selected chapters of *Love and Marriage* in *Bluestocking* from 1913 to 1914. This translation revealed Raichō’s main interest. She emphasized Key’s argument on love and motherhood, obviously inspired by the following passage from Key’s work:

> The power of great love to enhance a person’s value for mankind can only be compared with the glow of religious faith or the creative joy of genius, but surpasses both in universal life-enhancing properties.\(^3\) (Chapter 2, The Evolution of Love)

Events in her personal life deepened her interest in Key’s idea of motherhood. After giving birth to two children, she promoted her policy of motherhood inspired by Key. In the motherhood protection debate in 1918, Raichō insisted that women’s freedom and independence would be feasible only after the freedom of love and motherhood was established. She formed the *Shin Fujin Kyōkai* (the New Women’s Association) with several feminists in 1920, with the goals of women’s suffrage and the protection of motherhood.

Another figure who contributed to Ellen Key’s reception in Japan was Honma Hisao (1886–1981). Being an English literature expert, Honma first referred to Key in 1912, in the article “Ellen Key Joshi no Ren’ai Kō (Ellen Key Joshi no Ren’ai)”, *Taiyō (The Sun)*, 17-12, September 1911, p.21.

---

1 Kaneko Chikusui, “Genjitsukyō (Practical Religion),” *Taiyō (The Sun)*, 17-12, September 1911, p.21.
Dōtoku ron (The Love Ethics of Ms. Ellen Key)”.* Thereafter, he wrote many articles introducing or translating Key’s works and disseminated Key’s concepts in Japan. He published Fujin to Dōtoku (Women and Morality) in 1913, which contained translations of Key’s The Morality of Women and Other Essays and Love and Ethics. With his later works, such as Ellen Key Shisō no Shinzui (The Essence of Ellen Key’s Thought, 1915), Honma cultivated the breeding ground that produced Kuriyagawa Hakuson’s (1880–1923) Kindai no Ren’ai kan (Modern Views on Love, 1921) and enlivened the Japanese Modern Love movements.

Honma made every effort to introduce the notion of Modern Love, which was likely to be misunderstood. His following comment on Ellen Key’s works bespeaks his conscientiousness:

As I told above, Ellen Key’s views on love were extremely ideal, totally different from the so-called “Free Love,” licentious and instinctive thing which allowed you to love whenever you want and stop whenever you want. Mrs. Key actually rejected the so-called “Free Love” to the utmost, as it violated both the sanctity of love and “the sanctity of posterity.” Ellen Key asserted Love’s Freedom, Love with Freedom, not Free Love.5

This passage shows us that “Love with Freedom” that meant an individual’s freedom to choose one’s partner, was a confusing term in the Japan of the 1910s. Because the Japanese word Jiyū Ren’ai could mean both “Free Love” and “love with freedom,” Honma tried to define the word clearly by analyzing Key’s view. Thus, he could confirm and disseminate the basic concept of Modern Love: it had nothing to do with the self-indulgent “Free Love,” but it assured one’s freedom in his/her personal life.

Another noticeable characteristic of Honma Hisao’s works on Ellen Key is his emphasis on “the will to ennoble the race (Key, 167).” Honma argues as follows:

---

5 Honma Hisao, The Essence of Ellen Key’s Thought, Tokyo: Daidōkan Shoten, 1921, p.50.
In other words, according to Ellen Key, the individual happiness in love has some social value at the same time, as far as it attracts the improvement of the race.6

There is no doubt that this attitude reflects Honma’s empathy with the idea of eugenics. As Lowy points out, Key sought the advancement of the human race as a whole, rather than espousing a doctrine of racial purity and superiority as done by many Social Darwinists.7 Furthermore, Key’s works were easier to be introduced by a Japanese man, when they were framed in the modern, scientific language of eugenics. Honma later said that he was sometimes criticized as a disgrace to men because he stood up for women.8 His emphasis on the eugenic aspect might have been his strategy to popularize Key’s ideas in Japan.

As stated above, Ellen Key’s ideas encouraged not only ‘New Women’ who had a passionate desire for women’s autonomy in love and marriage, but also male intellectuals who spoke out in support of the modern view of love in the Japan of the 1910s.

But no other motive power exists which will finally induce all—the small and the great, the weak and the strong—to follow the line of development, except the increased freedom of choice of personal love, with a correspondingly increased certainty as regards the influence of that choice upon the welfare of the race. For unless love continued to be the condition of morality, the cause of selection, the new humanity would gradually lose advantages already gained. (Chapter 3 Love’s Selection)9

---

6 Honma Hisao, Fujin mondai jukkou (Ten Lectures on Women Problems), Tokyo: Tokyodō Shoten, 1923, p.112.
8 Honma Hisao, “Jibun no koto no ichi souwa(One Episode of Myself)," Fujin Kōron (Women’s Opinion), 101, 1924, pp.121-123.
9 Key, Ibid., pp.156-157.
Japanese intellectuals took two compelling catchwords from the passage above; they believed that “the freedom of choice of personal love” would develop “the welfare of the race.”

**Key’s reception in China**

In China, students who studied in Japan in the 1910s greatly contributed to the trend of arguing Modern Love by referencing Ellen Key’s works.

Key had, in fact, first been noticed in the Chinese educational world. An excerpt of Key’s *The Century of the Child* appeared in *Jiaoyu Shijie* (*Educational World*) in 1906. Her biography was printed in *Jiaoyu Zazhi* (*Chinese Educational Review*) in 1914.

In 1915, her texts on women began to attract the intellectuals who created *Funü Zazhi* (*The Ladies’ Journal*). Then, in 1920, Shen Yanbing (沈雁冰, also known as Mao Dun 茅盾, 1896–1981) proposed the creation of “the new ethics of both sexes” in the February issue of *The Ladies’ Journal*, referring to Ellen Key:

> Swedish Ellen Key considers the new ethics as a new definition of chastity. She emphasizes on the strict chastity; not only both man and woman should remain faithful, but one has to prize chastity for lifetime. It is not the short-term responsibility for one’s partner. (cf. her works *Love and Marriage* and *Love and Ethics*)

---

10 Paul Bailey, “Active Citizen or Efficient Housewife? The Debate over Women’s Education in Early-Twentieth-Century China,” Glen Peterson et al. (ed.), *Education, Culture and Identity in Twentieth-Century China*, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2001, p.345.

11 Shen Yanbing, “男女社交公開問題管見 (Opinion on the open relationship between man and woman)” *Funü Zazhi* (*The Ladies’ Journal*), 6-2, February 1920, pp.3-4. For the translation, I received generous support from Kiyochi Yukiko.
He published a digest of Chapter 5 of Key’s *Love and Marriage* in the next issue of the journal. This article drew a large response from the literary world; an abridged translation of *Ellen Key, Her Life and Her Work* (1913), a well-known biography by Louise Sofia Hamilton Nyström, ran in *Xin Zhong Guo* (『新中国』 *New China*) in June, 1913. In July, *Xuedeng* (『学灯』 *Light of Learning*) published an outline of Key’s view of love and marriage. Key’s ideas of the freedom of divorce and motherhood were also introduced by Li Sanji (李三旡) and Shen Yanbing, in *The Ladies’ Journal* and *Dongfang Zazhi* (『東方雑誌』 *Eastern Miscellany*), respectively.

Chinese writings on Modern Love and sexual relationships influenced by Key have often been viewed to be largely the results of Kuriyagawa Hakuson’s Modern Views on Love.\(^{12}\) However, as Shirouzu Noriko points out,\(^ {13}\) Honma Hisao’s works seem to have played a more important role in Key’s Chinese reception. In the aforementioned article about the freedom of divorce, Li Sanji observes:

As stated above, the freedom of divorce insisted by the idealists like Mrs. Ellen Key is never based on the Free Love. What she respects is not “Free Love,” but “Love of Freedom (sic).” Not free love but love with freedom and responsibility. The freedom of love means that affection is never threatened, nor influenced by unreasonable will.\(^{14}\)

This coincides with the point emphasized by Honma Hisao. Li Sanji

---


\(^{13}\) Shirouzu, Noriko, “《Fujo Zasshi》ni okeru Shin Sei Doutokuron: Ellen Key wo Chūshin ni (The propagation of New sexual Ethics in 《The Ladies’ Journal》: with special Reference to Ellen Key),” *Jinbun Kiyō* (*The Humanities: Journal of the Yokohama National University*), 42, 1995, pp.1-19.

might have consulted Honma’s writing for his article on Key.

“Seiteki Dōtoku no Shinkeikō (A New Trend in Sexual Morality),” Honma’s article referring to Key, was carried in *Waseda Bungaku* (『早稲田文学』 Waseda Literature) in 1918. This essay was translated twice in Chinese in 1920; Chen Wangdao (陳望道, 1891–1977) published his translation in the August issue of *Juewu* (『覚悟』 Consciousness), while Se Lu (瑟盧) provided his translations in the November issue of *The Ladies’ Journal*. Se Lu also published a digest of Honma’s *The Essence of Ellen Key’s Thought* in the journal in 1921. *The Ladies’ Journal* continuously published Honma Hisao’s works with references to Ellen Key, where Wu Juelong (呉覚農, 1896–1989) and Zhang Xichen (章錫琛, 1889–1969) were actively translated.

The key members of *The Ladies’ Journal* shared their interest in eugenics with Honma Hisao. As a Chinese pioneer of eugenics, Zhou Jianren (周建人, 1888–1984) wrote many articles beginning in 1920, introducing the ideas of August Weismann, Francis Galton, Karl Pearson, Gregor Mendel, and Hugo de Vries. He emphasized “the merit of improving race” through the freedom of love and marriage, referring to Honma Hisao:

> The centre of Mrs. Ellen Key’s freedom of love is not only to maintain the soundness of body and mind, but proceeds on the assumption that it

---

15 Kuriyagawa Hakuson’s *Modern Views on Love* was translated in Chinese three times in the 1920’s. Chinese interest in Kuriyagawa’s work was much wider than his relation to Ellen Key. Kuriyagawa received a visit from Tian Han (田漢 1898-1968) and Zheng Boqi (鄭伯奇 1895-1979) the then overseas students in Japan, on March 18, 1920. (cf. Kudoh Takamasa, *Chūgokugoken niokeru Kuriyagawa Hakuson Genshō: Ryūsei, Suitai, Kaiki to Keizoku (The “Kuriyagawa Hakuson Phenomenon” in the Chinese-Speaking Region: The Rise, Decline and Regeneration of His Reception in Mainland China, and the Continuation of His Popularity in Taiwan)*, Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2010.)


contributes to the evolution of the race.\textsuperscript{17}

Here again, we can observe the same strategy as Honma Hisao’s. Considering the social and cultural milieu of the time, Chinese intellectuals desired that their opinion be supported by some scientific evidence. However, their arguments on new sexual morality caused a controversy in the Chinese literary world, which finally led Zhang Xichen and Zhou Jianren to leave \textit{The Ladies’ Journal}. Lu Xun (魯迅, 1881–1936) commented that their arguments on new sexual morality were too early for the 1920s China,\textsuperscript{18} whereas Zhou Zuoren (周作人, 1885–1967) criticized their attitudes as editors, although approving their opinion.\textsuperscript{19}

However, the fact remains that Key’s works introduced in China motivated the younger generation, including the May Fourth women’s writings.\textsuperscript{20} Let us quote just one example. Although women writers remained quite cautious in discussing independent love and marriage, while being fully aware of the potential risks in such practices, Lu Qiuxin (陸秋心) argued that consensual marriage worked best for the Republic.\textsuperscript{21} She took an evolutionary view on marriage, which seems to be influenced by the translation of \textit{Love and Marriage} in \textit{The Ladies’ Journal}.

In 1928, Honma Hisao met Zhang Xichen in Shanghai.\textsuperscript{22} Calling Zhang “a new face who is remarkably contributing to feminism,” Honma wrote in an article that Zhang had made him aware of the circumstances

\textsuperscript{18}Lu Xun, “編完写起 (Editorial note),” \textit{Mang Yuan} (野草, Wilderness), 4, May 1925.
\textsuperscript{19}Zhou Zuoren, “與友人論性道德書 (The Argument on Sexual Morality with a Friend),” \textit{Yu Si} (語絲, Threads of Conversation), 26, May 1925.
\textsuperscript{21}Lu Qiuxin, “婚姻自由和民主共主 (Freedom of Marriage and Democracy),” \textit{Xinfenwu} (新婦女, New Women) 2-6, June 1920. In \textit{五四時期婦女問題文選} (Selected Articles on the Women Question during the May-Fourth Period), Beijing: Life, Reading, New Knowledge Sanlian Bookstore, 1981, pp.242-45.
\textsuperscript{22}Honma Hisao, “Shanghai Zakki (Miscellanea in Shanghai),” \textit{Taiō Inshōki} (Impressions of Europe), Tokyo: Tokyodō, 1929, pp.353-357.
of Chinese women. Although it did not receive a wide response, Ellen Key’s works brought Chinese and Japanese intellectuals in contact and contributed to their exchange of thoughts on women’s status.

**Korean women and Key**

Key’s argument that “marriage should be based on true love, and love makes a marriage moral” was well-accepted in Korea as well. The Korean magazine *Kaebyok* (『開闢』The Creation) published an article introducing Key as the foremost advocate of the women’s movement in 1921. In this article, the author No Ja-Yong explains that for Key, love leads to the morality of marriage, and that Key emphasizes the importance of properly raising children.

What is intriguing about Key’s reception in Korea is that many Korean girl students witnessed the enthusiastic reception of Key in Japan. Although the Japanese Annexation of Korea in 1910 firmly fixed the criticism and resistance movement in the minds of the Korean youth, the students in Japan were full of intellectual curiosity. Key’s ideas of freedom to love, freedom to marry, and freedom to divorce attracted young girls struggling against the traditional, emotional inhibitions.

I would like to focus on three important female writers who studied in Japan: Kim Myongsun (金明淳, 1897–1951?), Na Hyesok (羅惠錫, 1896–1946), and Kim Wonju (金元周, 1896–1971).

Beginning in 1913, Kim Myongsun spent two years in Tokyo. After graduation from a girls’ high school in Korea in 1917, she achieved an historic feat in Korean literature: her first short story, “Usim ui sonyo (Suspicious Girl),” was published in the November issue of *Chongchun* (『青春』Youth), having received the second prize in a literary competition sponsored by the magazine. Her work received praise from Yi Kwangsu (李光洙, 1892–1950), a towering figure of modern Korean literature, who was one of the judges of the competition, for its realism and its complete

---

23 In 1942, he commented that “Suspicious Girl” was a plagiarized work from Japanese fiction.
restraint from the old style of didacticism.\textsuperscript{23} This work is considered the first modern Korean fiction by a female writer.

Theresa Hyun argues that Key’s emphasis on love over social customs was reflected in Kim Myongsun’s works.\textsuperscript{24} Her book \textit{Saengmyong ui kwasil (Fruits of Life)}, published in 1925, was an anthology of poetry, fiction, and essays, always focusing on the ethics of love.

Na Hyesok also studied in Tokyo from 1914 to 1918. In 1914, she wrote for \textit{Hakjigwang (學習光 The Light of Learning)}, the journal published by the Korean students in Tokyo, an article titled “The Ideal Woman” in which she referred to Hiratsuka Raichō and Yosano Akiko. Because Hiratsuka Raichō was an influential figure for Na Hyesok, she shared with Raichō an interest in Ellen Key. Na Hyesok made her literary debut in March 1918 with the short story “Kyonghui.” It appeared in the second issue of \textit{Yojagye (婦女界 Women’s World)}, a magazine published in Tokyo, and also received praise from Yi Kwangsu.

Kim Wonju graduated from the Ewha girls’ school in 1918 and got married. She devoted herself to secretly printing anti-Japanese leaflets when the March First Movement broke out. Then, she left for Tokyo, briefly attending the Eiwa School, where she was inspired by the activities of Japanese ‘New Women’.

On her return to Korea, Kim Wonju began preparing to publish a women’s journal. She took her pen name, Iryop, from the Korean pronunciation of the Japanese female writer Higuchi Ichiyō, and became the editor of one of the earliest journals for women, \textit{Shin Yoja (新女子 New Women)} that was published in March, 1920. She continuously wrote articles urging the improvement of women’s status.

She directly challenges the traditional ideology of chastity. In the article “Our Ideals,” published in 1924, she claims: “Without love, there

cannot be chastity.” Her essay “Na ui chongjo kwan (My Beliefs on Chastity),” published in the *Chosun Ilbo* (『朝鮮日報』 Chosun Daily) on January 8, 1927, goes further:

We, new women and new men, who want to do away with all the conventions, traditions, concepts and who are determined to bring attention to a new and fresh concept of life, cannot but strongly resist, among other things, the traditional morality on sex, which has ignored our personalities as well as our individual characteristics. Although it seems that we have got behind the times, we will then be in sympathy with the thought of Ibsen and Ellen Key.26

This statement that coincides with Na Hye-Sok’s denial of traditional chastity proves the fact that Korean new women were widely encouraged by Ellen Key’s thought. They also began to discuss divorce, a then-banned topic for women. Strengthened by Key’s argument, they tried to break the barrier that had limited Korean women and began to express their thoughts and opinions in various forms.

Although their active movement did not last long, their literary activity was a step forward, demonstrating the possibility of writing as both a profession and a form of public engagement.

**Conclusion**

The East Asian approaches to Key’s texts about love, sex, marriage, and divorce varied depending with every region, society, and gender. It was, nonetheless, remarkable that the East Asian intellectuals felt the urge to give voice to the issues raised by “Modern Love,” and that they were not afraid to publish their opinions during the 1910s and 1920s. Ellen Key’s works stimulated the propagation of the concept of Modern Love, with its emphasis on spontaneity and references to eugenics. Furthermore,

---

considering the social and cultural situation of women at that time, which confined them within the domestic sphere, the public display of their ideas and opinions on Modern Love by the women of the region was nothing less than revolutionary. Sympathizing with Ellen Key’s ideas, the East Asian intellectuals in the opening decades of the 20th century shared their thoughts to begin a new stage of relationship between the genders.

Noriko Hiraishi
Zhou Zuoren and Japanese Culture: Focusing on His Cultural Criticism in the 1920s

Liu Anwei

Zhou Zuoren was a writer with experience of several different cultures, including that of Japan. Zhou belonged to the first generation of Chinese overseas students sent by the Chinese government to Japan in the early twentieth century. During his five years of study there, he discovered the charm of the country, being fascinated by the simplicity, cleanliness and artistic disposition of the Japanese people. At the same time, however, he was upset and confused about Japanese ultra-nationalism during times of war. Despite the ambivalent feelings he developed toward Japan, his relationship with Japanese culture lasted his entire life.

As a moderator of cultural conflicts, Zhou Zuoren, through a series of articles on Japanese traditional culture and customs, strived to promote better understanding between Japan and China. This paper examines some distinguishing features of Zhou’s cultural criticism by analyzing his essays on Japanese culture that were published in the 1920s.

1. “The Pro-Japanese”

Following in the footsteps of Lu Xun, his brother, Zhou Zuoren went to Japan at the age of 20 as an overseas student sent by the Qing government. During his five-year stay in Japan, he married a Japanese woman. Not long after returning to his hometown of Shao Xing, he was appointed Professor at the Peking University, where he taught Japanese language and European literature and contributed essays to the leading May Fourth journals. For the decade following the May Fourth Movement, Zhou Zuoren was the most prominent figure in the Chinese literary
world. During the Sino-Japanese War (1937-45), Zhou Zuoren remained in Beijing, and while under the Japanese occupation, he was forced to join the collaborationist government. After the war, he was sentenced and imprisoned by the Nationalist government for holding office in the puppet regime. Although he was not permitted to use his real name on publications under the Chinese Communist Party’s regime, Zhou spent the rest of his life writing essays and translating foreign literary pieces, most of which were Japanese classics.

Considering his formative years as a writer, we find that Japanese culture greatly influenced Zhou Zuoren. His experience of studying in Japan provided him with not only material for his works but also his comparative perspective of cultural observation. His view of Japanese culture forms an important part of his overall cultural criticism, and this indicates his own views of the world. Thus, an analysis of Zhou Zuoren’s attitude toward Japanese culture would enable us to understand his thoughts and, to a certain extent, his conduct under Japanese occupation.

Several approaches have been taken in the discussion of this subject previously, but I would like to introduce a key person to examine this subject here, a person from whom Zhou Zuoren learned a lot and by whom he was deeply inspired. This person was Patrick Lafcadio Hearn (1850-1904), who came to be known as Koizumi Yakumo after he gained Japanese citizenship.

Among various Chinese modern writers, Zhou Zuoren was the first who paid attention to Lafcadio Hearn. Zhou wrote an essay titled “The Pro-Japanese” which appeared in *Beijing Chenbao* (Peking Morning Paper) on October 23, 1920. In this essay, Zhou mentioned Hearn as “Koizumi Yakumo,” calling him a true Japanophile or pro-Japanese. In order to understand the implication of the word pro-Japanese around this period in Chinese history, it is necessary to recall the political situation in 1920. The May Fourth Movement mentioned above organized a demonstration in 1919 to protest at the humiliating treatment of China at the Paris Peace Conference, which had allowed Japan to assume German privileges in China. This action developed into a nationwide movement in 1920 for the cultural and political awakening of China. Zhou Zuoren published his
essay “The Pro-Japanese” under these circumstances, at a time when the word pro-Japanese was used merely as a synonym for “traitor.” Zhou Zuoren, however, used the word in a different way. He himself criticized traitors in China who betrayed their own country to Japan, and insisted:

There is no true pro-Japanese in China who can appreciate the true honor of the Japanese people. It is obvious at a glance that there has never been a book or an article on Japanese literature and arts published in China. Japanese people had a genuine friend. His name was Koizumi Yakumo (Lafcadio Hearn, 1850-1904). If ever there was a true Japanophile, he was the one. Is there any such person in China? I would answer shamefully that there is no such one as him.1

Here we should pay attention to what Zhou Zuoren meant, and his way of thinking. He applied the word pro-Japanese only from a cultural angle, and not from an actual political one. His standpoint put great emphasis on cultural tradition, seeming to be similar to that which he had shown under Japanese occupation. Thus, his attitude toward Chinese culture should be called “cultural nationalism,” as will be discussed in the other paper.

As an outstanding cultural critic, Zhou Zuoren himself wrote many essays on Japan. It is not clear, however, whether he had already heard of Hearn or read any of Hearn’s books while in Japan, but it should be pointed out that during his years in Japan, like many Chinese students, he seemed to show little interest at first in learning the Japanese language. He had spent his time reading and translating European fiction with his brother Lu Xun. It seems to me that he came to recognize the need to study Japanese when he returned to China and started his Japanese study around that time. His understanding of Japan, at least in the early period, was more rational than sensuous. Therefore, Hearn’s works on Japan became a very important reference source for him, especially Hearn’s observations of small, important details of ordinary daily life in Japan.

---

2. Esperanto and the “New Village Movement”

I would like to quote the following passage from Zhou Zuoren’s speech “Women and Literature” which was given to the Student Council at Peking Women’s Normal College on May 30, 1922. At the beginning of his speech, Zhou Zuoren indicated that women also need their own literature. He continued, however, by saying that concepts about women and literature have changed completely in recent times, where literature is now recognized as a form through which life is realized, and is not ancillary to life as a tool of edification or entertainment. Its essence lies in self-expression, its function in emotive effects on humans. The individual is its core, and humankind is its domain. As a member of humankind, a woman has an independent character and is not subservient to anyone. Here, we take the expression *a member of humankind* as a key term in understanding some of the distinguishing features of Zhou Zuoren’s cultural criticism in the 1920s.

“Member of humankind” is a new term. Only Esperanto has the expression “homarano”, meaning a part of the human collective. Ordinarily we think that the individual is opposed to humankind and society, that to benefit the individual we must harm society and to benefit society we must sacrifice the individual. As such, individualism and humanism are treated as opposite terms, thus creating many unnecessary arguments. Actually, humankind and society are the sum total of individuals; without individuals, they are empty concepts. Individuals can only live safely within society; without society they would find it hard to survive. Therefore, individuals without society and society without individuals are equally unimaginable.²

As is well known, Esperanto is an artificial language invented in 1887 as a means of international communication, and is based in the main on European language but with easy grammar and pronunciation. Looking back at the history of Esperanto, I think it was more significant as a thought movement than as a linguistic one. The Esperanto movement, which sought the mutual understanding of different cultures and world peace, also had an impact on Chinese intellectuals after World War I. Reading Zhou Zuoren’s diary written on April 16, 1922, more than a month before he made the speech “Women and Literature”, we find an interesting record of his visit, made with two foreign friends, Vasili Eroshenko (1890-1952) and Wu kongchao or O Sang-soon (1894-1963), to the recently established Peking Esperanto Society. I knew little about O Sang-soon, the modern Korean poet and the author of “The Landscape of the Last Night of Asia”, a difficult meditative poem, but I knew that Eroshenko was a Russian poet and well-known Esperantist who came to Shanghai in October 1921, after being banished from Japan. He moved to Peking in February 1922 and was invited to teach Esperanto at the Peking University. Since Eroshenko had stayed in Japan for years and could speak Japanese well, he was asked to stay at Zhou Zuoren’s house where Japanese was ordinarily spoken. Until he left Peking in the spring of 1923, Eroshenko gave many lectures in Esperanto at the Peking University and several colleges. It was Zhou Zuoren who acted as an interpreter for him.

In the speech “Women and Literature”, the expression *member of humankind* also indicated that we should consider the new relationships between individual and society and between human beings. Zhou Zuoren said:

To love your neighbor you must love yourself first, and to love your neighbor is to love yourself. When seen from this point of view, individualism and humanism are two sides of the same coin. The new concept about literature that I advanced earlier is based on this relationship.⁴

At almost the same period, Zhou Zuoren paid great attention to a social practice that was being started in Japan by the younger generation, a practice which taught him how to build this new relationship between the individual and society, and inspired him to seek a new way to reform China's traditional society. The social practice was called the “New Village Movement” that began with a small group of young reformers, whose leader was Mushanokoji Saneatsu, a young Japanese writer. Zhou Zuoren went to Miyazaki and visited the New Village in 1919; he also opened the Peking branch office of the New Village at his own house. Indeed, he was the most enthusiastic advocate and supporter of the New Village Movement in China at that time.

3. The Moderator of Cultural Conflicts in East Asia

As Professor Louis Allen has pointed out in his essay on Hearn, “He (Hearn) had gone much further than any other Western intellectual in his identification with the people of Japan. Bigelow and Fenollosa had turned Buddhist, but they remained Americans, just as Chamberlain remained English. Hearn decided to shed the West.” Hearn was happy in his first home in Japan. Until the end of 1891, he lived and taught in Matuse, a little town on the west coast, somewhat isolated and away from the mainstream of Japanese industrial development. “Old Japan” was still present there. Just like Lafcadio Hearn's Matuse days, Zhou Zuoren also spent a peaceful and happy time in Tokyo. He married a Japanese woman, and felt somewhat close to the country when he found some customs of ancient China, which had disappeared from the contemporary China, in the ordinary life of the Japanese people. “Old China” was thus still present in “Old Japan” as the Japanese had learned a lot from Chinese civilization, while at same time “Old Japan” had her own traditional culture that was very different from the culture of the Continent.

Concerning “Old Japan” and “New Japan”, I would like to quote

---

a letter that Lafcadio wrote to his friend, W. B. Mason. Hearn said that “about the variability of one’s feelings towards Japan being like the oscillation of a pendulum: one day swinging toward pessimism and the next to optimism. I have this feeling very often, and I suppose you must have had it many times. But the pessimistic feeling is generally coincident with some experience of New Japan, and the optimistic with something of Old Japan…” (6 August 1892).

The modernization and industrialization of “New Japan” greatly changed the Japanese society, as Hearn had mentioned, not only in costume, architecture and habit, but also in heart and manner. New Japan’s foreign and economic policy towards China also caused a large-scale conflict between the two nations as mentioned above. During the 1920s, there were many anti-Japanese boycotts in China. Most Chinese harbored ill feelings toward Japan and Japanese culture. In the speech “Women and Literature”, Zhou Zuoren mentioned an excellent example of such opinion. He introduced a correspondence from Tokyo, which was reported in the *Peking University Daily*, that declared: “Art is an indispensable part of life, but the art of a shallow culture can hardly satisfy our desires…Japanese painting cannot arouse noble sentiments in us; its coloring and brushwork are representative only of the mentality of an island-country and lack the grandeur of a great nation.” Regarding this opinion, Zhou Zuoren said that enmity plays no part in art, in cultural understanding. If we have self-awareness only as citizens and not as individuals, we will be unable to communicate with the people of the world, and we will be even less likely to understand art and culture.

The cultural criticism of Zhou Zuoren in the 1920s seemed to play no real part in the major issues of that time but it seems to me that it offers some kind of hint for thinking about so many issues in our age. May be, it is time to reconsider the term *member of humankind*.

Liu Anwei

---

Miyazawa Kenji and Global Justice

Masahiko Nishi

Miyazawa Kenji (1896-1933) is even today one of the most famous juvenile writers in Japan and his main works are translated into more than thirty languages. Most of his novels are staged in a “dreamland” named “Ihatov(o)” (Russian or Esperanto-flavored adaptation of a Japanese prefecture’s name, Ihatre or Iwate), where indigenous animals or people are fated to negotiate with invaders from remote lands. His novels, even though they were written for young readers, deal with various planetary-sized political problems, like collisions between indigenous people and colonizing farmers, between forest dwellers and an educated young boy or amateur hunters from the urban world and so on.

Miyazawa Kenji seems to have “insisted that the creation of literary art and that of a new world are twin desires that have been lodged in his mind”¹, as Angela Yiu wrote about Kenji’s contemporary, Mushakôji Saneatsu, who was a founder of the “New Village”. “One cannot be happy personally”, Miyazawa Kenji wrote in a manuscript entitled “An Essential Outline of a Peasant’s Art (農民芸術概論綱要)”, “until the entire world becomes happy.”² And we should add that he was also an activist of a modern Buddhist sect, Kokuchû-kai (国柱会), which promoted the Greater East Asia that was supposed to be pacified by the Japanese militarized Emperor system peculiarly combined with Buddhism, whose most famous apostle and propagator was Ishiwara Kanji, a Japanese officer, who had great military ambitions, and is notorious above all for his role in establishing Manchukuo (満洲国). But Miyazawa Kenji was not so impatient to see the completion of the ideal world, at least while he wrote novels. He was

then mainly concerned with questions of the kinds of conflicts that impede human development, what kinds of conflicts historically have made it difficult to realize the peaceful coexistence of various species. So, it would be misleading, to confuse his utopian inclination with his archaeological writing style.

What I want to emphasize here is the latter. While in the case of Ishiwara Kanji a series of events were planned and done one after another to promote his paranoid ideal, in the case of Miyazawa Kenji, he recommended that historical events be kept in mind so that the promised future may be realized. Ihatov was, above all, a land of history, where the future must be constructed on the commemoration of the historically stratified past.

“Wolf Forest, Colander Forest and Thief Forest” (狼森、笊森、盗森), contained in his collected works that was published in his lifetime, in 1924, under the title of *The Restaurant of Many Orders* (注文の多い料理店), is a story about the foundation of a new agrarian colony in the depth of an old forest inhabited by the aboriginal people and fauna. The farmers begin to destroy the forest piece by piece and to cultivate the fields, without however forgetting to obtain in advance permission from the forests. “Can we hoe fields here?” “Can we build houses here?” “Can we make fires here?” “Can we take a little timber?” They asked, and each time the forests answered in chorus, “Yes, you can!”

With this playful call-and-response ritual, the story begins very idyllically. The farmers are polite and the aborigines hospitable, or so it seems.

This scene reminds us of the following passage in the above-mentioned “Essential Outline of a Peasant’s Art”:

In olden days our fathers, though they had little, lived cheerful lives
They had their arts and their religion

---

Now we find ourselves with only our labor, a necessity of our survival
Religion has lost its meaning and modern science takes its place
But science is cold and dreary
The arts are gone from us and have been corrupted
Goodness and beauty are monopolized and sold by artists and men of religion
We have neither the means to buy nor a need of these things
Let us set out anew on the proper road and create our own beauty
Burn away the dull grayness of our labor with art
Here is everyday found a noble and delightful creation
City dwellers, come join with us
Humankind, receive these purely intentioned sons of the soil

But Miyazawa Kenji did not only glorify the days of the “fathers”, but also tried to commemorate and historicize the “original sin” of the “descendants of Cain” and its consequences. The new settlers were to be annoyed every year by mischievous or delinquent aborigines.

In the second autumn, when an ample harvest was to be reaped, the four smallest children suddenly disappeared. Everyone searched for them frantically, entering into the forests, and the small children were found in the forest where they were being nourished by wolves with chestnuts and mushrooms. The wolves or wolf-men were not bloodthirsty beasts but anthropophile babysitters like those who brought up Romulus and Remus in Roman mythology. The pacification between settlers and the aborigines was scrupulously arranged. The tradition of paying millet cakes regularly to the forests as a tribute is explained by this mythical anecdote. But we should pay attention to the emphasized fact that the population of wolves did not increase in harsh contrast to the prosperity of the new settlers, who propagated and became more and more wealthy.

In the following autumns, farm tools were stolen by the Colander Forest and millet grains stored in the barn by the Thief Forest, to be

---

4 Quoted in http://www.kenji-world.net/english/who/reformer.html, where the translator's name is not indicated.
eventually given back in both cases in exchange for millet cakes.

This story can be understood as historiographical in the sense that
resurrects from the past the conflicts and hard negotiations between new
settlers and the aborigines. The “original sin” of the “descendants of Cain”
seem counterbalanced by the childish mischiefs done by forest dwellers.
But can this equation be justified? Were millet cakes sufficient to quench
the increasing hunger of aborigines and to establish their peaceful symbiosis
with newcomers?

Miyazawa Kenji as a novelist did not answer to the colonialist question
of who is just and who is not. He left it suspended, to be answered in the
future. The “Peasant Art” that he promoted had no other foundation than
the question itself.

His archaeological and skeptical attitude toward history persists
throughout his juvenile novels.

In “Acorns and Wildcat” (どんぐりと山猫), another story contained in
the same selection, a schoolboy one day gets an unexpected postcard from a
Wildcat.

Ichiro Kaneta Esq. September 19
Is good to no you are fine.
Tomorrow I got a bothersum trial so please you better come.
Kindly do not bring no projectiles. [sic]
Yours Truly, Wildcat

The card is written in an authoritative tone but at the same time
imbued with respect and humility to the addressee. The language the
Wildcat uses appears very clumsy, probably because he is lacking in
education. And he is scared of human beings carrying firearms. He is forced
to stick to traditional authority, faced with the new trend of modernity,
symbolized particularly by education and firearms.

---

5 “Six Early Stories of Kenji Miyazawa”, p. 3 (328).
The “difficult case” mentioned in his postcard is about the overheated competitiveness of the acorns under his rule. He reigns in the forest like an out-of-date slave-driver but is not competent enough to judge by himself who is the best among his acorns, though they are all eager to know it. That is why he sought an advice from a schoolboy. The sentence Ichiro provided for the Wildcat after long consideration and hesitation is the following: “the greatest and the best is the one who is the most insignificant, stupid, messed up, hopeless and ugly squash head of the lot.” This advice must have been disappointing but the Wildcat showed formal gratitude to Ichiro by proposing to give him a reward: “which would you prefer? Two quarts of golden acorns or the head of a salted salmon?”

The Wildcat who worries about his acorns’ rivalry as a ruler, nevertheless, considers them only as disposable slaves. Ichiro who was excited when he was invited to the court in the forest, gets disillusioned ultimately, when he returns home with a measure of acorns in his hand. The last scene is tragic and catastrophic; the acorns which shone like gold in the forest lose their glitter. How can the Wildcat get a citizenship and survive in the new era of modernity and human right?

The Wildcat reappears once again in “the Restaurant of Many Orders” (注文の多い料理店). Here the Wildcat who disguises himself as a restaurant owner does not mean to work at patrons’ orders at all, but turns out on the contrary to be a kind of concentration camp officer who issues orders one after another to prisoners: 《THERE ARE RATHER A LOT OF ORDERS, BUT WE HOPE YOU WILL BE PATIENT》; 《PATRONS ARE REQUESTED TO COMB THEIR HAIR AND GET THE MUD OFF THEIR BOOTS HERE》; 《PLEASE LEAVE YOUR GUNS AND CARTRIDGES》, and so on.

His anxiety about the fire-arms has greatly intensified and he is now conspiring against the invaders of the forest. The double meaning of

---

6 Ibid., p. 19 (312).
7 Ibid., p. 21 (310).
the “orders” symbolizes the question which is characteristic at the age of colonialism, that is: who has the authority to issue orders? And the Wildcat arms himself with refined European cuisine style against British-styled amateur hunters from Tokyo.

Miyazawa Kenji is reluctant to answer the question of who is just and righteous. Global justice is not a question which is supposed to be supplied with a shortcut answer. It must continue to be asked generation by generation. Rather, Miyazawa Kenji emphasizes the trauma with which the hunters returned to Tokyo.

Even back in the capital, and however long they soaked themselves in hot baths, their faces that had gone all crumpled like wastepaper would never go back to normal again.9

History is an accumulation of traumas, whose memory cannot be obliterated among their victims, though victimizers optimistically have the habit of forgetting them. Miyazawa Kenji did not witness himself what happened in the colonies, like Taiwan, Korea and India but he knew pretty well that colonialism is a traumatic process. This is true of the colonized people as well as of the colonizers.

We have come to the conclusion that the “dreamland” named Ihatov was a geopolitically colonial space where domestication and demilitarization of indigenous beings have not yet been brought to completion. Generally speaking, Miyazawa Kenji tends to be considered as a one-side Utopian, or optimistic colonialist, but that is a misunderstanding. For he knew conspicuously well that colonial modernity is destined to be confronted with recurrent mischiefs, disillusions or vengeance on the part of the natives under colonial rule. The concept of an utopian and peaceful world that is on the long way toward realization, might be replaced by the word of globalization. And Miyazawa Kenji managed scrupulously to situate himself in a neutral position, that is, neither in favor of the colonizers nor in favor

9 Ibid., p. 55.
of the colonized, though we would better pay attention to the fact that in all his novels the colonizers have Japanese faces, whether industrious farmers, a smart schoolboy or bourgeois hunters.

He is famous on the one hand for his interest in the cosmopolitan Esperantist movement, which was a new trend of sorts among the intellectuals of his age, though his proficiency of Esperanto was too poor to produce abundant works. To be sure it would be exciting to suppose that he might have written some of his novels in Esperanto, but we must not forget that he inevitably was a writer rooted in Japan, rather than a cosmopolitan one. As a writer born in Iwate, it was his mission before all to see his neighbors or Alter-egos forced to surrender and assimilate to Japanese nationalism or imperialism in the indigenous beings of the woods of Ihatov. It would, therefore, be more appropriate to remember that he was an enthusiast of Ainu folklore, which became available in 1923, with the apparition of *The Collection of Ainu Epics of the Gods* (『アイヌ神謡集』), both written down alphabetically and rendered into Japanese by a teenage Ainu girl, Chiri Yukie.

The north-east part of Japanese mainland, where Ihatov was located, was an area crossing over Jomon (縄文) and Yayoi (弥生) cultures, that is, hunting-and-gathering culture and agriculture. The collision between them is historically remembered as the conquest of Emishi by the Yamato dynasty at the beginning of the 9th century. And after the Meiji restoration, new technology and developmental industries triumphantly advanced to the area. What Miyazawa Kenji observed there were the traces of enormous historical changes on a global scale. So he was critical of two types of civilization, agricultural and modernist. The indigenous inhabitants of Ihatov were vulnerable to both as were the Ainu. When Miyazawa Kenji imagined the peaceful Ihatov, he had an inclination to base it on the farmers’ position, but he was also conscious of the coerciveness rooted in any civilization. Fortunately this archaeological attitude towards history

---

prevented him from regarding farmers as incontestably innocent. The construction of a new land must be realized on the basic consciousness of its own sinfulness. This is probably why Miyazawa Kenji is actually considered as a precursor of environmentalism.

Masahiko Nishi
A Note on
Esperanto as Means of Mutual Understanding
in East Asia in the 1920’s and 30’s

Keiko Saito

Esperanto is the most important international artificial language which was created in 1887 by Polish oculist and philologist Ludvik Zamenhof (1859-1917). The language was named after the pseudonym of its creator Zamenhof, ‘DOKTORO ESPERANTO’, Doctor Hopeful (fig.1).

Zamenhof was born in Bialystok, a small Lithuanian city on the Polish Russian borderline under Russian domination in 1959. Bialystok is a region composed of a large number of ethnic groups (Russians, Poles, Jews, Germans, Latvians, Lithuanians and others) and linguistic ones (Russian, Polish, Yiddish, German, Lithuanian and so on). The Zamenhofs were Jewish, but the family members spoke Russian.

Living in an environment of perpetual racial and national conflict, Zamenhof and his family suffered from bitter prejudice and discrimination. Zamenhof decided to promote tolerance and world peace through the development of an international neutral language and the creation of Esperanto was announced in 1887. The central concept of this language is the ideal of “homoranismo”--- the belief that all humankind is one big family. Large sections of the public became aware of its existence toward the beginning of the 20th century and
for most people, Esperanto has become a synonym of artificial language.

The basic structure and grammar of Esperanto is simple and regular. All words are spelled as pronounced. Its words are derived mainly from roots commonly found in the European languages, particularly in the Romance languages.

To illustrate the resemblance to European languages, let us have a look at the first half of the Lord’s prayer (主の祈り) in five languages - Esperanto, Latin, Volapük, English, and Japanese. Volapük is the artificial international language, precedent to Esperanto, invented by a German Catholic priest, whose formulation was published in 1879.

The Lord’s Prayer in five languages (the first half)

**Esperanto**
Patro nia, kiu estas en la cielo,
sankta estu Via nomo,
venu regeco Via,
estu volo Via,
kiel en la cielo,
tiel ankau sur latero.

**Latin**

\(<PATER NOSTER>\\)
PATER NOSTER QUI ES IN COELIS.
SANCTIFICETUR NOMEN TUUM.
ADVENIAT REGNUM TUUM.
FIAT VOLUNTAS TUA
SICUT IN COELO ET IN TERRA.

**Volapük**

(The first artificial international language)
O Fat obas, kel binol in süls,
paisaludomöz nem ola!
Kömomöd monargän ola!
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Jenomöz vil olik,
äs in sül,
i su tal

English
Our Father, Who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name:
Thy kingdom come;
Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven.

Japanese
にましますわれらの父よ、願わくは名のとうとまれんことを、み国の来らんことを、み旨の天に行わるることと地にも行われんことを。

Esperanto was intended for use as an international second language among people with different cultures and languages. It is relatively simple for Europeans to learn Esperanto, but Esperanto was not necessarily successful in Europe as means of mutual understanding, mainly for two reasons. The first was the anti-Semitic feeling toward the language created by a Jewish person. The second was that the universality of Esperanto which was supported by pacifists and anarchists was regarded as dangerous.

Instead, surprisingly, among East Asian countries, chiefly Japan and China, Esperanto attracted considerable attention, and became an international second language as means of mutual understanding of intellectuals in the 1910’s, 1920’s and 1930’s. Both Japanese and Chinese languages have few things in common with Esperanto. These two languages have Chinese characters (漢字) in common, but as a language they are totally different. For their mutual understanding, some international language is necessary and Esperanto was considered suitable for this purpose as it was simple and regular, and took a short period of time to master.

Esperantist Vasilii Eroshenko (1890- 1952), the blind Russian poet and author of children’s books, and internationalist, contributed greatly to the spread of Esperanto in Japan and China. Eroshenko was born in 1890 in the village of Obukhouska near Kursk in Southern Russia and he lost
his eyesight at the age of four because of measles. He was a student at the School for the Blind in Moscow, where he studied Esperanto and Japanese, too. He felt great a sympathy for Zamenhof’s ideal of “homoranismo”. He had a talent for music, playing the balalaika and the violin, and was a member of the Orchestra of the Blind. After graduating from Moscow’s School for the Blind and staying for a year in London, Eroshenko came to Japan in 1914. Dr. Nakamura Kiyoo, (中村精男) Esperantist and president of the central meteorological observatory in Japan, was his mentor-with-sponsorship.

Esperanto was introduced in Japan at the beginning of the 20th century, with the Japan Esperanto Association being established in 1906. There were a considerable number of Esperantists and supporters of this language among eminent people in various fields, for instance, Futabatei Shime (二葉亭四迷, novelist), Yanagida Kunio (柳田國男, folklorist), Shinmura Izuru (新村出, philologist), Oka Asajiro (丘浅次郎, biologist), Sakai Toshihiko (堺利彦, socialist), Osugi Sakae (大杉栄, anarchist), Takakusu Junichiro (高楠順一郎, Sanskritist), Yamada Kosaku (山田耕筰, composer) and Nitobe Inazo (新渡戸稲造, educator). Scientists (meteorologists, biologists, etc.) needed an international language since their sphere was universal; socialists and anarchists required one to strengthen international unity. Nitobe and Yanagida were of the opinion that the League of Nations should adopt Esperanto as its official language.

One of the purposes of his coming to Japan was to master manual therapeutics as the art of self-support for the blind. Eroshenko attended the Tokyo School for the Blind, and learned manual therapeutics; he also taught Esperanto there. About 60 to 70 blind students, including Korean girl students, studied it ardently1.

With his amiable personality and good command of Japanese, Eroshenko befriended a number of Esperantists, poets, artists and socialists in Japan. Among them are Akita Ujaku (秋田雨雀, playwright), Osugi Sakae, Kamichika Ichiko (神近市子, writer), Takehisa Yumeji (竹久夢二,)

---

1 Takasugi Ichiro 高杉一郎, Yoakemate no Uta 『夜明け前の歌：盲目詩人 エロシェンコの生涯』, Tokyo : Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1982, p.94.
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painter), Nakamura Tsune (中村彜, painter)(fig.2), Shimamura Hogetsu (島村抱月, writer), Mushanokoji Saneatsu (武者小路実篤, novelist and a leader of the “New Village Movement”) and Soma Kokko (相馬黒光, businesswoman and patroness of the arts)(fig.3). Soma Kokko and her family encouraged and supported Eroshenko wholeheartedly. Miyazawa Kenji (宮沢賢治, children’s writer), whose works have been translated into more than thirty languages, did not meet Eroshenko personally, but when he knew of Esperanto in 1926, he was inspired by its universality and he tried to write several poems in Esperanto. The naming of Ihatovo, a famous dreamland in Kenji’s works, might come from Esperanto2; probably he wanted his works to be read universally.

Eroshenko wrote poems and books for children both in Esperanto and Japanese in raised letters. However, Eroshenko was suspected to be a socialist (Bolshevist) and expelled from Japan in 1921. He was not accepted in his homeland either. He went to Shanghai in October 1921 and moved to Peking in February 1922. He formed friendships with

---

Lu Xun (魯迅) and his brother Zhou Zuoren (周作人). Lu Xun had studied in Japan with his brother Zhou Zuoren. Soon after returning to China, he had become a leader of the literary revolution. In the 1910’s and in the 1920’s in China, Esperanto had a strong impact on Chinese intellectuals who looked for the modernization and liberation of Chinese society. They regarded the complexity of the Chinese character as a serious barrier to the modernization of China, and thought of the possibility of adopting Esperanto instead. Actually, in these periods, some socialists and communists of Japan and China, proficient in Esperanto, communicated each other in this language.

There were very active groups of Esperantists among intellectuals, mainly in Shanghai and Peking; for instance, Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren, Pa Chin (巴金), Chen Shuanton (錢玄同) and Ts’ai Yüan-pei (蔡元培). Ts’ai became the Chancellor of Peking University, China’s most prestigious university, and he made it a center of scholarly research and inspired teaching. He adopted Esperanto as a regular subject at the University. Esperanto was called World Language (世界語) there. (fig.4)

Lu Xun valued Eroshenko as poet and Esperantist and he translated Eroshenko’s works in Esperanto into Chinese. Eroshenko was asked to stay at Zhou Zuoren’s house and was appointed Professor at the University of Peking where he taught Esperanto and Russian literature (fig.5). Zhou Zuoren acted as an interpreter. At first many Chinese students attended
Eroshenko’s class, but the number of the students decreased gradually. Eroshenko felt discouraged and depressed and he left Peking in the spring of 1923.

In 1924, Eroshenko came back to the USSR in great disappointment. He taught at Moscow’s Communist University of Toilers of the East until 1927. In the 1930’s, Esperantists were suppressed bitterly under the Stalinist regime in the USSR, but Eroshenko was active in the Esperanto movement and in education for the blind until his death in 1952. Esperantists were oppressed harshly under the Hitler regime in Europe, and also in Japan during the World War II. In the twentieth century, several ideas of “modernization” of the Japanese language system were suggested, but they were not successful. The Japanese still use the same language system with Chinese character, hiragana (ひらがな), and katakana (カタカナ) together. In China, numerous efforts have been made after the end of the World War II to turn written Chinese into an alphabetic script, but with little success.

Today, Esperanto is still the most important international artificial language. Zamenhof’s ideal of homoranismo is as invaluable as ever. However, as means of mutual communication among people of different cultures and languages, the predominance of English is undeniable, whether one likes it or not. Prof. Liu Anwei has said in his paper, “Looking back at the history of Esperanto, I think it was more significant as a thought movement than as a linguistic one”\(^3\) And looking back at the history of Esperanto in Japan and China and Eroshenko’s life from the present point of view, I agree with him.

Keiko Saito

---

\(^3\) Liu Anwei’s paper, “Zhou Zuoren and Japanese Culture”, included in the present volume.
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The Noguchi Legacy:
Artistic Vagabondage of Yone and Isamu Noguchi
— Between Patriotism and Internationalism —
From Poetry to Sculpture in Conflict
between the East and the West

Organizer: Shigemi Inaga 稲賀 繁美
Professor, International Research Center for Japanese Studies

Outline

Yonejirō Noguchi (1875-1947) was a Japanese poet of international renown and was widely appreciated in the pre-World War II English-speaking world. However, he lost his credibility, mainly because of his War-time involvement in the Japanese military’s ultra-nationalism. He died immediately after the War, without being able to wipe out the disgrace. Not only his political position but also his entire career as a poet has been negatively assessed as a whole.

However it is worth pointing out that his patriotism stems from his American experience as a youth. Miyako Hada locates the young Noguchi in the context of American Japonism in fiction writing so as to elucidate the reason why Noguchi as the narrator disguised himself into a Japanese lady so as to criticize the American society.

Madoka Hori reassesses Noguchi’s poetry and critical essays and tries to refute the stereotypical view of Noguchi as a fanatic supporter of Japanese militarism. At the same time an Indian critical view toward Noguchi, epitomized in Rabindranath Tagore’s exchange with Noguchi on the issue of nationalism and Pan-Asianism, cannot be overlooked. The conflict between Oriental identity and the claim of internationalism was the legacy that Yonejirō transmitted to his son, Isamu Noguchi (1904-1988). Gen Adachi will examine the sculptor’s indebtedness to his father in terms of
love-hate relationships that the sculptor had to entertain in his suspended
dual existence between America and Japan. His life-long endeavour was
dedicated to the objective of linking the Western Art and Oriental tradition.
Is Isamu’s effort compatible or not with his father Yone’s struggle in search
of an international recognition?

Shigemi Inaga, as the organizer of the panel, proposes an overview
of the problem at the beginning of the session and conducts an open
discussion following the 4 paper presentations.

Objective of this Panel

Under the main theme, Expanding the Frontiers of Comparative
Literature, the 19\textsuperscript{th} Congress of the International Comparative Literature
Association in Seoul in 2010 intends to “move beyond its Western origins.”
It also emphasizes the fact the “Korea is the only divided country on the
face of earth.” “Breaking down boundaries and overcoming frontiers” are the
main issues. The cases of Yonejirō and Isamu Noguchi bridging the domain
of poetry and sculpture in the border-crossing of the East and the West may
provide essential lessons for our task.

The Panel proposal should logistically cover several of the sub-themes
of the Congress, so as to make it more convincing and easily acceptable.
The theme of the present Panel, The Noguchi Legacy, addresses the issue
of “Writing the Conflicts and Otherness” as both the father and son were
in constant conflict with their own “Otherness” which they rendered in
artistic expressions. The mutual conflict between the father and the son,
and their troubled relationship divided by the Pacific Ocean must be also
taken into account. Leonie, who had to raise Isamu as the illegitimate son of
Yone, was the third and hidden term who provided the essential matrix for
the complicated permutation that the triangle had to draw as the locus of
their lives. Their effort in trio of “Translating Differences” which their lives
incarnated contributed to show the difficulties of “Connecting the World”
in a given socio-cultural context of the period. The oscillation between the
War-time ultra-nationalism of Yone and the post-War internationalism
by Isamu, articulates by its opposing amplitude “Asia in the Changing Comparative Paradigm,” and testifies to the destiny of the 20th Century.

Hisako Matsui’s third film, Leonie was completed in June 2010 after more than seven years of preparation and is going to hit the box-office on November 2010.¹ Dr. Madoka Hori, present here, is appointed to be one of the supervisors of the historical verifications. When I proposed the Panel for the ICLA 2010 in Korea, I did not know at all that the subject will be treated in road-show movie business. Let me stress that the Panel The Noguchi Legacy is not part of any advertisement for the movie, but an entirely independent project. I hasten to add, however, that as the organizer, I have to be more than satisfied with this unexpected and timely coincidence.

Seoul, August, 19, 2010

What the Son Inherited from His Father?  
Preceded by A Brief Introduction to the  
Noguchi Legacy as a Working Hypothesis

Shigemi Inaga

The relation between Isamu Noguchi and his father Yonejirô Noguchi has not been thoroughly investigated. This is partly because the father has been almost ostracized in Japan after the Second World War, and partly because the son would not want to touch upon the subject. Indeed Isamu had to live as the illegitimate son of Leonie Gilmour, as his father refused to recognize him. By way of an introduction to the issue, a brief chronological outline and basic factual data of the main personalities must be given at the outset.

In his last year, in 1988, Isamu reported in one of his final interviews that his father, Yone, “did not quite fit into the picture (of Isamu’s life) too well. It was unfortunate.” Here is the transcription published in English. However, the Japanese version, taken from the same interview, gives a slightly different phrasing. Isamu is said to declare that his father only “planted his seed,” and appeared on the scene only to give birth to Isamu in this world. And Masayo Duus, who wrote an excellent biography of Isamu, asks if this was true. This question serves as the starting point of this paper.

1. Triangle

Yonejirô Noguchi was born on Feb. 8, 1875. On Nov. 3, 1893, Yone, at the age of 18, set sail for San Francisco as a third class passenger on the steamship Belgique. As a disciple of Joaquin Miller, Yone makes his debut as a young poet. His maiden work, Seen and Unseen--Monologues of a Homeless
Snail (1896), deserves our attention, as the title turns out to be also relevant in understanding Isamu’s life (fig.1). In Feb. 1901, Yone moved to New York, taking a room on the Riverside Drive overlooking the Hudson River. It was then that Leonie Gilmore appeared before him as the editorial assistant so as to “correct” his composition in broken English.³

Leonie was born on June 16, 1874, that is, she is one year and 6 months elder to Yone. Although Isamu did believe that his mother had dropped out of Bryn Mawr College, the record tells that she graduated from the college in 1895. She was teaching Latin and French at a Catholic Girls’ School in Jersey when she read a news advertisement by Yone. It is doubtless that the success of Yone’s American Diary of a Japanese Girl (published as a book in Sep. 1902, and welcomed by more than 70 newspaper reviews) owes to Gilmour’s rewriting and editing. The fact that the Japanese author disguised himself into a female narrator was a tactful gender strategy which deserves careful feminist reading. Yone’s dependence on Leonie also reminds us of Isamu’s relationship with Priscilla Morgan, who served as Isamu’s...

---

¹ Isamu Noguchi, interview by Kazue Kobata, spring 1988. Masayo Duus, The Life of Isamu Noguchi, Journey without Borders. Translated by Peter Duus, Princeton University Press, 2004, p.11 (hereafter abridged as P. Duus). As we shall see, there is a huge gap between the Japanese ‘original’ and the English ‘translation.’ For the sake of convenience, (M. Duus) refers to the Japanese edition whereas (P. Duus) to the English version; the English version is almost half in length compared with the Japanese published version. The gap is in itself a precious indicator to show the difference of culture and conventions in publishing biographies in Japan and in the United States. The most interesting anecdotes for Japanese readers are often omitted in the English version probably for the sake of smooth reading and clarity of paragraph making. The conversations taken from the author’s interview are translated at length in the Japanese ‘original’ version whereas most of them are eliminated from the English ‘translated’ version. The gap turns out to be a relevant guide so as to pursue the trans-Pacific comparison of the father and the son. As a case of translation studies, the author will write another paper on the gap revealed between the English and Japanese versions of Isamu Noguchi’s Biography by Masayo Duus.
What the Son Inherited from His Father?

manager and business partner from 1959 for the last 29 years of Isamu’s career as an artist.4

Yone’s attitude to Leonie is easily to be blamed for. Their relationship remained ambiguous, to say the least. One letter Yone addressed to Leonie is omitted from the English translation of Msayo Duus’s biography.5 There, we see Yone explaining himself to Leonie as if it were a warning to her. In this confession, Yonejirō, half self-justifying, and half self-humiliating, qualifies himself as an amorphous animal without head or tail, just looking like a jerry-fish floating in the sea. One may wonder if the jerry-fish in English has as strong a poetical evocative power as in Japanese: Indeed, it appears at the very beginning of the Japanese Mythology, Kojiki narrating the genesis (if the term is allowed here) of the Japanese archipelago.

Noguchi spent 11 years in the US before his return to Japan in 1904. His departure from San Francisco was on Nov. 17, 1904. Two months later, Leonie Gilmore gave birth to a boy in Los Angeles. The Los Angeles Herald put “Yone Noguchi’s Babe, pride of Hospital.” on Nov. 17, 1904. The lead

2 ドウズ昌代『イサム・ノグチ 宿命の越境者』講談社, 2000, Vol.1, pp.17-18. (hereafter abridged as M. Duus). The paperback edition was also published in 2003, which will be abridged as (M. Duus 2003), hereafter.
3 P. Duus, p.20. Hereafter, if there are no notable discrepancies between the Japanese and the English versions, only the relevant page of the English edition is given. For poetries, both references are given so as to indicate the English and Japanese renderings.
4 P. Duus, pp. 288-89.
remains itself quite ambiguous as the inter-racial marriage was still almost a taboo, and could easily become a scandal in the State of California. But the reality was much worse as Noguchi was then intending to marry Ethel Armes, literary journalist of the *Washington Post*, whom he designated as his “American agent.” Their engagement naturally broke out when Yone Noguchi’s deception became evident. Therefore, Leonie was legally Yone’s “lawfully wedded wife.” But she did know that she was a wife, whom her husband did not love. This was what she wrote in her letter to Yone, on Feb. 24, 1906.\(^6\)

By the time Leonie sent this letter to Yone, he had already married Matsuko in Jan. 1906. Masayo Duus wondered why Leonie decided to move to Japan, despite her doubts about Yone, whose “letters are ominous, to say the least. He warns me not to bring any ‘dreams’ with me,” as she observed in her letter to Frank Putnam, on Jan. 23, 1906.\(^7\) The only possible answer would be the anti-Japanese sentiment which gathered momentum after the earthquake of 1906 in California. Arriving in Japan, the baby finally was baptized Isamu, at the age of two years and four months. The name was given by Yone. And yet Leonie had to know by the spring of 1908 that Yone had already got another Japanese wife. Isamu would remain an illegitimate son of his American mother.

## 2. Inheritance

The circumstances above would suffice to understand Isamu’s antipathy to his father, who abandoned both himself and his mother. Yet, it would be quite another matter whether or not the son partakes of some similarity with the father. So as to conduct the comparison between Yone and Isamu, let me take up one anecdote as a guiding thread. Curiously enough this anecdote is entirely eliminated in the English version of Masayo Duus’s biography.

Leonie refers to a curious similarity which the father shares with the


\(^7\) P. Duus, p.46.
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son. Yone tends to run to the extreme opposite when he is criticized. So does Yo (as he was called then). When scolded by his mother as he was covered with mud, he jumps into the bathtub without taking off his clothes. This kind of oscillation is also observed by Priscilla Morgan.

“Isamu’s character is infinitely complicated and at the same time pure and simple as a child. At times he was incredibly sweet and sympathetic, but at next moment he exploded like tornados or instantaneous water heater. He was an untreated choleric. But he was outstanding in his high pride as an artist and sincerity as a human being. His insight into all kind of things was a constant surprise for me. An intolerably selfish behavior was followed by his dry, original humor which was so natural and intelligent. I know his wonderful smile which he showed when we were alone. Such were constant intoxication for me.”

The instantaneous temper and the oscillation to the extreme opposite seem to be common characters that the son inherited from his father. Yet beyond the heredity, this jerry-fish like flexibility may be understood as one of the essential factors in their artistic creation, constantly oscillating between the two sides of the Pacific Ocean. This reminds me of Hagiwara Sakutarō analyzing Yone Noguchi.

“For the purpose of introducing Japan to the West, Yone Noguchi is the best choice. If we try to show the genuine in-translatable Japan as it is, the foreigners can hardly understand it. It is indispensable to modify it to a certain degree in Western languages so as to render it accessible to them. Yone Noguchi is the top person who is capable of doing this wise job without hesitation. (...) From our Japanese standpoint, however, Mr. Noguchi’s poetry smells too much Western, and we are not satisfied with this incongruity in him which does not fit our national emotions and sentiments. The opposite would be also the case with European observers.

---

8 Passage dropped from the English version; May 27, 1906, M.Duus, vol.1., p.91.
However, this is why his art is constantly new for us, and allows us to feel the fresh sea wind blowing from the Pacific Ocean.”

Sakutarō sharply analyzes not only the in-between-ness of Yone Noguchi’s poetry but also the fundamental uneasiness of his self divided into two cultural spheres. From the Western point of view, Noguchi’s opinion looks as if representing exemplarily Oriental poetics; whereas judging from the Japanese sensibility every line of his utterance in poetics smells strongly Western. Yone Noguchi’s entire endeavor consisted in this structural double tongue. The intensity of his utterance was sustained by this inner conflict which was inevitably perceived as Yone’s constant contradictions. Nobody else grasped better than Leonie how this insurmountable conflict was transmitted from Yone to his son Isamu (and even accelerated) as the driving force of their artistic creation.

3. Warning Bell

In his famous poem en prose, Yone self-mockingly observes his ambiguous position floating in between.

When Japanese read my poetry they say,
His Japanese poems are not so good but perhaps his English poems are better.”

When Westerners read my English poetry, they say,
“I cannot bear to read his English poems, but his Japanese poems must be superb.” To tell the truth,

---

10 萩原朔太郎 Hagiwara Sakutarō, “On Yone Noguchi,” Shiika-jidai (Poetic Era), May, 1925. The apparent logical awkwardness of the translation comes from the inversion of word order which occurs in the English translation of the Japanese original.


12 Tokyo, 1921; M.Duus, Vol.1, p.73; P.Duus. p.37.
I have no confidence in either language.
In other words, I guess I am a dual citizen.¹²

The stigma of cultural dual citizenship was the destiny the son inherited from his father. During the Second World War, the father had to play the role of a fanatic ultra-nationalist because of his international renown. Otherwise he could have been persecuted in his homeland as pro-American and unpatriotic; likewise, the son suffered from his experience at the compulsory relocation camp of Japanese-Americans in Poston in which he was voluntarily incarcerated.

In connection with his work, Bell-Child (1950), Isamu quoted from the last poem that his father, Yone left shortly before he passed away in 1947 (fig. 2).

fig. 2
Isamu Noguchi with his hand written hiragana Script of the last poem left by his father, Yone Noguchi, shortly before his death in 1947. At his Solo show exhibition, Mitsukoshi Department Store, Tokyo, 1950.

The Bell rings,
The bell rings, This is warning!
When this warning rings,
Everyone is sleeping,
You too are sleeping.¹³

A photo is left when Isamu wrote in his handwriting this Japanese poem on a blackboard at the occasion of his solo show exhibition at the Mitsukoshi Department Store in 1950. No less than his father, Isamu felt himself to be a warning bell, located in between the two conflicting
parties. The bell rings in vain as both of the two parties would not listen to it. The form of the bell, half buried in the field, strongly reminds Isamu’s *Hiroshima Atomic Bomb Memorial Project* (1952) (fig.3). Judging from the circumstances, it is undeniable that Isamu’s project for the peace memorial was inspired, partly at least, by Yone’s last poem after Japan’s defeat. And by showing the drawing of the bell, Isamu did not hide his indebtedness to his father. It is well known that his planning of the Hiroshima Memorial Monument was turned down by the municipality of Hiroshima in 1952. The political reason in the backyard is recently revealed to be more complicated than Isamu imagined. Yet Isamu had to feel that he was rejected by Japan because of his American citizenship.

4. *Akari* as Sculpture

Even in his final years, Isamu felt humiliated when the honor of representing the United States was addressed to him at the Venice Biennale in 1986. On that occasion, Isamu is known to have demonstrated his

---


14 See Gen Adachi’s paper in the present volume.
dogged determination to have the Akari light sculpture recognized as legitimate art. Masayo Duus remarks that Isamu “seemed to take pity on them, as if they too had been branded as “bastards” or “half-breeds.” These “nomads, restless wanderers between the realms of art and design,” literally symbolized Isamu’s own existence. The Biennale was a once-in-a lifetime opportunity to legitimize not only his akari, but his whole career as an “in-between” person. This in-between-ness inevitably implied uncertain identity, preventing Isamu from being fully recognized as a typical American cultural hero.

Until his death, Isamu Noguchi’s artistic identity remained uncertain. He was suspended, as it were, between “sculptor” and “industrial designer” from the Western critical view point. While enthusiastic in his garden project, Isamu clearly refused to be treated as a half-Japanese gardening craftsman (niwashi). In the final analysis, however, Isamu’s greatest strength was “that he does not belong,” as Calvin Tompkins put it. Curiously enough, this no-belonging-ness was what Shunsuke Kamei, in his seminal study on Yone Noguchi, had singled out as the key term to understand Isamu’s father’s poetry.

Obviously, the destiny unwillingly shared between the father and the son complicates their relationships. Although it was inevitable that Isamu negatively talked of his own father, it would be superficial to take his words simply at face value. Beneath a personal rejection and hatred lies a deeper semi-unconscious sympathy or empathy which would be worthy of investigations. Instead of exacerbating the opposition, I would like to propose here, as a working hypothesis, a tactics of mutual elucidation between the father and the son. Masayo Duus maintains: “Ironically, his father’s passionate dream of conquering two cultural worlds had taken firm root in his bastard son.”

15 P. Duus, p.370.
17 Kamei 1988,p. 238.
he wanted to be like him. “In taking his father’s surname without his father’s permission [Isamu] was not only reclaiming his rights as a “Japanese,” [Isamu] was also transforming his smoldering anger into a vital creative drive.”  

And yet, this ambivalence in creative drive cannot be fully understood without taking Isamu’s mother into account. Indeed, without Leonie’s editorial intervention, Yone’s early success in North America and Great Britain was unthinkable; without her initiative, the artistic career of Isamu could not have been achieved as we know it today. Especially his keen sense of space in architecture was fostered through his experience of designing the Triangular House in Chigasaki with his mother and supervising its construction work  

As Fujimori Terunobu, architect and historian of architecture, judiciously points out, Isamu’s interest in the Japanese lamp in the Gifu province in the 1950s owes to his skill in manipulating the Japanese plane, kanna (which is used by pulling and not by pushing). Around 1915, while they were in Chigasaki, Leonie had a Japanese cabinet maker initiate his son into the skill of using the plane. The mother judged it to be useful for the son of uncertain future to be accustomed with the toolbox of the Japanese carpenter. Without this special hand craft training in his childhood, Isamu would not have had the chance to bring the akari light sculpture into existence. The akari lighting sculpture thus turns out to be a good guiding

---

20 M.Duus: vol.1, 141-152; P.D, p.74.
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metaphor and a pilot lamp for our investigations into the Noguchi legacy.

5. Garden

It was in 1950 that Isamu visited Keio University where Yone had taught for almost 40 years. Isamu could see many of the professors who knew his father well. On that occasion, Isamu was “honored by the suggestion that I (Isamu) might design something in his (Yone’s) memory.” The project came into reality through the construction of a Reception House by Yoshirō Taniguchi combined with a sculpture garden by Isamu. Recalling the issue of their collaboration, Isamu wrote in 1952.

“It was felt that a room and garden would be the best expression I could offer, wherein the spirit of my father could be best perpetuated. It was to be a place of relaxation and contemplation upon the ideals of beauty expressed by my father’s poetry. I like to think that my undertaking this was appropriate not merely because I was his son, but because by my background and birth. I happened to be that combination of viewpoints of East and West embodied in his poetry. I felt that if I could offer a continuation of that bridge which is the common language of art, I will have offered my part to the human outlook that must one day find all people together.”

Isamu tells that the project was part of the “reconciliation of wounds” caused by the War, and the words implicitly suggest that it was also a process of his reconciliation with his late father. Once again, however, Isamu’s interest in the Japanese garden seems to be awoken thanks to his mother rather than because of his father. While the visit to the gardens in Kamakura with his mother was deeply inscribed in Isamu’s memory of his childhood, Yone practically left no substantial observation on the subject in

---

his extensive writings on Japanese art.\textsuperscript{24}

The \textit{Sunken Garden} for Chase Manhattan Bank Plaza in New York (1961-64) may be regarded as the prototype of Isamu Noguchi’s earthwork. Here the sand garden (such as the Raked Garden of Hōkokuji Temple in Kamakura) and the arrangement of the stones (like that of the Ryōanji Temple in Kyoto) were successfully combined. It is evident that Isamu learned a lot from the painstaking trial and error apprenticeship at the garden for the UNESCO headquarters in Paris (1956-58), where he had experienced frontal collisions with the Japanese garden master, Kiichi Sano, future Tōemon the XVI.\textsuperscript{25}

In my opinion, the idea of the sunken garden seems to have been fostered in the artist’s mind through his intimate appreciation of Paul Klee (1879-1940). His \textit{Versunkene Landschaft} (1918), executed during the First World War, depicts flowers and vegetations around the pond reflected on the blue of the water surface. The underground location of the Chase Manhattan Bank with a huge round opening court of 60 feet in diameter surrounded by the glass well-hole allowed Isamu to integrate all these elements into an appropriate arrangement with intensive aesthetic effect. Saburō Hasesgawa’s (1906-1957) recollection is worth mentioning, because it reinforces our hypothesis as of Isamu’s inspiration. Hasegawa accompanied Isamu in his trip to Kyoto in 1950 for visiting gardens and was delighted to hear Isamu declaring Klee’s affinity with the Japanese sensitivities.\textsuperscript{26}

\section*{6. Grave Stone}

These experiences of designing gardens attracted Isamu to stone hunting. This brings us to India. Once again the leading thread of our

hypothesis resides in Masayo Duus’s biography. And once again this important passage in her preface of the Japanese edition is completely eliminated from its English “translation.” Here, let me use a retrospective description as it is better fitting to explain what is “lost in translation” of Isamu’s relationship with Yone in this context. In her prologue, Masayo Duus speaks of the so-called Chrisna’s Butter Ball, a huge egg shaped rock which miraculously clings on the slope of a hill near Mahabalipuram, located on the way to the south from Chennai to Pondicherry twenty-seven (fig. 5).

Chrisna’s Butter Ball remains there since the immemorial past, as if dropped from the sky and attached to the earth on the spot. The biographer recalled that she was at a loss how to get out of the labyrinth of her monumental research of the mercurial Isamu world when she saw by chance the photo of this mysterious stone. Isamu’s mentality was often likened to mercury, so unstable and hard to locate. In fact, mercury is difficult to treat as it tends to split in infinite number of small elastic balls when one tries to accumulate them. But when one gives up collecting them in one parcel and leaves them as they are, they secretly attract with each other and amalgamate by themselves as if by their own will without being noticed by human beings.

Isamu’s relationship with India was just like such mercury balls. Looking back we recognize that Isamu visited India almost every year since his first trip in 1949. In India, he realized that there was a close and intimate tie between people and stones, and he felt that stones there have their own vital power. Why then was Isamu so deeply attracted to India?

---

This question brings us back to an Indian woman writer, Nayantara Pandit (1927-), whom Isamu met for the first time in 1943, when she was 16. Her mother, Vijayalakshmi Pandit, was Nehru’s younger sister, and was to become India’s ambassador to the United Nations after its independence in 1947. Her father, Ranjit Sitaram Pandit, like Nehru, came from a well-known Kashmiri Brahmin family, and was to die in prison in India that year, under the British rule. Mahatma Gandhi was an old friend of Ranjit Pandit’s father. Isamu thus got acquaintance with the most distinguished Indian family residing in New York. Replying to Masayo Duus’s interview, Tara, as she was then nicknamed, frankly replied that she had been amazed at Isamu’s deep knowledge of traditional Indian art and culture.

Why, then, did Tara, at the age of 16, find in Isamu, “the human being closest to my heart, the person whose opinions I most respected”? As always, the English “translation” eliminates the hint that the Japanese “original” does not fail to mention. Shortly before Isamu’s first departure to the “pilgrimage to the East,” he had received a letter from her mother, saying that in India Isamu should not forget to contact his father’s friends, Rabindranath Tagore and Sarojini Naidu (letter, June, 16, 1930). Isamu’s intimacy with things Indian stems from this experience in situ. And Yone was the person who not only initiated Isamu to India but also facilitated Isamu’s access to the VIPs. Yone himself was going to be sent to India on a cultural mission and made an extensive lecture tour in India in 1935-36. His interviews with Mahatma Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore and Sarojini Naidu, Indian poetess (1874-1949), marked an important moment in the

---

28 P. Duus, pp.186-87.
29 From P. Duus, p.408, we know that the Masayo Duus’s interview with Nayantara Sahgal took place on Jan.31, 1996, but the passage quoted above from the Japanese edition is missing in the English “translation” and we cannot locate the source for lack of reference in Japanese “original” published from the editor Kôdansha, M. Duus 2003, Vol.1, p.427.
30 Nayantara Sahgal, Prison and Chocolate Cake, New York, Alfred A. Knopf. 1954, p.208; P. Duus, p.188.
intellectual exchange between India and Japan shortly before the outbreak of the China-Japan War. Not only Mahatma Gandhi but also Sarojini Naidu, Yone’s intimate friend from his London days, was closely related with Tara’s family. It is true that the English version mentions the hearsay that members of the India League of America welcomed Isamu as the son of Yone Noguchi, whom they knew not as a “Japanese fascist” but as a friend of the poet Rabindranath Tagore. However, these important details accounting for Tara’s intimacy with Isamu could not survive in the American publication.

Judging from the circumstances, we cannot deny Isamu’s father’s close ties with India as well as Isamu’s indebtedness to his father in his discovery of India. However, mentioning his father in full detail seems to have been judged as irrelevant for the readers of the English edition of Isamu’s biography. In reality, however, Isamu’s deep involvement in Indian spirituality is closely related with his relationship with Nayantara Pandit, and the ground for their fruitful encounter had been prepared by Isamu’s father. Yone Noguchi’s fame as one of the representative poets in Asia in the pre-War period was at least highly helpful for the son.

As for Isamu himself, it should be stressed that without his encounter with the *Chrisna’s Butter Ball*, New Yorkers would have never seen the *Red Cube* (1968) on the Broadway, in Manhattan, statically spinning on the ground by supporting itself at one point of the cubic edge. In addition, the huge stone facing the Yashima Island at the hill of the Isamu Noguchi Garden Museum in Shikoku also undoubtedly demonstrates Isamu’s enchantment with the *Chrisna’s Butter Ball*, which he transplanted to his own favorite


site, as his own grave stone. Isamu had rescued the egg-shaped huge stone, named *mannari-ishi* in Okayama three years prior to his death. The stones such as these seem to exercise emanating vital power of attraction, putting together diverse elements of Isamu’s mercurial life which would otherwise have remained scattered without finding out any convergent focal points. Moreover, the reason why Masayo Duus ended her story with this grave stone is hardly understandable without the anecdote of the *Chrisna’s Butter Ball* she inserted as if an aside in the Prologue of her Japanese edition (fig.6).

7. Posthumous Legacy

*Moere Numa Park* was open to public in 1998, in the northern Island of Hokkaidô ten years later than Isamu’s sudden death on Dec.30, 1988 because of the unexpected pneumonia. From this complex earthwork, let us mention just two factors. *The Play Mountain*, a nineteen foot high artificial hill consisting of a huge stone stratification in the guise of staircases, was already conceived as early as 1933, but remained unrealized for more than 64 years after Noguchi’s proposal was rejected by the city of New York. One cannot help being astonished at its similarity with Paul Klee’s *Ad Parnassum* (1932), executed only one year earlier than Isamu’s original plan. It seems as if Paul Klee’s vision was materially put into reality. In the park one can

---

also find out a corn-shaped (*konide type*) mountain, with a spiral slide for children. The shape strongly reminds us of the famous volcano Mount Fuji, which every Japanese knows.

Is it a sign of Isamu’s return to his father’s land? Or was it a kind of lip service to the Japanese mercenary? What did the Mount Fuji stand for in the creation of Isamu Noguchi? These questions bring us back to his father for one last time. In his *Hokusai*, published in 1925, Yone Noguchi recalls his first experience in London.

“It was in London where I tired with difficulty to find my own poetical way through winter’s mists, and my manuscripts of poems did not appear then to help me much. One of my poet-friends who perhaps wished to cheer me up, took me one evening to a night reception of another poet. When we reached the place, I found that the faces of guests that filled the room were already growing dim under the cigarette smoke. I was thrown among those faces unknown to me, as a heathen devil in shabby clothes or a lonely god with a Yankee accent. (Then I came to London not from Tokyo but from New York). I was uncomfortable in my situation. I looked around. There on the wall above the mantelpiece I found Hokusai’s Fuji in the colour of red ochre, a piece I called “Windy and Fair,” stretching its proud legs over the marble-white shoulders of the one lady who sat in front of it.”

At this unexpected encounter with Hokusai in a foggy winter in London, Yone confesses that “suddenly I felt that I regained my original strength like that of Fuji Mountain frowning down on the West. I became so cheerful” that, when he returned to his lodging late that night, he wrote a poem in praise of Mount Fuji (I come back to this poem later). The reconstruction proposed by Dr. Madoka Hori allows us to suppose that it was at a party held at the house of Thomas Sturge Moore (1870-1944), and

---

Yone was accompanied by Laurens Binyon (1869-1943), poet and keeper of Oriental Art in the British Museum.

Yone narrates the story as if it happened shortly before the publication of his *From the Eastern Sea* (printed on Jan.13, 1903 in 73 page private edition), i.e. at the very end of 1902. However, in the chronological explanation given to the Japanese version of the same collection of poems (1924), Yone’s visit to Moore with Binyon is recorded in the entry of Feb. 11, 1903, shortly after the publication.\(^{36}\) One may well suspect a temptation to dramatization, but at the same time one cannot deny the psychological factor: in Yone’ mind the rediscovery of Hokusai coincided with his own successful debut as a poet in London and was engraved as such in his memory.

By identifying himself with Hokusai and his Mount Fuji, Yone recovered from his lapse of confidence in isolation. Yone also highly appreciated Hiroshige as the landscapist and published a book from a New York editor in 1921. Yone states that in Hiroshige, “art is born in parochialism and dies in universalism” by quoting from George Moore. “There is nothing more interesting and mysterious in the world’s annals of art than how Hiroshige entered into Europe.” As an example, Yone takes up the case of J. McNeil Whistler’s *Old Battersea Bridge*, and remarks that the “faithful followers of Whistler” “will be unable to deny the fact that he owes many things to our Hiroshige” and agrees that “Hiroshige, since discovered in the West, was interpreted and reconstructed by a decidedly new understanding.” Yone recognized that he himself, as a traveler newly returned home from abroad, shared the same eye of “Hiroshige in the West.”\(^{37}\)

While Hokusai emphasized eccentricity in his treatment of the Mount Fuji, Hiroshige popularized the sacred mountain as a symbol of “the spirit of Japanese Art,” where the Japanese poet detected a sort of “polyphonic prose” akin to the style in *Epics of the Heike Clan* or that of *Noh* plays.\(^{38}\) The book itself is illustrated with Hiroshige’s *Fuji Mountain seen at Miho no Matsubara*, or the volcano seen *à travers* the pine tree alley at the shore.

\(^{36}\) Madoka Hori, Ph.D. Dissertation (op.cit.), 2009, Ch.4, pp.1-20.
of Miho, a typical “polyphonic” composition. In this context, Masayo Duus’s remark is revealing. In fact, poems such as “The Pine Tree in Japan” begins to appear frequently in Noguchi’s verse and prose from the period around 1914, when Leonie Gilmore moved in Chigasaki and took the habit of daily looking at the Mount Fuji from her house with her children and walking back and forth through the alley of the pine tree of the Tōkaidō Road, which Hiroshige depicted ca. eighty years earlier. At that time, Yone Noguchi made his third stay in London and delivered series of lectures on “The Spirit of Japanese Art” (to be published in 1915) as the sequel to his precedent “Spirit of Japanese Poetry.” The year 1918 was also the 60th anniversary celebration after Hiroshige’s death and Yone’s commemorative lecture on Hiroshige was published in Arts and Decoration (London: Feb.-Mar.1920).

Staying in Japan, Leonie continued to check and brush up Yone’s versatile and prolific English writings destined for foreign markets.

8. A Shadow of a Haunting White Woman

As we have seen above, Yone, upon returning from the party at one night in 1902-03, wrote a poem in praise of the Mount Fuji. In this, we see Yone invoking as below: “O white-faced wonder, /O matchless sight,/ O sublimity, O Beauty! Fuji Yama,/ Touched by the divine breath, /We return to the shape of God,/ Thy silence is song.” This reminds us of the branch of the first manuscripts that Yone had handed to Leonie for editing at the beginning of their collaboration. Among them was “Apparition” that many reviews cited. It begins:

38 Ibid. pp.8-9.
"Twas morn;
I felt the whiteness of her brow
Over my face; I raise my eyes and saw
The breeze passing on dewy feet.\footnote{M. Duus, 2003, Vol.1, p.62; P.Duus, p.27.}

Those who are familiar with Lafcadio Hearn’s (1850-1904) ghost stories, *Kwaidan*, can immediately understand the affinity of Yone Noguchi’s “Apparition” with the “yukionna” or “snow woman” story that Hearn eternalized. It could not have remained a simple coincidence. From 1908, Leonie is known to have served as an English teacher to Kazuo Koizumi, Lafcadio’s eldest son. Isamu, then at the age of 4, remembers having played with elderly children at Hearn’s house in Nishi-Ôkubo. Setsu Koizumi (1868-1932), widow of the late American writer, took care of Leonie, when occasions were provided.\footnote{M. Duus 2003, Vol.1, pp.134-35; P. Duus, p.56-57.} Masayo Duus judiciously surmises that Setsu’s sympathy with Leonie stems from her knowledge that Leonie’s help was indispensable for Yone’s English writing. Setsu herself had told stories at her husband’s request in the evening, and the Japanese oral transmission had been transformed into English written narratives. In 1909, Yone’s poetry collection, *The Pilgrimage*, was published in London, and the Valley Press brought it out in a private edition in Japan. The book was dedicated to Leonie, who represented in fact the Valley Press by herself.

These elements related to Yone Noguchi allow us to suppose what could have been compounded in the realization of the Mount Fuji shaped hill in the Niere Numa Park, which the son, Isamu was to conceive at the end of his life. The “white faced wonder” of the Mount Fuji was also secretly

\footnote{Yone Noguchi is also the author of a biography of Lafcadio Hearn. *Lafcadio Hearn in Japan* was published in 1910 and another book on Hearn in Japanese was issued in 1926. It seems that the disagreement between Yone and Setsuko Koizumi was caused primarily by Setsuko’s learning about Yone’s “another wife” rather than the trouble about the priority of the materials that Yone borrowed from Setsuko.}
connected with the horror of the snow woman, whose “breeze passing on
dewy feet” can easily kill her lover, when his deception is revealed. “The
whiteness of her blow” may easily allude to Leonie herself, as a white
woman. Just as the Japanese ghost story crossed the national and language
boundaries, thanks to the collaboration of Setsu and Lafcadio, Yone’s early
success as a Japanese poet in English expression was also the product of
Leonie’s collaboration with Isamu’s father.

The corn-formed mountain was at the same time a symbol of Japanese
nationalism that his father worshipped and the primal scene for the son,
a landscape full of nostalgia of his happy childhood with his mother in
Chigasaki (The volcano was just in front of their house, and Isamu is said to
have designed a round window at their house so as to appreciate the Mount
Fuji through it). Covered by the white snow, the shape of the mountain may
suggest reconciliation of their parents. The volcanic eruption is for the male
creativity just as the covering white snow is for female protection. But the
metaphor of the snow-covered volcano also reveals the menace of the female
revenge in the guise of the snow woman. With all its ambivalence, the corn-
shaped mountain in the Niere Numa Park summarizes Isamu’s life and
his “longing for someplace” where he belonged, as a child who was “born
bearing the burden of two countries.”

Shigemi Inaga

---

43 Isamu Noguchi: The Sculpture of Spaces, directed by Kenji Hayashi and Charlotte
Between Patriotism and Internationalism:
Yone Noguchi as a Japonisme Novelist

Miyako HADA

Yone Noguchi wrote two “Japanese” novels over the course of his literary career: one was The American Diary of a Japanese Girl (1902), and the other The American Letters of a Japanese Parlor-Maid (1905). The former was written as a journal kept by a young Japanese girl named Miss Morning Glory, and the latter was composed as a series of letters between Miss Morning Glory and a friend in Japan. A question worth examining is why Noguchi, whose literary career was devoted primarily to poetry, would want to write “sentimental” novels of great popularity based on Japanese themes. Of course, there were good monetary reasons to do so, in that such potboilers were big time best sellers and successful authors working in that genre were making a lot of money; however, it is unlikely that Noguchi who harbored serious literary ambitions would compromise his talent merely for the sake of money. What he was really interested in his fiction was countering the lies and misperceptions he felt were being perpetrated on the gullible reading public in the West by popular foreign writers who had appropriated the Japanese fictional specialty. Their success enraged him and he felt that their wrongs could be set right only by a “real” Japanese writer, reclaiming the Japanese fictional specialty as his own. And he intended to be that literary warrior. That he failed in his attempt for lack of talent as a writer of fiction does not detract from the nobility of his intent.

As is well known, by the late 1890s, many American families embellished their homes with Japanese-style furniture, decorative lacquerware and painted screens. So enamored were Americans of the refinements of Japanese culture, that it is safe to say that every family had at least one small Japanese article, be it a Japanese fan or a piece of pottery in its possession. As well, in their eagerness to know more about the quaint, exotic people who lived in that country, a considerable number of
Americans poured over “Japanese” novels written by non-Japanese. Most of those stories describe the love between a Western man and a young Japanese woman. The most famous and popular writers of this genre in the United States at that time were John Luther Long and Onoto Watanna, whose Japanese sounding name hid the fact that she was of English and Chinese parentage. Their works were received enthusiastically during the craze for “Japonica” which swept the United States at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century.

Despite their very visible popularity, or perhaps because of it, Yone Noguchi was unhappy with these works, since he thought the Japan they described was distorted and unreal. It bore no resemblance to the world of Japan as he knew it. To add insult to injury, these books were very successful best sellers. In them, all Japanese women were stereotypically depicted as frail, thoughtless, geisha-types. Noguchi was angered by the ignorance and misunderstanding of Japan and the Japanese people that these novels promoted. The reason why he made his protagonist female, instead of male, is partly for the reason of easier sexual stereotyping of women over men, and partly because the readers of these novels were generally women who liked to focus on interesting, sympathetic female characters, however exotic or quaint they might be. Of course there was also the craze vogue among Western readers for stories focusing on romance between a Japanese woman and a Western man, as epitomized by Pierre Loti’s Madame Chrysanthème which was refashioned into the ‘Madame Butterfly’ story by John Luther Long and later, in 1906, into the famous Puccini opera of the same title. (An interesting point is that the craze for inter-racial romances seldom, if ever, took the form of a Western woman and a lover of another race, even though Noguchi, in his own life, did precisely just that, his son from that union being the famous American artist Isamu Noguchi.) In an effort to reset the balance, Noguchi resolved to show how Japanese women were sensible, intelligent and tactful, not the doll-like, mindless figures of popular fiction. He was eager to wipe out these insults to Japan.

The following article was written by Noguchi in 1907 after he returned to Japan:
How irritated I was, I remember, on seeing the theatrical bills of The Mikado or The Geisha in America! In fact, when I first saw The Mikado at the Tivoli, a San Francisco playhouse, some fifteen years ago, I was highly indignant and even prepared a letter for the papers denouncing it ….Later, when I began to read the Japanese stories written by American writers (?) I felt the same indignation! I refer to the works of John Luther Long and Onoto Watanna. The saddest part about Miss Watanna is that she is still posing as a Japanese, a half caste at the least.¹

It is obvious from this passage how he felt about the Japonisme fad in the West and the ‘Japanese’ novels of that time. His indignation was so intense that he wanted to correct the stereotypical images of Japan, while at the same time writing a satire of American society of that time. His book, the first American-published English language novel written by a Japanese national, takes the form of a diary. As is well known, there is a long tradition of diary literature in Japan: this includes prominent works such as Tosa Nikki (which was written in 935 A.D.) by Ki no Tsurayuki and Makurano Soushi or The Pillow Book by Sei Shonagon (written around the end of the 10th century).² Tosa Nikki was written by a male author posing as a woman. Noguchi, no doubt familiar with this work, might very well have used its literary form as a model when he created his novel. In addition to these books, of course, there are many other non-Japanese works which also adopted the diary or letter form, for example, Oliver Goldsmith’s The Citizen of the World published in 1761 and which was purportedly written by a Chinese traveler. Goldsmith used an outsider’s perspective to comment ironically and at times moralistically on the British society and manners. It is not likely that Noguchi knew about this work, but it is easy to understand how one could use that same technique when wanting to express critical

remarks about a delicate subject. In other words, employing a mask makes one to speak up more freely and directly.

In his novels, Noguchi uses the heroine, Miss Morning Glory, to represent another side of himself. Morning Glory, a young woman with a lot of wit and humor, makes mention of many curious American customs and compares them with those of Japan. A well-to-do lady of Japan who visits the United States with her Yale-graduate uncle, going from San Francisco to Chicago and then New York City, she is surprisingly aggressive, bold and unrestrained in her comments and conclusions. She is even mischievous, vain, and not particularly serious. This is very different from the stereotypically submissive, eager-to-please Japanese girl in the popular “Japanese” stories of the time. She frequently indulges in flights of fancy, expressing her ideas with great self-confidence, and in the process makes bitter criticisms of both American and Japanese culture. When she thinks about the Japanese idea of marriage, she finds fault with Japanese men who still persist in their belief that women are sub-human articles of trade or objects of desire. “No Oriental man is qualified for civilization, I declare. Educate man, but – beg your pardon – not the woman!”3 She insists that a Japanese “gentleman” should have an understanding of love when he marries. Incidentally, she considers herself to be a very literate person and she has great confidence in her talent: “My ‘Lotus Eaters’ is to be equal in length to ‘The Lady of the Lake.’ Now, see, Oji San, mine has to be far superior to the laureate’s, not merely in quality, but in quantity as well.”4 She plans to write a magnificent poem which is comparable to that of the great poet laureate, Alfred Tennyson. She boldly says her poem will be far superior both in quality and quantity than Tennyson's.

In another instance, she is confident that her beauty compares well with the beauty of her American friend, saying that the American’s beauty is ‘spring white sunshine’ whereas hers is ‘autumn moonbeams.’ By this, she means that both have equal value in terms of their attractiveness,

although their respective charms appear in different forms: “She must be the pattern of Meriken beauty. I felt that I was so very homely. I stole a sly glance into the looking-glass, and convinced myself that I was a beauty also, but Oriental. We had different attractions. She may be Spring white sunshine, while I am yellow Autumn moonbeams. One is animation, and the other sweetness.”\(^5\) She continues to comment in a similar vein on her various attributes in such a lofty manner that the reader cannot but smile at her innocence. She continues on and on: “I cannot comprehend where ‘Mericans get the conception that Jap girls are eternally smiling puppets.”\(^6\) However, for all her confidence in herself, when she comes across a cultural ideal or expression which seems, in fact, to be better than what is available to her in Japan, she promptly gives up her old custom. “It used to be my belief that a woman not equipped with the art of bowing showed a terrible gap in her moral foundation. Bowing is out of place in Amerikey, like a comedian’s smile in the clear daylight. I’ve given it up completely, Matsuba San.”\(^7\) She compares ‘bowing’ with a ‘comedian’s smile in the clear daylight.’ She implies that bowing expresses an idea of subservience which is out of place in the modern world, and she soon gives up the custom completely. She is a very forthright lady indeed!

Later in the novel, she severely criticizes the American society in an unladylike way which is contradictory to her own position as a well brought up woman of substance. Her anger is so fiercely expressed that it seems as though Noguchi himself has inadvertently dropped the mask of his fiction in order to speak directly to the reader.

“Madame Butterfly” lay by me, appealing to be read. “No, iya, I’ll never open! I erred in buying you,” I said. I dislike that “Madame.” It sounds indecent ever since the “gentleman” Loti spoiled it with his “Madame Chrysantheme.” The honourable author of “Madame Butterfly” is Mr.

---

\(^5\) Ibid., p.52.
\(^6\) Ibid., p.76.
Wrong. (Do you know that Japanese have no boundary between L and R?) Undoubtedly, he is qualified to be a Wrong.\footnote{Noguchi, \textit{The American Diary of a Japanese Girl}, p. 238.}

This is a journal entry for one day when Miss Morning Glory is on a train. With her copy of \textit{Madame Butterfly}, which she says she bought by mistake, she starts criticizing Pierre Loti and John Luther Long, saying that the word ‘Madame’ sounds coarse and vulgar, ever since Loti’s and Long’s works were published. That “Madame”, with its present-day sexual overtones, suggests a woman who runs a brothel, only further her point. In an effort to show that John Luther Long was just plain wrong in his depictions of Japan, she wittily refers to him as ‘Mr. Wrong’, using the artless excuse that Japanese cannot distinguish between the pronunciation of the letters L and R.

In what would appear to be a reference to Onoto Watanna’s Chinese-English parentage, she makes a sarcastic remark about the book market of the time: “Authorship is nothing at all, nowadays, since authors are thick as Chinese laundries. Well, still it can be honourable, if it is honourable.”\footnote{Ibid., p.238.} She continues, “Japanese fiction penned by the tojin! It is a completely sad affair.”\footnote{Ibid., p.239.} It is clear that Noguchi, speaking in Morning Glory’s voice, thought that those “Japanese” fictions were profaning Japan. Moreover, Morning Glory, using the murky racial epithets of the time, mentions that the heroines of those books are “devils of mixture”. She continues:

Do I vex you, gentleman, when I say that your Japanese type could only be an unprincipled half-caste? Your Nippon character eyed in blue, and hairy-skinned always. Isn’t it absurd when it puts a ‘Merican shoe on one foot and a wooden clog on the other? And if you insist on registering it as a Jap, I shall merely laugh loudly. One heroine I have read of placed a light summer haori over her heavily padded mid winter clothes. Your Oriental novel, let me be courageous enough to say, is a farce at its best.
Oh, just wait, my sweet Americans! A genuine one will soon be offered to you by Morning Glory. I stepped out to the platform, and threw out “Madame Butterfly.” Poor “Madame!” I trust in the mountain lions of high Nevada to cherish her lovingly.¹¹

Thus she dishes out provocative observations one after another, finally declaring that “A genuine one will soon be offered to you by Morning Glory.” In this pronouncement, she was expressing exactly what Noguchi had wanted to do when he began to write his novel. Morning Glory speaks for him.

It should be noted that Noguchi’s novels contain several illustrations by Yeto Genjiro, who had gained great popularity at the time as an illustrator of “Japanese” books. He was especially well known for his design and illustrations for the Harper and Brothers edition of Onoto Watanna’s *Japanese Nightingale* in 1901. He also illustrated Lafcadio Hearn’s *Katto* for Macmillan. With regard to the illustrations for his first novel, Noguchi wanted an American illustrator; however, Harper and Brothers hired Yeto and subsequently introduced him to Noguchi. In spite of his initial apprehensions, they immediately established a rapport, which had Noguchi changing his mind and agreeing to the use of Yeto’s illustrations for his own book.

Ironically, by using Yeto’s illustrations, Noguchi’s novels appeared so graphically similar to the other “Japanese” stories of the time that American readers probably could not make out the difference between Noguchi’s novels and the ones of which he was so critical. This ran contrary to Noguchi’s intention. For this reason, using Yeto’s illustrations was not a good sales strategy, because from an American point of view, the authenticity of Noguchi as a “real” Japanese author was not evident. He had the strong belief that he alone could write about Japan better than any other author, because he was a real (genuine) Japanese. Such being the case, he should not have allowed his publisher to use Yeto’s illustrations. Or, if they were going to use Yeto’s work, it should have been completely different from

¹¹ Ibid., pp.239-240.
his other designs.

Contrary to Noguchi’s expectations, the sales of his first novel were disappointing. Even more disappointing to him was the fact that the manuscript for the sequel, *The American Letters of a Japanese Parlor-Maid*, was rejected by his American publisher. Later, he published it in Japan, but unfortunately, for lack of an English-reading public, it received little attention there. Probably the reason for his American failure was the absence of a plot in his book. For example, *Madame Butterfly* by John Luther Long has an exciting sympathetic plot, while Onoto Watanna was a great storyteller and created vivid fantasy worlds in her works. Noguchi disliked Onoto Watanna for passing herself off as a Japanese. To him, she lacked “authenticity” as an interpreter of Japanese values to the Western world. This understanding was complicated by the fact that at first, Noguchi had actually believed that Watanna was Japanese, based upon her own attestation and, until he found out differently, he had had no reason to believe otherwise. But later, after he realized that he had been duped, he turned against her in a very strong way. He was filled with anger because she was passing off as a Japanese in her personal life, just employing a pen name for the sake of promoting her books. He could not forgive her for the deception. Complicating the matter was the fact that Watanna became one of the best-selling writers of her time, whereas he and his work languished in oblivion. He was deeply jealous of her popularity and he could not bear that her irresponsible “thoughtless and unreliable” novels were more highly valued than his. In order to justify his vision of Japan over hers he vowed to continue writing novels.

Ironically enough, Noguchi did not notice that his literary career followed the same trajectory as Onoto Watanna’s. In later life, in Japan, when he wrote poems in English, some critics and the reading public thought that he was pretending to be an English poet. His own literary identity was indecisive. He, too, could be accused of a hypocrisy similar to hers. This contradiction troubled him endlessly in a different form when he started writing in Japanese. He realized that he was writing “defective” English poems in the United States and “imperfect” Japanese poems in Japan. He was deeply distressed by the thought that he did not feel rooted
in a single culture. He blamed himself for being neither completely English nor completely Japanese. This agony was always on his mind.

In 1921, Noguchi published his first collection of poems in Japanese, and the conflict over his dual nationality is clearly expressed in these poems. The prominent scholar, Kamei Shunsuke once stated about Noguchi that “To be a “man of dual nationality” was not his fate alone: it was a fate that poetic and intellectual leaders of the period of “civilization and enlightenment” could not help suffering, for they were to challenge Western culture while they were under its overwhelming influence. In this sense, Noguchi was not only quite an interesting literary phenomenon but also a conspicuous example (almost a symbol) of modern Japan’s dilemma.”

Even though it is easy to criticize Noguchi from a feminist perspective, it is important to remember that his significance as a writer lies in the fact that he skillfully introduced Japanese culture and Japanese cultural values to non-Japanese people. He wrote a substantial volume of critiques on Japanese art and literature for the Western audience. When he first went to San Francisco in 1893 at the age of 18, there was a strong prejudice against Asians. As such, he must have had many unpleasant and humiliating experiences. In his novels, he often used words from that era, which are now defined as “politically incorrect”. Such words help us to understand his simple and honest feelings even more directly. He also gives his readers glimpses of the actual conditions of the Japanese people of that time. His patriotism as a Japanese became stronger each time he met with unpleasant experiences in the United States. Would it be incorrect to conclude that they must have inspired in him a desire to confront his experience of American racism by expressing a “true Japanese heart in English?” Although he failed in his effort to express the “real” Japan in his fiction, he, nonetheless, had the courage to switch from writing fiction in English to writing poetry in English. Thus, compelled by the social conditions of his time to come to a greater awareness of himself as a Japanese finding his place on the world

stage, he took it upon himself to become the one to introduce Japanese culture to the outside world. In doing so, Noguchi naturally lived the life of a globalist, some might say, internationalist.

Miyako HADA

Illustrations (by Yeto Genjiro)

(1) The guest of honor (AD)
(2) “Such disobedient tools!” (AD)
(3) “Uncle, Please count how many stories in that building.” (AD)

(4) “Mrs. Stuart-Dodge scrutinized my face through her lorgnette.” (AL)
(5) “Madam’s bell” I cried bowing. (AL)
(6) “Look at Miss Cissy poking her nose into the flowers of the drawing room every morning!” (AL)
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Yone Noguchi’s Poetics as a Writer of “Dual Nationality”

Madoka Hori

Introduction

This paper demonstrates some of the results of my research on Yone Noguchi’s poetics and life as a writer of “Dual Nationality”. It also looks at the spiritual lineage between a father and his son. In other words, I would like to present an overview of Yone Noguchi’s life and poetry in brief, in order to think through the connection with his son, Isamu Noguchi.

1. General Opinion of Yone and Isamu

Yone Noguchi, best known for his role as a Japanese poet up until the end of World War II, has been rather too harshly judged - and almost totally neglected - in the post-war era. Yone Noguchi has been almost totally sidelined, in fact, excepting insofar as he attracts some attention by way of being the father of Isamu Noguchi (1904-1988), a highly-regarded versatile sculptor.

In this connection, in any case, the assessment of Yone carries both distaste - and a critical flavour, because Isamu was his illegitimate child. In Isamu’s biography,1 Yone is usually painted in lurid color, and in several interviews of Isamu,2 he spoke about his father in a rather negative light,

* All the English titles in brackets are not in the original but tentatively proposed here by M.Hori.
1 Ashton (1992) and especially Duus (2004). Both of the biographies are quite negative towards Yone Noguchi.
and about his American mother in a more positive manner. If we have regard for the world-wide success of Isamu as an artist, however, it is apparently true that Isamu has inherited from his father's estate - in terms of an international human network - and also, it may be argued, a similar motivation as an artist.

Yone Noguchi, who is not very well studied, even in Japanese literary history, was quite an influential figure as a Japanese-writer or an interpreter of Japanese culture overseas. The main reason for the harsh judgements towards Yone Noguchi in the post-war era is that Yone was stigmatized by his identification as a ‘Nationalist’ or ‘Imperialist’. In post-war Japan, a number of Japanese were targeted with criticism as being inadequate “Nationalists” (with the attendant ugly image) and remained under a kind of 'seal of taboo' without any further investigation as to their truth. Noguchi was one of such figures in the post-war era. From 1942 onwards, especially, Noguchi wrote War-effort poetry, intended to whip up pro-War sentiment, along with others such as Takamura Kotaro (1883-1956). They were not alone: almost every literary contemporary did so. In radio broadcasts, Noguchi, well-known as a poet across the world, became the land-mark or signature poet of Imperial Japan. However, in the post-war era of Japan, being labeled a "writer of War Poetry" brought an immediate harsh assessment, not only to all the Japanese-language poetry written by Yone during the War-time era, but also to the totality of his identity as a writer.

2. Yone Noguchi’s poetics

Let us start with a rough sketch from the beginning of Yone’s life, before entering into the issue of the lineage of the father to the son. Yone Noguchi - the writer - emerged in the period of the beginnings of the worldwide Symbolist literary movement. Noguchi left Japan for the USA in 1893, and then gained a chance to study poetry under Joaquin Miller (1839-1913) in Oakland, California. During his association with Millar, Noguchi studied the works of such American poets as Edgar Allan Poe (1809-1849), Walt Whitman (1819-1892) and others, who had also been
attracted by Symbolist writers in the period of transition from the latter part of the 19th to the early 20th century. That is, Noguchi, who learned about naturalism, mysticism, the maverick free spirit, and localism, was aligned with the trends of the time. Noguchi started to write English poems under the influence of both Poe’s poetic theory and Whitman’s style, mixed with Japanese tradition, harking to MATSUO Basho (松尾芭蕉: 1644-1694) or Haiku (俳句), and Zen Buddhism. The period prior to 1900 and just after was the heyday of literary Symbolism, foreshadowing Modernism. It had attracted attention to the mysteries of the Orient and of such non-Christian philosophy. Noguchi’s literary career began thus as a young Japanese poet providing a breath of fresh air in the literary world of the Pacific Coast of the US, where the local and national literary atmosphere had developed on its own cultural terms. Seen and Unseen; or Monologues of a Homeless Snail (1896), which was Noguchi’s first collection of verse, was well-received among American writers. After this success in the US, Noguchi went on to London, which was the place, where in the canonical English literary world, the movement that established modernity in between the traditional and innovative, took place. Noguchi’s publication in London entitled From the Eastern Sea (1903) was favorably received among the many writers in London, including, for instance, Arthur Symons (1865-1945), and William Butler Yeats (1865-1939).

From the latter half of the 19th century, and especially after the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) and both before and after the First World War (1914-1918), the Western literary world had reached a new sensitivity for the modern. In other words, a movement of interest in, and admiration of the Orient had developed, which objected to the predominance of Western thought. English poets, who had acted for social reform and artistic innovation, such as W.B.Yeats, Arthur Symons and Laurence Binyon (1869-1943), were deeply interested in Oriental poetry and poets. With the transition stage of the turn of the 20th century, some Indian English-language poets appeared in London, such as Aurobindo Ghose (1872-1950)

---

3 This term is a translation of the Japanese Phrase “chiiki shugi(地域主義)”, which relates to an artistic methodology of elevating rural culture and tradition in art.
and Sarojini Naidu. Moreover, from Japan, Yone Noguchi too had emerged as a Japanese English-language poet. It can be said that Tagore becoming recipient of the Nobel Prize in 1913 was a vivid flagship of the movement, a signal of the fluctuating nature of Western power.

3 “Like a Paper Lantern” and Akari — Father and Son

To begin with, I will refer to one poem here, from Seen and Unseen: Monologues of a Homeless Snail, which is Yone Noguchi’s first publication in 1896.

“Like a Paper Lantern”

“Oh, my friend, thou wilt not come back to me this night!”

I am alone in this lonely cabin, alas, in the friendless Universe, and the snail at my door hides stealishly[sic] his horns.

“O for my sake, put forth thy honorable horns!”

To the Eastward, to the Westward? Alas, where is Truthfulness? — Goodness? — Lights?

The world enveils me; my body itself this night enveils my soul.

Alas, my soul is like a paper lantern, its pastes wetted off under the rainy night, in the rainy world.  

This work was produced under the influence of the Haikus of Matsuo Basho’s- “Katatsumuri Tuno furiwakeyo Suma-Akashi 「蝸牛角ふりわけよ 須磨明石’”; which was used as inspiration for the following lines ‘《古来人は幻の中に夢を見ている、人間の栄華位はかないものはない》Since ancient times, people dream within an illusion. Nothing is as ephemeral as human prosperity (translated by Hori).’ Yone Noguchi was inspired by Basho’s idea, and tried to express various levels of lonesomeness and solidarity of human-beings. “To the Eastward, to the Westward? Alas, where is Truthfulness? ---Goodness? ---Lights?” This sentence does not refer to the matter of direction or destination, but the matter of the spiritual home. This poem

4 Noguchi, Yone (1896), no. xix, n.p.
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depicts one poor homeless Japanese boy, who is wandering and struggles in the juncture between Western and Eastern cultures, in his search for the place of Body and Soul, Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. It is a subtle and profound symbolic expression of sensibility.

This poetry explains in detail how much he leads a solitary life in the global world, and sings the pain of his soul vanishing into the darkness. And then he casts a reflection on the ‘Paper-lantern’, which he expresses as “its pastes wetted off under the rainy night”, not a typical motif of Japanese culture as a colorful image, but of more different or additional esthetics - as a melancholic and gloomy image.

This poetry was the starting point for Yone Noguchi, and expresses his own original motif, which is his own swinging and bewilderment between the East and West - a ‘Dual Nationality’. Yone cherished this poetic expression, the suffering in the binary, until his death in 1947. It might be said that the son Isamu followed in his father’s footsteps.

The series of Isamu’s Akari Light Sculptures (fig.1), is widely known as a type of eclectic furniture in the world of interior design. This series was one of his own favorites among the thousands of works. This sculpture, which becomes part of human life, shows the effect of light and shadow, by using Japanese paper and bamboo. The inspiration for the creation of this work series was his encounter with the traditional Japanese paper-lantern (Chochin) in Gifu-prefecture, while he was on a visit to see ‘cormorant fishing’ in the Nagara-river, on the way to Hiroshima, in 1951. The Nagara-river flows close by Tsushima city, which was the hometown of Yone Noguchi. That area has been famous for Chochin paper-lanterns since the medieval Muromachi-era, of the 14th century. Tsushima is very famous for its Chochin-festival, the Owari-Tushima-Tenno-Festival (尾張津島天王祭), and its spectacles of the chochin was represented in the
Ukiyoe-wood block-printing『六十餘州名所圖會』 by Ando Hiroshige’(fig.2-a,b). Yone Nogochi refers to the festival and the Ukiyoe in his essay. These references might well relate to Isamu’s curiosity towards the Paper-lantern art. Isamu manufactured more than 200 types of Akari Light Sculpture over a period of 35 years. This series of Akari has received recognition across the world as a ‘Paper Lantern’ or the ‘Expression of the Sun and the Moon’.

The ‘Chochin’ or Japanese Lantern has been well-known as a typical Japanese motif since the 19th century, similar to the tradition of Geisha and the mountain Fuji-yama – as it has been known outside Japan. However, the Chochin was internationally recontextualised by Isamu, from a strange local prototype to a modern life-style form.

It is not very well known that the concept of the Chochin originated in the hometown of Isamu’s father, because it is something that Isamu never mentioned. The Akari series is not usually connected to the subject matter of his father. Nonetheless, it might be argued that Isamu has empathized with his father’s poetry, in a manner cloaked in the love-and-

---

hate relationship he appears to have had with his father. Comparing the piece of writing “Like a Paper Lantern” and the Akari series appears a little romantic, perhaps, but might well be a symbolic example of transmitting this conception.

4. To fulfill my “heritage”

Yone Noguchi (fig.3), who found himself in the ambiguous situation of a bilingual writer, referred to himself as possessing ‘Dual Nationality’. And his son Isamu was born into dualism - with a dual citizenship practically, and as the racially mixed son of a Japanese father and a US mother.

However, the fact that he was the son of Yone Noguchi was the starting point and operative label for Isamu. When Isamu set his sights on becoming an artist, he was destined, one might say, to follow in the footsteps of his father. Isamu made the choice to call himself Noguchi. Thanks to his father’s connection, Isamu can connect with various other famous artists, such as Michio Ito, Tsuguharu Fujita, Brancusi, and others.

Isamu was awarded the John Simon Guggenheim Fellowship for travel to Paris and the East in 1927. In his proposal written in 1926, he said:

I have selected the Orient as the location for my productive activities for the reason that I feel a great attachment for it, I having spent half my life there. My father, Yone Noguchi, is Japanese and has long been known as an interpreter of the East to the West, through poetry. I wish to fulfill my heritage.⁷

It can be said that Isamu has the intention of inheriting his father’s genealogy, though with a different artistic way of expression.

Yone Noguchi wrote about the use of language in the critical essay titled Shi no Honshitsu 『詩の本質』(The Essence of Poetry) in 1926, as below:

Words are very important as an intermediation of expression, but can also be extremely dangerous. It is because the language selected is sometimes a compromise, or because it doesn’t have genuine freedom, the power of artistic construction might be broken down in order to express the philosophy and emotional feeling through the medium of explanation. From this point of view, the sculptor is much more fortunate than the literary writer, because of the minimal danger of misapprehension and misconception in expressions. The marble stone or the clump of earth for a sculptor does not weaken the power of artistic expression, unlike that of language for writer. (Translated by Hori)

言葉は表現の媒介として必要なものであるが、これ位危険なものはない。如何とならば言葉は妥協的で、眞実の自由を持たないが為め、その媒介の結果として思想感情をもる時自然に建設的力を弱める事になる。この点から見ると、文學者より彫刻家の方が遙か幸福な地位に立つてゐる。表現上の危険が少し。彫刻家が媒介物として使用する大理石にしても土塊にしても、文學者に対する言語のやうに、建設的力を薄弱ならしめるような悪戯をなさない。

---

8 This Japanese Translation is quoted from the Pamphlet: Noguchi, Isamu (2004), n.p.
9 Noguchi, Yone (1926), pp.7-8.
This book of Yone was published just when Isamu had started on his way to becoming a sculptor. It might be said that it was some form of commutative consciousness between Yone and Isamu.

Let me show you another example of Yone’s poem titled ‘Satsujinki 殺人鬼’ (The Murderer), which was written from the viewpoint of the stone carver - in other words, the viewpoint of the sculptor.

The old rock carver from the stone quarry said: ‘The Stone is alive, have a look at it ….’

‘Smooth skin and blood vessels like an animal, 
We can not compare the aesthetic symmetry of muscles, 
Yes, the human being is blind; they don’t see the bloody internal organ of the stone, 
When I boldly quarry the stone, 
it feels as if the blood cascade down from the blood vessels. 
Alas, am I demon; a murderer…. I tremble with fear. 
Perhaps a comparison to autopsy is presumptuous, 
but I kill the living tendons and boldly cut the rock like tofu 
Yet, when I pass by the mason in the city, 
I gaze at the piled up corpses of volition 
Oh Dear! Sometimes I even cover my nose from the stench. 
Yes, lucid airy skies in autumn, I confine myself to the solitary stone mountains, 
and grin. The work of this ‘murderer’ should be spectacle.’
(Translated by Hori)

「石は生きてゐる、御覧なさい……」石切場の老人夫は語る。
「動物のやうな皮膚に血管……
この筋肉の均斉美は何に譬えることが出来ない。
はい、人間は盲目だ、石の汚い臓腑を見ずに済むが、
私はかうざくりと石を切つてゆくと、
恐らく血管から血潮が瀧のやうに流れるであろう。
ああ、夜叉だ殺人鬼だ……かう思ってきよつとすることはある。
外科医の解剖に比較するのは僭越だが、
It might be said that the idea, intention, and vitality of Yone Noguchi had been handed on to Isamu and Isamu’s works. Isamu was an international artist who emerged beyond the domain where lay the ‘Danger of linguistic expression’ and ambiguity, which most concerned his father.

5. ‘In island sea’ and the plan of “the theater of the Sun” of the Seto Inland Sea

There are some other symbolic examples for looking at the artistic expression of Isamu’s father and son relationship. It involves the ‘Seto Inland Sea’. As you may know, Isamu constructed two ateliers/studios; one is located in New York on Long Island, and the other in Mure, in Kagawa-prefecture, which is located on the eastern end of the Seto Inland Sea. Why did Isamu decide upon the location of Mure on the Seto Inland Sea? Well, one reason was the quality of the stone in the ground. But there may also be another reason:

We may find the answer in Yone’s poetry, ‘In the Inland Sea’ in The Pilgrimage (1909).

Oh, here the twilight of the Inland Sea,
Here I hear a song without a word,
(Is it the song of my flying soul?)
That’s the song of my dream I dreamed a thousand years ago,
Oh, my dream of the fairy world, oh, the beauty of the Inland Sea!
(…)
O birds with white souls, steer my soul with white love,

10 ‘Satsujin-ki’, Noguchi, Yone (1938), pp.142-143.
Here the sea of my dream, Oh, the beauty of the Inland Sea!\(^{11}\)
This piece of poetry entitled ‘In the Inland Sea’ is abstract, and it is quite plain and undistinguished. However, when he translated this original English version into the Japanese version by himself later with the title ‘Seto Inland Sea’ in his *Hyōshō-Jojō-Shishū* (A Collection of the Symbolist Lyrics) in 1925, it can be said that it is a much better and more symbolic one than in English.

In this poem, the poet has fixed his eyes on a specific scene and locality, and listened to his own voice - the voice of the soul which takes flight, and then sees and listens to the ‘dream’ which goes beyond time and space. Isamu has tried to *come-and-go* between *West and East, New York inland-sea and Seto Inland Sea*, which was sung by his father in the USA and Japan. In contrast to this poem, I am led to wonder whether Isamu might have had any knowledge about the plans for ‘the theater of the Sun’ in regard to the imagery of the Seto Inland Sea.

During the War, in 1944, Michio Ito (1893-1961) formed a plan for the construction of the ‘Laboratory of Performing Arts for the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere’ as a national project, which was called ‘the plan of ‘the theater of the Sun’”(「太陽の劇場」構想). It was under the influence of the Jaques-Dalcroze Institute in German, where Michio Ito had studied in 1915 and had formulated the

---

\(^{11}\) ‘In the Inland Sea’, Noguchi, Yone (1909), pp.47-48.
\(^{12}\) ‘Seto-nai-kai’, Noguchi, Yone (1925), pp.78-79.
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plan as an Asian concept from that time. Yone Noguchi and Tsuguharu Fujita (1886-1968) were among the supporters of this idea. Michio Ito – a dancer based in USA, and Tsuguharu Fujita – an oil painter with much success in France, were friends of Yone Noguchi, and they were both father figures for Isamu from the 1920s. The background of both Ito and Fujita had similarities with that of Yone: they also debuted as Japanese artists internationally, were used as national propagandists in the War-time era, and were then criticized in the post-war period. It is not certain which part of the Seto Inland Sea is formulated in the plan of ‘the theater of the Sun’. But I wonder if Isamu knew about the plan of ‘the theater’, or whether he may have had some inspiration, which was the same way as that of his father as well as his friends.

Conclusion

After the War, Isamu read his father’s English book “Japan and America” (1921) and underlined several parts. The following passage was underlined and ‘Importance’ was written alongside it in the margins:

From somewhat cynical attitude, they even looked back longingly toward the period of spiritual insularity or many hundred years ago, when our ruling class observed the old homogeneous ethics to their advantage. The Western civilization, generally speaking, intoxicated our Japanese mind like strong drink; and as a matter of course we often found ourselves, when we awoke from that intoxication, sadder and inclined even to despise ourselves.13

13 Noguchi, Yone (1921), p.3.
It seems clear that Isamu was conscious about inheriting something of his father’s mission.

This essay did focus on the influence of Yone’s symbolic poetry around the subject of Isamu, and consider the artistic and spiritual lineage between father and son, with special focus on the post-war period. This will concern the capacity for the artistic connection between father and son, citing some of Yone’s poems and writings. Yone Noguchi was sidelined as a poet in the post-war period. However, his father’s existence should have been quite decisive for Isamu who decided to live in solitude with art. Isamu’s artistic spirit and his strength and solitude as a citizen of the world, were, in some senses, handed down from his father.

Madoka Hori
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Avant-garde Debates over Japanese Tradition in the 1950’s with a Focus on the Role of Isamu Noguchi

Gen Adachi

Introduction

How do traditional practices become avant-garde? How are feelings of nationalism represented as a form of internationalism? In the 1950’s post-War Japanese avant-garde art scene, behind its rapid internationalization, most avant-garde artists were concerned with the ‘Japanese tradition’. This paper seeks to identify the significance of the way a Japanese cultural aspect is used by post-War avant-garde artists of Japan. The paper will also argue that the debates over Japanese tradition have the following three features.

First, it was a globally minded nationalism. It began with the works and approaches of Japanese-American Isamu Noguchi as he reinterpreted Japanese traditions and reconstructed the framework for Modern art. Shortly thereafter, it became a common theme for almost all avant-garde artists.

Second, the development of the ‘Debates over Japanese tradition’ throughout the 1950’s was more than just deciding whether to agree with Noguchi’s methods or not. It led to a larger re-evaluation that included reconsidering Japanese cultural heritage and institutions of fine art.

Third, from a viewpoint of the social context of the times, we must acknowledge the tensions of the Cold War in the background of the debates over Japanese tradition. In other words, one of the reasons for the pin-pointing of Japanese tradition was a desire to break away from the communist ideology.

The phrase “Debates over Japanese tradition (伝統論争)” has been
used to point out controversies that occurred in the field of Japanese architecture circa 1955 to 1958. More specifically, it refers to the debates initiated by Tange Kenzo and Shirai Seiichi.\(^1\) However, this phrase has not been used in Japanese art history, and thus I will argue that these “debates over Japanese tradition” were also a central theme in Japanese art history at much the same time as in the history of architecture. So in this paper, I will apply the architectural term “Debates over Japanese Tradition” to post-War Japanese art. Also, I will analyze the too often hidden relationship between avant-garde art and architecture.

For this purpose, I will discuss the impact and role of the Japanese-American artist, Isamu Noguchi, on the way art is considered within the concept of fine art.\(^2\)

### Preceding Incidents

Here, I would like to refer to the historical incidents that preceded the debates over Japanese tradition that occurred in the 1950’s. From 1945 to 1946, there were debates over War-time paintings (戦争画論争), which brought artists’ responsibility for their works to the forefront.\(^3\) But the

---

\(^1\) Debates over tradition in Architecture have been discussed in the following documents.
Funo Shuji ‘Architecture as movement.’(「運動としての建築—昭和建築についての覚書」)Funo Shuji’s essays on Architecture.(『布野修司建築論集 国家・様式・テクノロジー—建築の昭和一』) Shokoku-sha. 1998
Fujioka Yosuke ed. ‘Turbulent of architecture journalism.’ (「激動の建築ジャーナリズム 50’s ～ 70’s から語る」) Kenchiku Journal. (『建築ジャーナル』) May, 1995

\(^2\) On Noguchi, this paper owes to the following documents:
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. debates ended because the General Headquarters of the Allied Forces (i.e. GHQ) did not want to punish those artists. Then, from approximately 1946 to 1950, debates over realism occurred in Japan. At this time, artists and critics argued about how to depict reality after the War-time paintings, and questioned how to position Surrealist painting in the Japanese avant-garde.

These two debates encouraged the almost diminished War-time Japanese avant-garde into a flourishing period. I would like to argue that these two debates foreshadowed the debates over Japanese Tradition, which is the main theme of this paper. Lastly, we must pay attention to the socialist undercurrents. First of all, there was a dominant censorship put in place by the GHQ from 1945 to 1949 that prevented people from speaking out publicly. In that time, people were not allowed to evaluate Japanese traditions because the GHQ thought that ‘tradition’ would conjure a remembrance of the fanatic culture of World War II. The debates over Japanese tradition were, of course, contrary to the censorship. Besides, there was, at that time, a strong Communist influence from Soviet Russia and consequently post-War art could be more appropriately deemed “Cold War Art.”

Noguchi’s Thoughts and Works

Isamu Noguchi was a Japanese-American sculptor and designer, born in Los Angeles in 1904. He was active worldwide, including Japan, and died in New York in 1988. His father was the poet Noguchi Yonejiro and his mother was an American teacher. In his early career, he was influenced by the Romanian artist Constantin Brancusi, and became well known for his abstract sculptures. He soon left this Brancusi-esque style, and in 1949, after

---

4 Eto Jun. Enclosed Space of Language. (『閉ざされた言語空間』) Bungei-Shunju. 1994
receiving a grant for studying environments of leisure, he made a great trip around the world. He came to Japan in May 1950 at the end of his trip.

During Noguchi’s visit to Japan in 1950, newspapers and magazines watched his movement constantly and asked for his comments. This is because he was already established in the American art scene and Japanese artists wanted him to teach them about the latest Modern Art of America. As is well known, he taught them the greatness of Japanese traditions. And in 1951, he married the famous actress Yamaguchi Yoshiko. With that, he got the attention of the Japanese public beyond the art world.

Noguchi made a presentation early after his arrival in Japan about the relationship of art and social community. In a way, he was strongly interested in art serving society, showing his affinity with Communism and Marxism. Before arriving in Japan, he had seen many ancient monuments and ruins; so he argued for the reinforcement of a connection between art and society. In other words, his argument was an anti-modern revolutionary thought which harkens back to a pre-modern approach that believes in the power of art. During his trip to Japan, Noguchi discovered the themes of Japanese Tradition and thus broke away from Marxist-like community thinking on art.

When Noguchi argued for a re-evaluation of the Japanese tradition, Japanese avant-garde artists wholeheartedly praised it, but at the same time they were suspicious. Let us first examine how Noguchi looked at Japanese traditions. While Noguchi himself did not clearly articulate his thoughts, his friend, artist Hasegawa Saburo, recorded Noguchi’s views in detail. In addition, Noguchi took many photos in Japan which are the key to understanding his thoughts and observations.

To summarize Noguchi’s thoughts on Japanese tradition: he praised

---

Hasegawa Saburo. ‘Noguchi and Japan’ (「ノグチ・日本」) Bijutsu Techo. August, 1950
Hasegawa Saburo. ‘Days with Isamu Noguchi’ (「イサム・ノグチとの日々」) San-sai. July – August, 1950
Zen Art, but denounced Buddhist sculpture. It may seem curious that such a sculptor was not interested in Buddhist sculpture. But he was more interested in the surrounding architecture and environment than the statue or the sculpture itself.

Noguchi appreciated Zen gardens and its rocks. He struggled to make a site or environment the center of art works; he also had a strong affinity for ancient Japanese culture, for example *haniwa*, or clay dolls from the Kofun period. His approach was to get back to ancient artistic views and to reconstruct them in contemporary ways; in that way, he was trying to overcome the framework of modern Western sculpture.

Let us now analyze some of Noguchi’s sculptural works, public art, terracotta, and product designs from the 1950’s in Japan. The work “Mu”, or Nothingness (fig.1), was made in 1950. It is a self-standing sculpture without a pedestal. The shape is based on the design of a Japanese garden lantern. The title “Mu” suggests the Zen painting of a circle. In addition to this sculpture, he made “Interior decoration” (fig. 2) for the Banraisha.

---

8 Some of Noguchi’s photographs were published. But the Noguchi Museum in New York has hundreds of unpublished photographs taken by Noguchi in the early 1950s in Japan.

Isamu Noguchi. ‘From my camera.’ (「私のカメラから」) *Bijutsu Techo.* (『美術手帖』) September, 1950

building at Keio University where his father had taught for a long time. In this interior environment, elements of the East and the West were made to co-exist, as can be seen in the use of the so-to-speak floor space, or the space for chairs.

As for public art, Noguchi designed two bridges (fig. 3 & 4) built at the Hiroshima Peace Center in 1952. Tange Kenzo, the architect of the Hiroshima Peace Center asked Noguchi to make the bridge as a monument for the victims of the atomic bomb, although it was never realized. The bridges were originally named, “Creating” and “Passing.” The shape of the parapet is like a ship carrying the souls of the dead. At the time, Noguchi’s desire to express Japanese mythical motifs in large-sized structures affected Tange deeply.

Noguchi made terracotta works in the 1930’s for one year and also
from 1950 to 1952 while staying in Japan. In 1952, Noguchi lived with Kitaoji-Rosanjin who was a traditional art director. In the works, “Curtain in dream”, and “Cat”, we can see evidence for how he enjoyed creating spontaneous forms akin to the works of the Surrealists (fig. 5. 6).

In 1951, Noguchi was inspired by Japanese paper lanterns and made “Akari” (fig. 7), a paper lantern made into an abstract shape. For Noguchi, it was a sculpture of light and a symbol of the integration of art and life. Today, “Akari” is counted as one of the best designs in the 20th century, but in those days there were criticisms of this work for its quality and the way it utilized something Japanese.

Acceptance of Noguchi

Noguchi’s works and comments made a sensation in the media in Japan during the early 1950’s. In fact, there were mixed feelings behind all the hype. We can classify three noticeable reactions to his work at the time: empathy, doubt, and criticism.

As for empathy, Noguchi’s attitude of rethinking Japanese tradition was praised. An extreme example includes the painter, Inokuma Gen’ichiro, who said, “Noguchi’s works fit exactly with our Japanese mind,” and “they clearly showed our road towards internationalization.” Noguchi was an icon of representing complicated Japanese mind: not only the envious attitude towards American culture but also the praise for Japanese culture that was tinted with an anti-American sentiment.

As for doubt and criticism, there were many voices that said Noguchi’s

---

use of Japanese tradition made Japanese people uncomfortable. As I will explore later, artists like Tange Kenzo and Okamoto Taro, wanted to make a stronger image of Japan than Noguchi. As an example of extreme criticism, the architect Yoshida Isoya said, “Noguchi’s Akari was made because he was a foreigner.”11 Moreover, it is well known that Noguchi’s design for the monument for victims of the atomic bomb was rejected because he was American. Those doubts and criticism included hostility towards America and the refutation of a foreigner’s understanding of Japanese traditions.

However, whether they were in favor of Noguchi or not, almost all avant-garde artists and architects were compelled to think about Japanese tradition in early 1950 because of Noguchi’s presence. In those days, the debates led to no single conclusion. But those new ideas formulated by artists regarding Japanese tradition created something new which led to considerable changes in the institutions of art. An illustration of a few examples of the many artists who were influenced by Isamu Noguchi in the 1950’s will prove this claim.

The painter Hasegawa Saburo had been thinking about the possibility of Japanese tradition in connection with Western Modernism since the War-time. In 1950, he travelled with Noguchi. Hasegawa guided Noguchi to the Kansai area and showed him Haniwa in the National Museum. Hasegawa had the intention of giving some positive impact on Noguchi’s view of Japanese tradition. In that context, the pair of Hasegawa and Noguchi were inspired by the Japanese traditional sculpture, and thus contributed to the debates over the Japanese tradition that were occurring at the time.

Hasegawa was at first a student of Japanese art history studying Sesshu and then became a painter. As he was a scholar and an artist, he argued that artists should have a deep spiritual nature rather than just technical drawing skills. Such an attitude was common in the pre-modern East Asia and he thought it was also common in contemporary Western avant-garde

---

Avant-garde Debates over Japanese Tradition

Hasegawa was so deeply influenced by Noguchi that he changed his style of painting from Surrealism to abstraction (fig. 8). He also changed his lifestyle. Not only Hasegawa but also Inokuma Gen’-ichiro and Abe Nobuya were influenced by Noguchi, thereby gaining confidence to use Japanese tradition as a powerful source for catching up on contemporary western painting. They went abroad: while Hasegawa died in San Francisco, Abe Nobuya stayed in Italy. Inokuma was in New York and Hawaii. They did not necessarily succeed in their new countries, but what was important was that Noguchi’s transcendence of globally minded nationalism affected veteran artists and led them to rewrite the existing geographical framework of Japanese art.

The world of sculptors in Japan during the time was dominated by the appreciation for Mario Marini of Italy and Henri Moore of England. In such a scenario, Noguchi’s thought on sites and environments could not be accepted in the Japanese sculpture world. But if we take the avant-garde flower arrangement artist, Teshigawara Sofu, as part of the history of Japanese sculpture, we may recognize that Noguchi and Teshigawara changed the Japanese view of “sculpture” that had begun in the Meiji period. This can be seen in the work, “Kyozo,” or virtual image, done by Teshigawara in 1951 (fig. 9). Using a living tree, Teshigawara cut the center into two parts, thus changing not only the tree itself but also the space in between the wood and its surroundings. In that style, it relates to Noguchi’s work, Nothingness. Furthermore, we can see that in Japan the

Fig. 8 Hasegawa Saburo, At aquarium (水族館にて) 1955

---


The genre of installation did not come from the world of sculpture, but rather has its origins in traditional culture, such as ikebana.

The next example is that of the ceramic artist, Yagi Kazuo, who wanted to become free from Japanese sentimentalism such as Wabi-sabi. When he encountered Noguchi’s terracotta, he found a concrete method for obtaining this freedom. He did the work, “Outing of Mr. Samsa” (fig. 10) in 1954 and began making Obje-Yaki, or Object wares. Although his views on ceramics were different from Noguchi’s views on pottery, both of them viewed ancient pottery as indivisible from sculpture. Such an imaginary pottery as inseparable from sculpture came from a text written by the critic Takiguchi Shuzo about Noguchi’s work.

Ken-mochi Isamu, an industrial designer, also wanted to find a way to use Japanese tradition in modern design. Then he came upon Noguchi’s “Akari” lantern and was astonished: he felt that Japanese designers were searching for a blue bird, or the great resource, outside the Japanese tradition. He praised Noguchi’s works highly; at the same time, he might have understood how difficult

---

16 Ken-mochi Isamu. “Thoughts on Noguchi’s Akari.” Bijutsu Techo. September, 1956
it was for Japanese designers not to be merely Oriental in taste, but also to be international in their design. Subsequently, Ken-mochi became internationally renowned for the work lounge chair (fig. 11) in 1961, but he killed himself in 1971.

The next example is Tange Kenzo, an architect, who designed the Hiroshima Peace Center (fig. 12), built in 1955. Inside the Peace Park, Tange also designed the *Monument for the victims of the Atomic bomb* (fig. 13) which reflected Noguchi’s influence in using haniwa, or ancient ceramic doll houses. Tange often said that through his collaboration with Noguchi in the early 1950’s, he derived considerable confidence which enabled him to express elements of modernism in relation to Japanese tradition after his War-time works.\(^{17}\) Noguchi’s reinterpretation of the Japanese tradition was not something new. In fact, it had existed before, or at least it had been brought to the forefront in Japan by people such as Tange.

\(^{17}\) Tange Kenzo. “Open space for 50,000 people: finishing Hiroshima peace center.” (『五万人の広場 広島ピースセンター完成まで』) *Geijutsu Shincho*. January, 1956
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fig.11 Kenmochi Isamu, Lounge Chair 1960

fig.12 Tange Kenzo, Hiroshima Peace Center (広島平和記念講演) 1955

fig.13 Tange Kenzo, Monument for the victims of the Atomic bomb (原爆慰霊碑) 1955
Tange wrote an article titled “How to understand modern architecture in Current Japan: For creating a new tradition” in January 1955 where he commented on the architectural debates in the field. In Tange’s article, there were clear signs of Noguchi’s influence in his evaluation of the Japanese tradition. In that way, the debates over the Japanese tradition originated from Noguchi’s presence and effects. In that context, it can be said that the art scene had a direct impact on the architectural scene.

However, during the mid-1950’s a shift occurred. Tange Kenzo distanced himself from Noguchi and collaborated with Okamoto Taro. Tange seemed to be uncomfortable with Noguchi. What Tange wanted was for the Japanese tradition to gain the strength to compete internationally. Meanwhile, Noguchi pursued the fragility, which could be found in the Japanese tradition, in order to overcome Modern Art as it existed in America. Then Tange gradually changed to support Okamoto’s opinion on Japanese tradition, for example considering Jomon pottery as powerful art. It was symbolic of the change that in 1957, “Tokyo metropolitan government office building” (fig. 14) was decorated with Okamoto’s “Wall of sun” (fig. 15), and not with Noguchi’s work. Therefore, in the field of architecture, the debates over the Japanese tradition that had begun by

---


---
Noguchi’s influence, subsequently shifted to Okamoto’s influence.

The last example is Okamoto Taro, an artist, who criticized Noguchi for his aristocratic manner and lack of native strength.\(^{21}\) Okamoto worked as an avant-garde artist in France for a time. So he was the only one who could criticize Noguchi without being nationalistic. After that criticism, Okamoto began to criticize almost all of Noguchi’s re-evaluations of the Japanese tradition. It might have been on purpose, although there was no clear evidence of this. In particular, Okamoto denied what Noguchi and Hasegawa praised: for example, Bunjinga-style painting of Tomioka Tessai, Zen painting of Sesshu, Okakura Tenshin who struggled to protect national cultural treasures, the fragility in Katsura-rikyu, and so on. Okamoto called such things and persons inauthentic or labeled them as not art.\(^{22}\) Then, in 1952, Okamoto wrote about Jomon pottery and compared it with Yayoi pottery.\(^{23}\) He also argued that there was a fresh and strong Japanese tradition in Jomon pottery. It was natural that Tange changed from Noguchi’s view of tradition to Okamoto’s. As such, being a talented writer, Okamoto took over the central position from Noguchi in the debates over the Japanese tradition when Noguchi left Japan after the mid-1950’s.


\(^{23}\) Okamoto. *op. cit.* “Jomon pottery: National power of life.”
Noguchi and Okamoto may appear as rivals in discursive debates over the Japanese tradition. But, as a matter of fact, they both shared the same idea, namely that one could choose any tradition in any place and at any time for artistic inspiration.\footnote{Isamu Noguchi. “Mr. Isamu Noguchi: A conversation with Japanese avant-gardists.” \textit{Atelier}. August, 1950
Okamoto Taro. “New development of theory of tradition: Past of Infinity and enclosed presence” \textit{Bungaku no hiroba}. April, 1959
}
The picture, taken some time in 1952, of Noguchi and Okamoto relaxing in Rosanjin’s house shows their underlying closeness and camaraderie (fig. 16). In that context, they set a precedent for not needing to be engaged with the Japanese tradition in the ordinary sense, but rather artists can make new traditions on their own.

\textbf{Social Background and Conclusion}

There were several backdrops for the debates over the Japanese tradition in the 1950’s. An often overlooked aspect was the social context. In the art world of the 1950’s, there were objections to Nihon Bijutsu kai, or the Japanese Art Association, which were supported by the Japan Communist Party that argued for socialist realism.\footnote{On another front, at that time, many avant-garde artists, including Noguchi and Okamoto, were attracted to Communism but were disappointed with socialist realism.\footnote{Ilya Ehrenburg (round-table talk with Hongo Arata, Okamot Taro and et al.) “Conversation with Japanese artists.” (「日本の美術家と語る」) Geijutsu Shincho. June, 1957
}}
It is reasonable to suppose that they chose Japanese traditions over the Communist ideology. While these debates arose in circumstances marked by instability, the political and economic stabilization that occurred in the late 1950’s gradually contributed to the fading of the debates on the Japanese tradition.

This paper has analyzed the avant-garde debates over the Japanese tradition in the 1950’s by focusing on the works and discourses of Noguchi Isamu, and other artists who were influenced or inspired by Noguchi. Keeping this in mind, I have made the following three points regarding the debates over the Japanese tradition:

First, they include a change in the way of making art, from materials and objects toward sites or environments.

Secondly, they began with Noguchi’s arrival in Japan during 1950s, an event that influenced the boundary of art genres, and then shifted to Tange and Okamoto by the mid-1950s.

Third, they were based in circumstances characterized by instability, beyond globally minded nationalism, and became an opportunity for the avant-garde to break away from the Communist ideology. In other words, the Japanese avant-garde needed traditional inspiration in order to gain a new freedom.
A Brief Assessment of the XIX\textsuperscript{th} Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association in Seoul (2010)
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韓国に比較文学の「辺境」を踏査する
— 国際比較文学会 第十九回ソウル大会
（Aug.15-21, 2010）報告と反省

稲賀繁美（ICLA 理事）

賢人たちの叡智
人類の叡智を集約し、地球の将来への指針をしめすことには、比較文学の使命があり、その名を冠した国際学会をソウルで開催することの意義がある。こう真っ向から狭間を切って、満場の聴衆を納得させるだけの実力者は、いまや世界中を探しても希だろう。韓国言論界になお大きな影響力を発揮し続ける李御寧教授が、大会冒頭の全体講演で口火を切り、この大役を見事に演じ切った。体調不良を押しての登壇だったが、口を開くや独特の才気発現たちまち全開となって会場を圧倒した。ソロモン王は赤字の所有権を巡って争った女性二人に対して、赤子をふたつに割いて分け与えるという判決を示して、それに同意しない女性を真の母親と見定めた智恵に満たす。だがそれより貴重なソロモン王の智恵は、それを求めて東方のエチオピアからシバの女王がわざわざ訪問したという事実、すなわち分割による判定ではなく加算による総合にあるのではないか。など意表を突く洞察に溢れた講演だったが、それを無理矢理一言で要約しよう。

殖民記述学者は、現今の知識世界におけるデータ万能主義に警鐘を鳴らし、知識社会の限界を指摘し、将来の方向を提示する。曰く、データは情報へと加工されれば無意味であり、情報は知識の基礎にしか過ぎず、知識も集積だけでは知的貢献の材料に過ぎないのであって、人類の課題は知識社会の確立といえ、いかにして叡智を養うかにある、と。その論旨を肉付けするために古代の哲学者、神学者から T.S. エリオット、さらに昨年物故したクロード・レヴィ＝ストロース『今日のトーテミズム』(Penguin 版 p.171) までが自由に引用される。如何せんそのあまりの雄弁卓越に、通訳が途中からはとてもついて行けず、韓国語不如意な聴衆には、なにか法外な叡智がいるという印象ばかりが放たれたに留まっていたのは残念だった。とはいえ英検的一刻も早い公刊を望む声が多くの聴衆から聞かれた。小冊子や電子配信のご一読をお勧めしてやまない。
いささか定型を無視して、無前提なままに報告を開始した。だがそれは意図してのことである。76歳を迎えた、元・初代文化大臣、李御寧氏を戴く韓国の知力と組織力が見事に発揮されたのが、今回のソウルにおける第十九回・国際比較文学会だったといってよいだろう。日本からの参加としては、自らworkshopを立ち上げ、常ながら自らの発表で範を垂れた芳賀徹名誉教授の発表が、また見事だった。こちらは当年80歳、20年前の東京大会の実行委員長だが、その実力は若手や中堅を遙かに凌駕した。大正の夢と潰えた理想郷の探求を武者小路実篤(1885-1976)の「新しき村」に見据え、それが中国の魯迅・周作人兄弟や韓国の詩人、呉相淳(1894-1963)らに伝播し、はては若き日の毛沢東(1893-1976)の「学生之工作」(1919)にまで影を落としていた様を活写した。英文の細部まで神経が行き届き、ひとつひとつの文字が立ち上がりつつ、全体の論旨が一辺倒に打ち寄せる波のように迫ってくる。これら最良の報告を英文で編集し、日本語へも翻訳して江湖に問えば、21世紀の今日にも、それなりの社会的反響を期待でき、また東アジアの今日的意義を再確認し、将来への活路を拓くうえでも益するところがあるに違いない。だがそうした企画を刊行し、社会に着実に還元する術を、今日学術は急速に喪失している。芳賀・元副会長は、学会最後の別れの祝宴でも、韓国大会の成就を言及して一服の祝辞を述べ、それは韓国と日本との事情に通じない欧米の聴衆にも、大きな感銘を与えたと、人づてに伝聞した。先人たちの努力と智恵を将来へと発展継承するための工夫が、今それだけに一層、要求されている。

大正文化史の脱国籍性と国際性

大規模学習の常として、個人で聴取できる発表の数は、著しく限定される。そのことは前提としたうえで、報告者が見聞したかぎりの発表から、将来への幾つかのピースを示しておきたい。

第一に東アジア近代の経験を韓・中・日の国境をとっぱらって総合的に検討する必要は、今更繰り返すまでもないが、これを実行に移すことができる話は別だろう。芳賀ワークショップでは、平石典子氏がエレン・ケイ(1849-1926)の日本で受容(戸張竹風、千基子水、金塚雷風、木間久雄、申川白村経由)を、韓国の金明渓、羅惠錫、金元元、中国の茅盾、陳望道などにまで拡げて要領よく発表したが、各論をさらに発展させるためには、国際的な共同研究が不可欠となることだろう。また鈴木楴宏氏の発表も明らかにしたように、1918年成立の「新しき村」はタゴールのシャンチニケトンに於ける学校経営とも呼応しているが、そのタゴールは英国デイヴィンのダーティトンの陶芸共同体に感化を受けており、やがて柳宗悦はそ
国際比較の観点から、日本の漢学の発展とその歴史を考察するため、本研究では、1920年代の日本の漢学者の活動を例として、漢学の発展とその歴史を考察する。この時期の日本における漢学の発展は、欧米の漢学者の研究活動に大きく影響され、特に、1920年代には、日本の漢学者の研究活動が活発化し、漢文の研究に多くの注目が集まっていた。

さらに、1920年代の日本の漢学者の活動は、欧米の漢学者の研究活動に大きく影響され、特に、1920年代には、日本の漢学者の研究活動が活発化し、漢文の研究に多くの注目が集まっていた。
う入試科目が幅を効かせてゆく。経学を包括していた「漢文学」の教養は、「支那文学」が支那思想から分離されるに従って、否応なく変質を被っていった。この経緯に照らしてみれば、従来の「支那」＝中国慶視といった先入観を時代錯誤に逆投影するかごとき誤見は、今後確実に根拠を失ってゆくだろう。英・日両語に着実な学力を示す陸胤氏の発表は、新世代の可能性を如実に実感させるに足るものだった。だがその周到なる英語発表に、日本の思想史学会や中国文学会、あるいは中国哲学研究者集団はきちんと応答できるのだろうか。少なくとも国際比較文学会という舞台には、陸胤氏の研究に対論できる思想史関係専門家は出席していなかった。果たして英語を作業言語とする近代東洋思想研究という場は、中・韓・日の枠を越えて成立するのか否か。

プロレタリア文学史研究、共栄園哲学と越境性

研究対象領域が国境を跨いでいるからといって、現在の研究者集団がそれに対応できる組織を確立しているとは限らない。「アジア文学への新たな視座 (2)」と題されたフォーラムは、1940年代の日本占領期の半島作家における東アジア文学構想、朝鮮と日本におけるアジア言説、ポルシェヴィッキ運動を中心とした近代の超克を巡るプロレタリア文学の脱植民化への奮闘、さらに日本併合期の韓国における文学の出版と検閲と、魅力的な話題を満載した部会だった。だが会場に足を運んでみると、発表者の多くが英語不如意なため、原則として韓国語で発表する、という。全員のペイバーの英訳が配布されていたが、残念ながら、辛うじて意味が拾える水準だった。教室には文芸評論家の金禹昌教授や、大会準備期の韓国比較文学会会長を務めた李応奭氏も出席して質疑に加わった。質疑には英訳がつくるとの触れ込みだったが、遺憾ながら実際には不完全にしか機能しない。漢民眾 Han Man-su 教授が挙った検閲の問題から述べるならば、同時代の日本や満洲国での検閲状況とその時代的変化を踏まえない一般論は危険かつ不十分だろう。また検閲の形式的分類にとどまり、具体的内容の検討を等閑にした処理にも批判があった。私見を述べるならば、折から光化門の復修が成り、「日韓併合」百周年の記念行事が行われたところだが、柳宗悦が「改造」に掲載した光化門保存の訴えがいかなる検閲を蒙り、いかに削除だらけの物語で刊行されたか、といった事実は知っておかなければ、半島で検閲の程度も評定できない。さらに三十年代に入っても、例えば関東軍の大連のほうが、内地よりも検閲が緩やかだった証拠もある。

このように問題の解析に限界もあったが、多くの発表は、「内地」日本の専門家の常識を問い直すうえでも貴重だった。近衛内閣下の東亜新秩序 (1938) 宣言
に対して半島内の知識人たちも反応しているが、こうした経緯は、韓国史や思想を専攻する日本の一部の専門家に知られているだけでよいのだろうか。韓国が中国と日本の媒介を果たすべきとの議論を進めた金明植、韓国を日本へと溶け込むのではなく、別途の実体として「内外一体」の理念を換骨奪胎しようとした仁貞植、中国大陸の改造を必至としつつ日本にあらたな普遍性を要求した崔載貞。これら「三千理」の同人と、「人文評論」では満洲国の実験に民族協和の理念と土着の国民主義との合体の夢を託した崔載瑞、東亜共同体に数国民の内面的自己調整機能を期待した朴致祐などが知られる。

尹大石 Yun Daeseok 教授の分析を借りるなら、政治的圧の危険を背負ったうえでのこうした微妙な議論の背後には、一方には朝鮮文化を抹消して日本への完全な同化を是とする総旗達成の玄永俊や李永根の主張もあり、反対に半島の伝統を維持したうえでの統合を訴える「国民文学」の立場もある。これらの主義主義の誤解と対立のなかに具体的な文学作品も紡ぎ出される。韓雪野 Han Seol-ya, 金史良 Kim Sa-ryang, 李孝石 Lee Hyoseok, 金延漢 Kim Yeonhan さらには崔載瑞 Choi Jaeseo の足跡を、韓国文学の問題であって日本文学とは無関係とする、敗戦後の文学史の枠組みも視野狭隘なら、反対にかれらを現時点の韓国における価値判断から裁断し、愛国者か親日売国奴かの弁別を下し、歴史上の人物の犯罪性を言い募ることも、歴史的現実への理解を促進することには繋がるまい。（なおこの点については、林志弦「朝鮮半島の民族主義と権力の言説」『現代思想』(2000年6月、板垣竜太訳) が、従来の禁忌に踏み込んで、民族主義言説の権力性を大胆に裁断している）。

三木清を介して西田幾多郎の影響を受けた韓国の理論家としては、Son Jeong-soo 教授が「世界史的にみた現在の意味」(1939) の著者、徐寅植 Seo In-Shik の場合を検討した。彼の歴史哲学については『思想』誌上で趙寬子による論考「徐寅植の歴史哲学－世界史の不可能性と「私の運命」」がある (957号2004年1月)。

また河内日 Ha Jeong-il 教授は NAPF(Nippona Artista Proleta Federatio) と並ぶ KAPF (Korea Artist Proleta Federatio) における国際主義と党派主義との対立を評価し、梁柱東 Yang Joo-dong の批判に対抗してプロレタリア文学の社会主義的レアリズムを訴えた林和 Lim Hwa の事績を分析した。祖国解放と朝鮮革命はプロレタリアによる世界革命の一環をなすのか、それならば韓国は日本のプロレタリアと結団すべきなのか、反対に韓国の前衛文学運動は日本の NAPF のボルシェヴィズムの流れであってよいのか、などの論争がプロレタリア前衛のなかで発生した。いまその詳細と歴史的展開に踏み込む余裕はないが、この領域でも日本と韓国の研究者の知的交流が必要なことは、明らかだろう。日本のプロレ
タリア文学史への側面からの見直しを迫る事例だからである。当時の韓半島の前衛作家たちと日本人作家たちとは、どの程度の交流があったのか。韓国の京都学派哲学者たちは内地留学者だったのか、それとも書籍を通じて知識を得ていたのか。そうした基礎的な常識すら持ってない我が身の無知に身を摘まされる経験であった。だが日本の韓国近代文学研究者がここにまったく出席していないのはどうしたことか。

フランス派少数者文学研究の孤立

「多文化社会における少数者文学」(WS23) と題するフランス語によるセッションにも顔を出してみた。論者はいずれも見事なフランス語を使い博士号取得者ばかり。サン・ジョン・ペレスや博士論文を書いた Jin Jonghwa 教授がイヌイットを扱ったフランス語圏カナダ作家 Yves Thériault を紹介し、ポール・ヴェルレーヌ博士論文の Lee Ji-soon 教授がドイツ移民のカナダ人作家 Régine Robin の社会的発言を検討する。マルグリット・デュラスで博士論文の Lee Ka-Ya 教授がカリブ海出身の Maryse Condé を紹介する。Maurice Blanchot による Kafka を論じた Park Kyou-hyun 教授に続き、アルチュール・ランボーで博士論文の Shin Ok-keun 教授が、韓国文学における多文化的他者性の現在を論じた。司会は韓国で教鞭を執る Antoine Coppola と充実。

日本では、先に触れた宮澤賢治研究の西成彦氏が、1970 年代末からのジル・ドゥルーズ研究を踏み台に、カフカのみならず、ボーランド文学でゴンプローヴィチやヴィクト・カー・ヴィチに手を伸ばし、さらにはラフカディオ・ハーンを切っ掛けに、マルチニックのクレールも含めて「移動文学論」を縦横に展開して、みずから extraterritorial を実践する実際性も見世事である（ちなみに、マリーズ・コンデは八雲獲後百周年に日本に招かれたが、このセッションの発表者で小泉八雲を知っている研究者はひとりも居なかった）。西氏の「移動」ぶりは、あくまでフランスの伝統に忠実に、個人作家の研究者として博士号を取得した韓国勢とは好対照である。だが日本でケベック仏語圏文学研究者といえば、わずかに小緻精和氏があるだけなのに、韓国ではどうしてこれだけ研究者の層が厚いのだろうか。唯一の闇入者の特権として質問してみると、コリアン・ディアスポラと韓国社会の多文化主義の反映として、ケベックの少数者文学への関心が高まっているのだろう。

カフカを頼りにドゥルーズが提唱した概念である écriture mineure を無批判に援用する発表が多かったため、試しに四方田父母提唱のマラーノ文学という分析装置を紹介してみた。スペインのユダヤ人改宗者たちはマラーノ（豚）と蔑まれたが、奇しくも、韓国ではチョッパリすなわち豚の豚が、日本人の下駄を連
想させるところから、偽装語として通用してきた。いわば在日韓国・朝鮮文学の担い手は、マラーノ文学としての被差別性を背負っており、改宗を強いられればこそより忠実にして日帝の過激な手先となり、あるいは日帝支配下で密かに二枚舌を使って韓国の文学的伝統の灯火を保とうとしながら、光復後には同胞から親目の汚名を着せられることもなかった。ここにはドゥルーズの概念を越えて韓国的事例を分析するのに適したモデルがあるのではないか。この問いかけに韓国側からは積極的な反応があった。だが、もっぱらフランス語を専門とする研究者集団であったためか、在日日本語文学は自分たちの領域外なので、という構えだった。

充実した発表にも関わらず、このセッションの聴衆は、筆者ただひとり。大会に参加しているフランス語圏研究者には、フランス語圏島嶼文学やクレオール文学の専門家もあるのに、誰ひとりこのセッションには現れない。発表者たちはいずれもフランス留学組だが、元来、仏文学を専攻していたためだろうか、パリの比較文学者たちの名前は知っているものの、直接の接触はしないのだという。国際比較文学会のなかすでにフランス語勢は少数派としてゲットー化しているが、そのなかで少数派文学への関心が、またさらなる縦割りの閉域を作っている。フランス語圏の研究者と韓国人研究者とのあいだの、せっかくの交流の機会がまったく生かされておらず、いささか残念だ。ICLAも大規模になり、欧米のみならずアジア・アフリカを取り込んだのは好いが、大規模な国際会議の通弊、機能不全を起こしていて、その本来の目的を達成していない。

もっとも顧みれば、韓国のみならず日本でもフランス文学専門家は、概して比較文学者に対しては不快そうな目差しを向け、その業績もハナから無視する傾向が否定できない。思えば 1994 年にタヒチで ICLA 理事会が開かれたときの学会では、招聘されていた、カリブ海・フレンチ・クレオールの旗手、パトリック・シャモワザーとエドゥアルド・クリッサンのおふたりが、残念も残念で、旧植民地帝国の首都・パリでの所用を口実にしてオフにし、筆者は急遽彼らの話を聞き、講演を仰せ付かった経験がある。またカナダ在住のユダヤ系作家、ナイム・カタンやコロンビア大学で比較文学者として教鞭を執るガヤトリ・スピヴァックも招かれていた。アラブ圏出身フランス語圏文学者の集いが、パリのアフリカ・オセアニア美術館講堂（当時、元来は植民地美術館で、今世紀以降、フランス移民博物館へと改装）で開かれ、招待されたことがある。その席では鶴飼哲が「在日」やアイヌの事例を見事に論じたが、まったく相手にされなかった。少数派を任ずるフランス語圏知識人のバリ中心事大主義。その通弊が、今回もまた、ソウルで反復されていた。
東アジア発信の「脱 - 植民地理論」の可能性

一時期の欧米産「理論」全盛時代は、急速に過去の記憶となりつつある。だが、それに代わるあらたな展望が開けてきたわけではない。そもそも代替の「展望」など、今後の人文学に期待できるのだろうか。そんな過渡期の風景のなかで、将来への希望を抱かせる発表にいくつか接した。

ひとつは通常セッションだが、前島志保氏が20世紀初頭の世紀転換期にかけたの婦人誌の成立と発展を国際比較した。英国のDaily Mailや米国のDaily Mirrorが写真掲載により新聞紙面を一新したのと相前後して婦人誌が公刊され、日本でも「婦人世界」(1906)、「婦女界」(1910)が登場する。ところがおもしろいことに、英米では婦人誌の購読者層が女性読者に限定されていたのに対し、日本では佐藤卓己も論ずるように、30年代『主婦の友』や『婦人倶楽部』は欧米同様ミリオネラへと脱皮したが、その購読者層が違っていた。隆盛の背景には就学率の顕著な向上などもあるが、本田和恵の研究に見られる概念枠を援用するなら、英米では国内/公共の区別が女性/男性のジェンダーの区別に密接に反映する傾向が著しく、男性たるもの女性誌を読むなど、 Symphony 来ない。ところが日本の平/私感覚では、女性誌は home magazine の地位を獲得し、亭主や下宿男子学生こそが、その熱心な購読者となった、という。

ここからはいくつか重要な結論が導かれる。まず婦人誌の発展は、日本列島に限定される現象ではない。寄稿欄や懸賞付き投稿も盛んになるが、とてもの台湾から応募して日本語女流作家として一世を風靡することになる黄氏寶樺のような事例を読者はご存じだろうか。上海を中心とする大衆誌について見れば、『東方誌』が日本の『太陽』の焼き直しであり、『新青年』が『白樺』の中国版だったことは明白だが、女性誌はどうだったのか。日韓併合期の韓半島での女性誌の研究も最近注目されているが、さらには満洲地方の婦人教育誌も含め比較検討すれば、二十世紀前半の東アジアにおける女性の社会進出について、従来の定説を覆す事例を発掘することは容易だろう。人民中国における女性の社会進出の下地を創ったのは、宣教師の教育活動とともに、日本の東北地域支配期の女子教育だった。これはまた公言するのは偽られるが、歴史的事実だろう。Information のみならず media そのものの transnational flow の実態を探る必要が見えてくる。

さらにこうした女性誌の男性購読という実態からは、欧米原産のジェンダー理論やメディア論の枠組みには当てはまらない、東アジアの特異性も浮き彫りとなる。同じセッションで発表した台湾出身の張誼聖 Chang Sung-sheng は、北米中国比較文学学会会長も歴任した人だが、彼女が戦後台湾の美的モダニズムの検
討で依拠したのは、もっぱら七十年代末の柄谷行人、ハーマース、ベター・ビュルガーといった理論的枠組みだった。だが呑孟晋氏が最近の研究で明らかにしたように（「民国期中国におけるジェルレアリズムの夢と現実」『現代中国』83号、2009年）、日本支配下の台湾では、日本経済の日本語回路で欧米最先端のモダニズム情報が流入し、咀嚼されていた。そこから栄養を吸って成長した世代の戦後モダニズム芸術を論ずるうえでは、前島氏が検討した日本経済の教育環境・メディア環境は無視できない。東アジアの女性雑誌は、従来とまたすればdomesticな存在と同一視され、婦人を家父長制の支配の下に御制するための道具とみなされる場合が多くあった。だが前島論文は、欧米産の理論的解釈を無条件に非西欧世界に押しつけることの限界をたどるtheoretical methodologyを提唱しうるだけの、深い射程を秘していることになる。

群島 - 理論的可能性

酒井直樹は、所詮「理論」とは「欧米」側の認知主体がみずからの認識を正当化するための手段としての枠組みであり、「残余」の非西欧社会は、その理論に適切な「生のデータ」を「西欧」の学会に貢ぐことをもって使命とする運命に置かれてきた、と学問における掟構造を終弾している（Traces1の導入）。そこまではまったくその通りだが、さてそれならばこの枠組をいかに切り抜けつつ、しかも代替的なヘゲモニーの誘惑をも回避する方策は如何、とすると、さしもの酒井の舌鋒も、北米という獅子身中の虫という境涯ゆえか、とたんに曖昧となる。だがこれに対して目の醒めるよう提案が、最終目的一般セッションでなされることになった。英語をそのまま挙げたいが、題してInsularity and Translatability of Japanese Contemporary Literature。題名だけみて、ア、これはマンマやラレタと思ったが、発表はその期待以上の恐るべき出来た。発表者は香港市立大学で教鞭を執るDennitza Gabrakova。ブルガリア出身の才媛である。

題名をみれば、すぐさま思い浮かぶだろう。一億を超える話者を持つ日本語世界は自国の文化流通圏に閉塞しており、逆に海外に発信可能で翻訳可能な作家は、村上春樹にせよ、桐野夏生にせよ、もはやこれを今更「現代日本文学」と呼ぶ必要もない国際作家の風貌を宿している。その事態をこの題名は見事に要約しているが、話はそこにつどまらない。島嶼性あるいは島国根性という表現のうらには、今福龍太や池澤夏樹の「群島」概念が仕込まれていた。エドワード・W・サイドはtraveling theoryを唱えたが、「旅する理論」は、名も知らぬ島の端辺に懸着する。映画用語でtravelingといえば移動撮影のことだが、移民先の土地のみならず、移民国による移動は、統一権力など存在しない治外法権の実態を体験する、
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不定住への誘惑だった。行き来する多島海を思い描いてみると、そこには、国境を頻繁に横断する現代移動文学論の土壤が見えてくる。

ガプラコーヴァ氏は、この比喻にそって六つの島を提示した。大庭みな子『舟噴い虫』、有吉佐和子『うみくら』、日野啓三『夢の島』、池澤夏樹『マシアス・ギリの裏切り』、島田雅彦『エトロフの恋』、多和田葉子『サハリン』。島を描く小説を、それぞれがひとつひとつの島であるかのように、海図のうえに並べ、それらの島々を結ぶ航路を作り、島嶼性文学の実相をなぞる身振りによって、みずからの航路を描いてゆく。この研ぎ澄まされた方法論的自覚によって、西欧原産「理論」の論文作法を平然と打破してゆく。それも繊細このうえない読みを、個々の作品に施しながら。

日本のどこかの文藝誌に早々に翻訳が掲載されることを願って、これ以上の紹介は慎もう。試しに以上の布陣から自分で思いつく限りの説解を試みて、その後、著者の分析と読み比べてみるのも一興だろう。どちらに軍配が上がるだろうか。国内の市場に媚びを売る生業としている程度の並大抵の日本の文藝批評家では、ガプラコーヴァ氏の読みを前にすれば、自らの島嶼性を露呈するだけだろう。

容易に外国には流通しない（が実際には他言語へと漂流している）作品を相手にしながら、それを逆手に取って日本でしか通用しない批評言語を乗り越えてみせると手脕には、作品の読みに対する自信のほども窺える。

同じセッションでは偶然ながら東京経済大学の西岡亙紀氏が、池澤夏樹の父、福永武彦の『死の島』(1971)を題材に、懇切な文体論を展開した。原爆の記憶に関する主人公の回想部分がカタカナ表記で記されているが、それはウィリアム・フォークナーの The Sound and the Fury (1929) のイタリック使用の意識的影畳だった。発表者が選んだ福永のカタカナ表記の文面は、内容のうえでもその後1955年に来日した機会を得たフォークナーの論説 To the Youth of Japan の主張ともぴったりと呼応していた。だがこれが日本語を理解しない聴衆に伝わらなかったのは惜しかった。また戦中期の慣用としての平仮名とカタカナの使い分けについての歴史的な説明などもなお不十分。とはいえ特異な表記法による表現力の厚みには、日本語を知らない研究者から、蒙を啓かれた、といった議評があった。

もとひとりの発表者、大阪大学の Linda Galvane 氏は、村上龍や山田詠美の初期作が描くアフリカ系アメリカ人の心理の縦を分析したが、こうした日本における多文化小説では、ガイジンのたどたどしい日本語や、反対に純正英語で発言され、ほかの日本人登場人物には理解不能な外国語会話を、わざとカタカナで表記する策略も執られている。そしてこうした書記体系の多様さをもっても極限まで推し進めて詩的言語の実験に挑身しているのが、デニッツァ氏も言及し、ブラジル絵み
の企画で今後とも協働している。吉増剛造の場合だろう。

ハングルまでも自在に取り込んで、音声と視覚に訴える儀礼的パフォーマンスを実践している吉増夫妻のテクストは、もはや国籍不明である。そして皮肉なことに、移民社会であればこそ表記の標準化に驚く学米合州国で、大学出版会から公認される、薄っぷらてdiacriticalの介在を許さない活版書法に則る限り、吉増詩文のpolyphonyはおそらく、山田詠美や村上龍のテクストに仕込まれたカタカナ表記の多声性も、そのままの賛美を維持した状態では、英語への翻訳に耐えない。編集上の検閲過程で、多声性が裁断されて、貧困化されたかたちでしか、翻訳結果は生き残れない。ここには多文化主義、transnational humanitiesの時代ゆえに、かえって書記の自由が伴う圧力という。翻訳の逆説が顕れる。だがArchipelagoの言語実践は、覇権言語によるtranslatabilityへの信仰と背離し、insularによってuniversalを脱抜きにする。

多言語性を内包したままの言語性が、原理的に、伝統的な翻訳という概念の許容範囲に抵触する。そして皮肉にも、多文化の共存を国是とした苦の移民大国（北米合州国）において、翻訳による抑圧が極限まで強化される。「理論」と称する。誰でも簡単に利用できる粗雑な調理法の跳梁跋扈が、こうした書記の抑圧と表裏一体であること、もはや明らかだろう。質疑応答のなかで、デニッツァ氏は控えめな表現ながら、脱植民地主義の理論が明らかにしたのは、理論の普遍的通用可能性という権威の破綻だった、と喝破した。昨年誌敬したクレード・レヴィ＝ストロースが1936年に南米ブラジルの新興都市サン・パウロで写真を撮ったその場所を再訪して、72年後の変貌を記録するという、人類学者生前最後の事業に携わった今福龍太は、その人類史的な経験をも糧として、自らの戦術を練ってきた。そしてすべてが相互に依存しながら、どれひとつとして支配的な権力を使役しえない群島という生存様式を構成し、覇権hegemonyへと肥大化することを回避する脱 - 理論の可能性を示唆している。それは奇しくも、李御寧氏が冒頭の基調講演で引用したレヴィ＝ストロースの『今日のトーテミズム』の叡智にも呼応していたはずである。

本学会報告の意図について：必要なる蛇足として

学会動向報告という作法は、近年では北米中心のアカデミズムの業績評価対象やアングロ・サクソンの社会習慣と合致しないためか、学会誌の誌面から削られることが多い。だが学会という場で当事者は互いに予期しないままに不意に浮上した課題や、互いに無関係なまま共通する問題意識が勃発してくれる様に気づいたならば、それを紙面が許す範囲で報告しておくことは、大きな教育的価値、
さらには将来の企画立案にむけた創発的価値が認められているべきだろう。海外での先行研究動向を数年遅れて後追いするという追従癖からなお脱し得ず、問題発見の企画力に欠けることが直観的にも顕著な日本列島の人文学事情からの脱皮のためにも、一言したい。学会誌からは論文と書評以外の文書の掲載を一切排除するという北米流純粋主義には、それなりの理由もあるが、その機械的な墨守には、得失両面あることにだけは、反省を加えてしかるべきだろう。ツイッターの例に漏れず、学会情報でも脇役の短報にこそ、新たな遭遇の契机が潜んでいる。

今回で19回を迎える国際比較文学会は、前回2007年のリオ・デ・ジャネイロ大会の折、総会でカナダとの決戦投票の末、韓国での開催が決定される、という異例の経緯で実現した。会場も大邱のコンベンション・センターが予定されながら、経済危機などの外因も働いて、結局首都ソウルの中央大学校が会場に選ばれた。理事会では韓国側の一方的変更を違約と見て、感情的な反発も噴出した。だがこれに目を向けてのそれは、かえって不見識、プリンストンがニューヨークに、あるいはプレーメンがハンブルクに変更されたからといって、それで大会中止だ、といった騒ぎになるだろうか。そう執行部を説得し、韓国での実現に尽力したのは、理事指名委員として名を連ねていた上垣外憲一教授だった。舞台裏ながら備忘録として付記しておきたい。

いくつかの反省点
「比較文学の辺境を拡大する」とのテーマを掲げた本大会では、個人発表の提案が八百件近くされた。日本からの参加者を集計する手順は存在しないし、その必要はないとのご意見もある。だが、どのような企画が浮上しているのか、日本比較文学会としてもある程度の情報が事前入手できる体制が取れれば、より有機的・積極的な参加を会員内外に促す手だてともなり、連携もより容易となるだろう。日本比較文学会会員とは別個に、筑波大学の斎藤一（はじめ）教授によるReconsidering "Reception” and Transformation of English Literature in Asia と題するsymposiumも企画されていた。会員側からは、芳賀徹教授企画によるIntellectual Interaction in East Asia in 1920s and 30s-Poetry, Art and New Utopianism および、筆者組織によるThe Noguchi Legacy: Between Patriotism and Internationalism-Artistic Vigabondage of Yone and Isamu Noguchi, from Poetry to Sculpture in Conflict between the East and the West が、日本関係者による企画のすべてであった（稲賀企画のパネルについては、本稿で言及することは避けた。傍聴者による第三者評価を期待したい）。とはいえ、これらはあくまで個人的な発意によるものであり、企画者同士、お互いに連絡は
一切取って居らず、ネット版のプログラム草案が公開された段階で、じして従いの企画の輪郭を知り得、という状況だった。日本比較文学会として何らかの組織的な企画を立案すべきか否かには、各論両論あるだろうが、隣国の大学に対して、日本側の学術組織としての働きかけるは不在に等しかった。これはICLA 理事と心の反省点である。

さらにいえば、現在、韓国や大陸中国さらには台湾・香港地域にくらべ東南アジアに至るまで、若手の多くの日本語文学担当者が現地で教鞭をとって活躍している。またこれらの地域から日本に留学中の博士課程学生、講師、学術振興会会員も少なくな。だが今回のソウル大会を見る限り、こうした立場にある若手からの参加はいっそ見かけで実際的ではなく、また関連学会および大学研究室側からの支援も、個別例を除けば、組織的には表されていない。そもそも比較文学という分野にそれだけの学術的板壁は売り込みマーケットとしての求心力があるのか、学会としての認知が十分なのか、さらなる分析が必要であろう。ただ昔日のように安楽として有益の若者の出現を待つ、という受け身の姿勢だけでは、おそらく有力な次世代の発掘・養成は見逃しまい。

なお、ここ数回の国際大会では、symposium, panel, seminar といった形式の参加は、proceedings からは排除することが内規となっており、また原則としてICLA 理事会の committee が主体となって運営する workshop も、その成果は proceedings には組み込まず、別途に公刊を目指すことが、理事会での了解事項となっている。これは公刊された投稿規定などではかならずしも判明ではないが、その背景には幾つか無視できない要素が働いている。まず北米および英独圏では、従来の proceedings では査読体制が不明確なため、これに掲載されても業績として評価されない場合が多くなり、若手の研究者が投稿に消極的となりつつある。さらに予算事情の悪化から、大会組織国の財政負担を極力軽減したいという意向とともに、人文関係では査読を経た論文集といえども、出版界の閉塞ゆえに、容易には編著として公刊できない現状がある。理事会構成員の多くは、それなりに実力ある学者としての自負もあり、自らの編著を大学出版会から公刊しつつ、弟子筋や学徒の業績作りを支援することが、職業上不可欠だ。すべてが業績主義に染まった昨今の姑息な学問事情を反映する話で恐縮だが、ICLA にも奮薇色の国際協力出版事業など、積極的に推進するに足るだけの資金援助を受ける才覚も、財政的足尾もない現状だけは直視したい。

将来への布石
国内学会組織と国際比較文学会とで double membership を採用している日本
は、学会員数で 700 名を越えている。これは 2000 名強（2007 年・リオ大会時点）から 1500 名前後（2010 年・韓国大会直前）まで増加している。韓国大会のための入会者を含む学会員数の、三分の一から五分の二を占める計算であり、（為替レートによる変動はあるが）ほぼそれに対応する割合の資金を ICLA に対して提供していることになる。だが多くの国際機関の類例に漏れず、日本比較文学会は金こそ出すが発言はしないという「美德」に甘んじている。勿論それまでも、ひとつ見識かもしれない。数に拘る威力行使は見苦しい。とはいえ数と相応しいだけの国際的学術的貢献は必須だろう。学会誌である『文学探究』Literary Research/ Recherche littéraire は、元来、英語・フランス語以外の少数言語圏の最新書誌情報を伝達する媒体としての役割をも期待して発刊された学術誌である。だが現在までの発行数はおおむね、先例に先立つ理想に膨張で、日本関係の話題が採用されることは、ほぼ皆無といってよい。近年ではヨコサ＝村上孝之氏による東洋史の『オタク』英訳版への寄稿が 2009 年度の 25 巻に収録された。間欠泉の噴出にも及ばぬ頻度で、存在の影があまりに薄い。

もとより日本語という入場市場は、少数言語圏と形容するにすぎない。その内需を満たすことだけで日本の学会は体力を消耗している。70 年前の大東亜共栄圏の夢への恩赦もできぬまま、敗戦後の反作用で内向きを国策とし、超高齢化を迎えた日本社会は、この中途半端に巨大な市場に埋没して動脈硬化を亢進させてきた。海外への学術発信の意図のみならず、気力・体力まで喪失させて低迷する日本。その一方で、隣国・韓国は、国内市場が狭隘なためか、かえって積極的に国際基準に合わせて強行突破を図り、経済や映画市場のみならず学会市場も隆盛を見せている。彼彼対立しての苦労論や読者数が国際的な認知を高める効果を発揮した日本語市場を列島内に限定する見方がある。それも視野狭小、時代錯誤であろう。国内需要の落ち込みと裏腹に、アジア各地で、有意の若者が日本語教育・日本文化教育の前線に立って活躍している。韓国・中国からの入場留学生も、なお増加の兆候を見せ、ヴェトナムやインドでも韓国や日本への関心が高まっている。これら若者たちの機会と育成、将来をめぐる飛翔の出発と思いが急務となっている。東・東南・南の三アジアと日本を個別に結ぶ「点と線」の発想は、すでに時代遅れ。これら群島をなす「三面のアジア」の学術的相互交通を多様に構想すること。そこで 21 世紀前半の transnational humanities が直面すべき挑戦がある。

* 末筆となるが、本ソウル大会の実現のために尽力されたチュン・チュンホ
Chung Chung-ho 会長、また実務のすべてを事実上たったひとりで見事に切り盛りしたチョ・ソンウォン Cho Sung-won 教授に、この場を借りてあらためて御礼申し上げたい。舞台裏の兵站関係は、僅か数人が個人責任をもって対応し、また会期中は中央大学を中心とする学生諸君が大動員され、日当わずか一万ウォン（内部情報）で献身的かつ細心の対応ぶりを見せた。これら裏方にも気配りを忘れない閉会宣言でスタンディング・オベイションを受けたチョ・ソンウォン教授と、これで ICLA 副会長の責からも解かれたチュン会長と。大役を果たしたばかりのそのおふたりとは、偶々その直後、中央大学の丘の頂上にある裏門からすぐの学生街の食堂で、李応壽さんともご一緒になり、改めてその労を犒ったことであった。
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