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Summary
Orientalism and Occidentalism are crossing with each other in modern visual representations of Asia. One of the most typical and extreme cases may be singled out in Manchukuo/Manzhouguo, a puppet monarchy which the Japanese overseas expansionism gave birth to in Northeastern part of China in opposition to the Soviet Union (1931–1945). The paper will discuss the geopolitical conditions in which visual symbols of historical deeds and events of the region were highlighted. It will also trace the chronological and geographical development of the politics of visualization which took place on the "new territory." Through the process Western Orientalism dwelt in Japanese colonial mentality, whereas a typical Occidentalism also took shape in Japan’s approach to Asia. The paper will analyze the crossover of the two axes in the so-called Asianism, which aimed to realize the “Greater Asian Co-prosperity Zone” during the period of China-Japan War.

1. Chang-bai-shan/Baektosan
Let us begin by picking up one anonymous photo taken on Feb. 04, 1936 with the explanation: "the view of the summit of Hakuto-san Mountain (frozen) from the sky at the altitude of 4000 meters." The huge heart-formed oval caldera of 4.4 km large and 3.6 km wide is located at the altitude...
of 2,190 m and surrounded by peaks of ca. 2,800 m high. The Manchuria Air
线路航空 had opened commercial lines connecting Shinkyō/Xinjing 新京
(Cháng-chūn 長春), 奉天 Hōten/Fèngtiān (later renamed as Shēng-yáng 漢陽), Harbin 哈爾濱 and other main cities in Manchuria. The photo seems to have been taken during one of such sky tours.

The mountain conveys a symbolic meaning as the ancestral place of the
Koryǒ Korean people. Choe Nam-sān (崔南善, 1890–1957), who had drafted the
Korean Constitution at the moment of the March 1. Independent Movement in 1910 and later to be accused of pro-Japanese, published a serial article in the Newspaper Dong-ā Ilob 東亞日報 (East Asia Daily) in 1926. His report of the mountain-seeing is said to have contributed to rehabilitate the mountain as the Sacred Peak of the Korean People. Thus the volcano, which is known to have recorded a massive irruption in the 10th Century, has become a national emblem comparable to the Mountain Fuji in Japan and Ju-shān (玉山) Jade Mountain in Formosa.

The mountain, named Chán-bái-shān 長白山 in Chinese, was also worshiped by the Manchurian Dynasty of the Qing as the place of its origin. Indeed the area around the volcano is the source of three major rivers marking the national border and nourishing the whole northern part of Manchuria. Tú-ménjiān 四門江 River runs to the north-east, constituting the national border between Jílín Province 吉林省 and Ham-gyeong-buk-do 咸鏡北道 of Northen Korea, the Second Sōng-huā-jūn 第二松花江 joins the Sōng-huā-jūn which eventually crosses the city of Harbin toward north-east. In contrast, Yǒuluō-jūn 鴨緑江 runs to the south separating Liá’níng Province 遼寧省 from Pyeong-an-bu-ke 平安北道 of Northern Korea.

The short description above will suffice to show the geographical as well as geopolitical importance of the volcano, which naturally separates Korea from China. Needless to say the keen sense of national border was nourished by Occidentalism, i.e. the impregnation of the Western idea of geopolitics. The designation of the sacred mountain also partakes of Orientalism in so far as it was the outcome of the national consciousness in modern era. The combination of the two factors was essential for the new evaluations of the ethnic symbol.

The present paper seeks to investigate the following topic: what kind of seeds did the mountain and the rivers convey in fostering the images of Manchuria during the Japanese invasion period? How were the factors of Orientalism and Occidentalism combined in the politics of iconography conducted by the puppet monarchy of Mánzhōugōu from 1931 to 1945? In this paper I bear emphasis mainly on paintings and drawings while putting aside photography and documentary or theater movies, which will be studied at another occasion.²


² Here may be the reason why the Marxist interpretation finds in the year of 1875 the beginning of Japan’s total expansion. However, unless mechanically applying the teleological view of expansionism, it would be difficult to reconstruct any consistent program in Japan’s overseas expansion. The most typical example is the South Manchurian Railway Charter which Japan obtained by the Portsmouth Treaty in 1906. Overlooking the strategic importance of the charter, Japan willingly tried to concede the charter to an American railway construction tycoon, Harriman. Financially Japan could not afford even maintaining the railway. At this point, the expansion to Manchuria was hardly included in the political agenda.
gation on the River so as to gain direct access to the Japan Sea. Wú Dàchéng (1835–1902), Chinese diplomat and famous calligrapher, who was in charge of the territorial negotiation with Russia, is celebrated nowadays as a national hero.1

2. Gando 간도/Jiāndào Issue 間島問題
The short historical overview above already shows the vital geopolitical importance of the border area between China and Korea, where the interests of Russian, Chinese as well as Korean-Japanese crossed-over in intricate ramifications. With the Japanese expansion toward the continent, the international jurisdictionally came to the fore in terms of territorial claims. This is what is commonly known as the Gando (K.)/Jiāndào (C.)/Kantō (J.) Issue which gained actuality especially since 1906, when Japan set up Protectoral Office of the Resident general in the Korean capital after Japan’s military victory in the Russo-Japanese War. Due to high Korean population density, the Gando area has become the zone where the Japanese and Chinese authorities dispute their own priority, interests and responsibility. In 1906, Naitó Konan 内藤湖南 (1866–1934), famous sinologist and professor at the Imperial University of Kyoto, presented to the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs a detailed accounts of the territorial disputes/conflicts of the region which had been recorded both by the Qing local officials and by the Choson Lee Dynasty administrators in a quantity of historical documents.2

鶴井Lyonjung (K.)/Lóngjìng (Ch.)/Ryūsei (J.) was the village in the Gando/Jiāndào region where a Japanese civil operation was deployed under the command of Lieutenant Saíto Suejirō so as to set up a detached office of the Japanese Resident-general for the purpose of “protecting the lives and properties of the Korean people” in the region. Shinoda Jisaku 篠田治策 (1876–1946), future and final President of the Keijô University in Colonial Korea, was the scholar in international law who was involved with this intelligence mission. His book, Stella of the Baektosan 『白頭山定界碑』 (1938) includes in addendum his earlier pamphlet, “Looking back the Kantō Problem” 「間島問題の回顧」 (1930) a retrospective view, in which he meticulously analyzes the diplomacy on the territory issue.3

Shinoda firstly points out that the Stella implanted by the Qing Dynasty is simply invalid because it failed to designate the watershed. He then remarks that the Choson Dynasty committed a diplomatic error by carelessly accepting and ratifying the forced identification that the Qing Dynasty had claimed for its own benefit. Thirdly Shinoda does not hesitate to sternly criticize the Kantō agreement which Japan had signed with China in 1909. For Shinoda, this agreement was “an ominous mistake that Japan committed in its rule over Korea,” because it contained a clause stipulating Japan’s agreement to Chinese territorial claim of the Gando province, based on the above mentioned forced identification. According to Shinoda, the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs thereby made an unnecessary and meaningless concession to China. The concession was made so as to secure several diplomatic advantages, such as the railroad charter between Andon 安東 and Fèngtiān 奉天 which was vital for the Japanese interest. In Shinoda’s opinion, however, this An-Feng Railway Charter, among others, had been internationally guaranteed by the Portsmouth Treaties. From the viewpoint of international law, it was therefore, he concludes, an enormous diplomatic error and a sheer absurdity for Japan to have made a useless concession of the Gando territory to China.

The misjudgment in 1910, Shinoda maintains, was to trigger a silly scandal, in the founding process of Mánzhōguó. The independence of a new Monarchy was declared on March 1, 1932, in consequence of the so-called Manchuria Incident that broke out on Sep. 8, 1931. Shortly before the declaration of Independence, between July 26 and the morning of July 29, 1931, the Stella of the Baektosan was reported to have been illegally removed and lost to the disposal of the authorities. The border guards are reported to have been stupefied by the unexpected loss of the Stella, but this testimony smells a flimsy excuse which cannot help hinting at a camouflaged frame-up.

Shinoda does not hide his resentment toward those who “committed this silly maneuver” of “concealing the historical monument for the purpose of blurring the border.” Objectively speaking, the removal of the Stella could not have been a simple criminal act committed by a private initiative but it should have required a systematic mobilization of main d’oeuvre, Shinoda does not hesitate to suggest that the removal was a “premeditated deed” executed, if not directly by the Japanese border control in mission there, but at least by its tacit approval. Despite Shinoda’s instigation the Government-general in Korea was said to have been reluctant to search for the lost Stella, and this fact may also reinforce the conspiracy hypothesis Shinoda had in mind.

Two similar cases of conspiracy are well known. On the one hand, Zhāng Zuòlín 張作霖 (1875–1928), head of the Fèngtiān militaristic government was assassinated through the explosion of his train wagon on June 4, 1928. Three
years later, the minor explosion at Liútiáohú 柳条湖 (Sep. 8, 1931) slightly destroyed the South Manchuria railway near Fèngtiān. This incident gave pretext to the Kanto 10军团 Army (which guarded the South Manchurian railway and its annexed territories) to eventually occupy the whole Manchuria within several months before the inauguration of Mánzhōuguó in March 1, 1932. 10 Both were the maneuvers plotted by the Japanese detached military headquarters in Manchuria and put into effect under the guise of subversive activities allegedly committed by the Chinese soldiers and “bandits” 匪賊. According to today’s Chinese official interpretation, all these Japanese conspiracies had a common willful purpose of justifying Japan’s military intervention which culminated in the incident at the Marco Polo Bridge 鬧橋事件 which broke out on July 7, 1937. 11 The “accidental” exchange of gun fires gave an appropriate pretext for the Japanese massive infiltration in Huáběi 北, northern zone in China through Héběi Province 河北省, including Beijing, lying far beyond the southern borderline of Manchuria, circumscribed by the Great Wall reaching to the Shànhuāguān 關山海关. 12

10 A Japanese writer, Hashimoto Osamu issues an insightful, if not scholarly, observation in his commentary of the year 1931, in an illustrated volume for general readership, Nihon no Sensō 1, Manshūkokoku no gen’ei 『日本の戦争1：満洲国の現実』 (Japan’s War vol. 1. The Illusion of Manchukuo), Mainichi Newspaper 毎日新聞社, revised new edition, 2010, p.21. He claims on the one hand, that the slogan of “Manchuria, the life line of Japan” was the manipulation that the Japanese army took advantage of so as to justify its policy of expansion in the Northern China in the 1930s. Originally “Japan” here did not mean the Japanese archipelago but the Korean peninsula which Japan had to “defend” in Russo-Japanese War. An intentional geographic extrapolation is evident, he says. On the other hand, however, it is clear that it also maintained that Japan had not seen at any cost Mánzhōu, at the point of 1906. For Japan willingly tried to concede the South-Manchurian railway charter to the American so-called “railway Tycoon,” Harriman so as to cover the financial deficit. Lacking in strategic perspective, Japan at the outcome of the Russo-Japanese War was not capable of “invading” the continent nor did it have any resources to make Manchuria a profitable economic market. Only the illusory military glory and the Japanese popular self-conceit gave birth to the uncontrollable and self-destructive Manchurian dreams. Whether fully acceptable or not, from an academic point of view, this hypothesis non-the-less reveals a hidden (lack of) mechanism of Japanese Imperialism and sheds light on one aspect of the Oriental reaction to the Occidental Orientalism.

11 It remains uncertain whether it was Japanese or Chinese side which shot the first bullet at the Bridge. The Chinese official interpretation sees in the Marco Polo Bridge incident one more example of Japanese habitual provocation for the sake of systematic invasion. Yet the historical circumstances do not entirely support this view, and specialists in international relations still continue to discuss the issue. According to some specialists, the excessive suspicion of the Ching Kaishen Government toward Japan accelerated the diplomatic tension after the incident and several following incidents lead to the military mobilization which retrospectively constitutes the systematic military invasion that the Japanese government wished to avoid, officially at least, for tactical as well as strategic reasons. The fact of invasion remains but it is an open question whether the Marco Polo Bridge Incident was the premeditated trigger for the whole scheme of the political intention.

12 During the period the propaganda campaign was published contrasting the “safe and prosperous earthly heaven” on Manchuria verses “corrupted and horror-reigned Republic of China,” divided by the non-military zone put along the southern proximities of the Great Wall. See Kishi Toshio 木下俊明, Manchuria’s Graphic Media Empire 満洲国のビジュアル・メディア (in Japanese), Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館 2010, pp. 91–99.

3. Rèhé 熱河 Operation

Between the declaration of Independence of Mánzhōuguó in 1931 and the beginning of Japan’s direct invasion in China in 1937, there intervened one major military deployment, i.e. Japanese occupation of Chéngdé 承德, historical capital city of the Rèhé(Ch.)/Nekkä(J.) Province 熱河, which took place on March 04, 1933, two years after the foundation of the ‘fake’ puppet monarchy (in fact it was only on March 1, 1934, after the completion of the Neika Operation that Pùyí溥儀 finally took the throne). The Rèhé Province, as it was called then, lay in the south-eastern corner of the so-called Manchuria-Mongorian District 渤海 neighboring the Northern border of the Republic of China. Historically the province was regarded as the “outside of the border gate” 関外, being located beyond the limit of the Great Wall. Accordingly, Rèhé Province was a restricted zone where the immigration of the Chinese people had strictly been limited up until the end of the Qing Dynasty’s rule.

The city of Chéngdé, located in the Mountain area was designated as the homeland of the Manchurian people and was famous for the Detached Summer Villa 避暑山荘 of the puppet monarchy that a railway was put into service from Jīnzhōu 錦州 to Chéngdé 承德 by 1936. And in the following year, 1937, the line connecting Chéngdé and Lǎoběikǒu 老北口 and Běipíng 北平, was finally completed through Hēbei 河北省, including Beijing, lying far beyond the south-eastern corner of the so-called Manchuria-Mongorian District. The occupation of the Rèhé Province and the fallowing construction of railway were also indispensable measures to control the opium trade and to monopolize its transportation, the Manchurian state economy was heavily dependent upon.

In the city of Chéngdé, fountainhead of the Rèhé River (namely hot river as it was not frozen in winter because of the water coming from hot spring), there was a huge villa of the Qing emperor surrounded by (more than) “Eight Exterior Rama Buddhist Pavilions” 外八廟. Especially famous was the one located on the hill just behind the imperial villa and garden. The huge temple building imitating the style of the Potala Palace in Lhasa, Tibet, was the main destination of the archaeological expedition lead by Sekino Tadashi 関野貞 (1867–1935). After the inspection Sekino pleaded the Manchurian government for its protection, insisting on the urgent necessity of conservation and restoration work (which was declined for lack of political urgency and because of the financial shortage). The Manchuria Movie Company shut a film, Ruîhe, Terra Incognita 秘境熱河 (1936), reputed to be one of the most successful scientific documentary pieces of the company. It immediately after the occupa-
Among the first painters at work was Kawashima Riichirô 川島理一郎 (1886–1971), who executed on the spot The Great View of Shôtoku (承徳大観) (1934). As a prolific essayist, Kawashima reports the local climate by saying that “in summer it is extremely hot in Shôtoku, the temperature climbs up to 120 degree Fahrenheit. In the mainland Japan, it is simply impossible to imagine how difficult it is to make painting here. Yet and yet the brilliantly strong sunshine and limpidity of the air enable us to catch the contours of the objects marvelously clear.” “The painters’ color sensation is thus satisfied to a degree beyond expectation as these splendid buildings are shining gold and the balustrades highlighting cinnabar red under the extremely bright exposure of the sun.” These observations transmit the fascination by which Kawashima was caught in front of the exotic heritage with crude primary colors in arid climate which makes a sharp contrast with the humid atmosphere of the Japanese archipelago.

Kawashima was also amazed at the huge scale of the imperial garden which surpasses the imagination of those Japanese who have been accustomed with tiny “miniature gardens” in the small islands of Japan. He was also surprised by the extreme dimension of the buildings which were beyond any comparison with Japanese wooden structure. The main Rhamma Buddhist temple revealed itself as no less imposing and gigantic than the stone-built monuments and palaces in the West. He mentions that the main mausoleum of the temple is “twice as large as” the largest reinforced concrete modern building at the center of the Japanese capital, Marunouchi Building, and he also notes the Kwanin with one thousand arms (sahasrabhuja ārya avalokitesvara, 千手観音), at the Temple Pûningsi 普寧寺, which is “22 meter high and known as the largest wooden sculpture in the world.”

Kawashima’s value judgment is worth analysis. In the hyper-large scale of the construction, the painter saw “a work of a mighty country,” and remarked that “everywhere we can see the traces of the splendid-ness of the glorious past.” “The ruins of 150 years age gathering rust surpasses by far the gorgeousness of the Nikkô Mausoleum, the Tokugawa Family, and its grandeur rather bears due comparison with the ruins of Rome or Pompeî.” It is not difficult to detect a typically “Orientalist” attitude in Kawashima’s descriptions. He found in Chéngdé such an imposing historical heritage that he felt difficulty in finding out any equivalent in Japan. The monumental scale of the ruins also reminded him of the lost glory of the past Chinese Civilizations. The rare opportunity of being selected as the first privileged eyewitness of the newly discovered remains flatters the painter’s pride as a pioneering explorer and tickles his vanity as conquer. Kawashima was the only artist officially dispatched to Chêngdé with a special status: he was treated as a major general 少将待遇 in the military hierarchy.

As a commissioned officer, Kawashima observes that the “beauty of Shôtoku is left in abandonment” and regrets the waste of the precious treasure. He wishes that the cultural heritage could be saved from the current oblivion and misfortune. This “mission civilisatrice” behooved on the new ruler, Japan, of which he was an official delegate. Naturally Kawashima expresses his amazement at the remarkable progress he saw in Japanese exploitation, and applauds the new development in public work advanced by Japanese engineers. “The glorious exploit is hardly imaginable unless you see it on the spot with your own eyes.” Kawashima confesses that he “was seized by a pious sentiment of devotion at the sight of the Japan’s New Territory.” He was also astonished to hear that thieves are risking their lives in illegally penetrating the sanctuary almost every night so as to steal the material from the bronze-covered shrine. The anecdote hints at the lack of national consciousness among the Chinese and Manchurian people. He was also marveled at the view of the vast poppy field in full bloom, and felt as if he were straying in the opium flower garden. “I am fascinated by the relentless-ness of the human existence” he is experiencing in the dream-like wonderland.

Full of conviction, Kawashima concludes that despite the difficulties in travel and the climatic harshness notwithstanding, Shôtoku is a place he “strongly recommends his fellow Japanese painters to... Manchuria, and because of the impressive view of the eight Buddhist Temples of imposing scales and richness.” Painters of official invited to Manchuria were to reply to Kawashima’s invitation.

Yasui Sôtarô (1888–1955), famous for his china taste of the Era in Green), Ryûseikaku 南宗, 1936. The above quotes as well as the followings are from pp. 99-112. Other essays by Kawashima treating the Rehe region include Tabibito no Me 旅人の目 (The Eyes of a Traveler), 1936, and Hokushi to Nanshi no Kao 北支と南支の貌 (Views of Northern and Southern China), 1939, from the same publisher.

15 Kawashima Riichirô 川島理一郎, Midori no Jidai 『緑の時代』 (The Era in Green), Rûnôshûkaku 呂宣閣, 1936. The above quotes as well as the followings are from pp. 99-112. Other essays by Kawashima treating the Rehe region include Tabibito no Me 旅人の目 (The Eyes of a Traveler), 1936, and Hokushi to Nanshi no Kao 北支と南支の貌 (Views of Northern and Southern China), 1939, from the same publisher.
These works have been recognized as marking the highest peaks of the Japanese oil painting in the Pre-war period. Especially, Yasui’s Portrait of a Woman in Chinese Dress or Umahara’s Forbidden City have been constantly reproduced in color in the frontispiece of the State-permitted history manuals in use at the junior-high or high school level, without any critical judgment. Even the history manuals edited by staunch Japanese Marxist scholars constantly inserted illustrations of these works regardless of the fact that the view of Chéngdé or Beijing of the period had been executed by privileged bourgeois artists under Japan’s military occupation in foreign land.

In my opinion, Yasui’s Chéngdé sceneries and Umehara’s Beijing series represent the most accomplished form of Japanese-made Orientalist painting, an Asian version and replacement of the Western colonial painting. The excitement that the Japanese felt at the view of the glorious and genuine essence of the Continental Asian culture contains an element of exoticism similar to the one the West had felt in the “Orient”. And the pettiness of the Japanese insularity complex seems to have experienced a mental hypertrophy in the midst of the monumental Chinese cultural heritage, which temporarily fell into their possession. A Japanese self-conceit of the conquer of the East was camouflaged under the slogan of the “constructor of the Royal Road reading to the Earthly Paradise” 王道楽土.

The hidden arrogance of the colonizer reveals itself through the pictorial rendering. Here is a typical crossing of Orientalism and Occidentalism. The Orient is depicted here through the Western medium and technique of oil painting that the Japanese Westernizing institutions of art academy had been busy assimilating in the last half a century. Just as Western weapons were means for military invasion, so were Western style oil paintings mobilized for the symbolic subjugation of the conquered land. Of course the oil painting here serves as a metonymy; every available Western measures were adopted so as to achieve the Cause of the East of which Japan claimed to be the champion. By so doing, Japan gradually transformed itself into a dummy of the Western style colonial empire. Orientalist paintings made in China by Japanese artists were just one example of such by-products of mimicry. The famous slogan formulated by Edgar Quinet, “The Orient proposes, the Occident disposes” is somewhat twisted and interiorized in the cultural politics of Manchuria under Japan’s military rule.

4. Camel and the Ideal of Five Races in Peaceful Collaboration

The same year 1937 saw the realization of the Exposition internationale des arts et des techniques dans la vie moderne in the city of Paris. Yamaga Seika 山鹿清華 (1885–1981), Nishijin weaver from Kyoto was one of the participants and exhibited his Tapestry of Rèhé 熱河壁掛 (1937). The following year Yamaga executed a Hand Woven Tapestry of the Stone Boat Qingyuanfâng 清源舫 taking the motif from the unsinkable stone boat at the Béihai Park in Beijing. The choice of these motifs suggests the high respect the artist paid to the Chinese culture. And yet the fact remains that both Chéngdé and Beijing have just entered under Japanese military besiege and control. The tapestry undoubtedly contributed to the enhancement of the Japanese national dignity (to which few Japanese felt uneasiness and doubted about its legitimacy). These pieces of art not only manifest Japan’s self-recognition as “the constructor of New Asia” (to borrow the term from Ōkawa Shūmei; the slogan of “New Asian Order” will be coined in 1939 by the Konoe cabinet); but they also proudly show to the West that the quintessence of the Orient, materialized in the Chinese civilization is now represented by the Japanese artists in replacement of the Chinese or Manchurian craftsmen.

It is not useless to recall the first quote that Edward W. Said made in his Orientalism (1978) from Karl Marx: “Sie können sich nicht vertreten, sie müssen vertreten werden”. Namely, in the context of the present paper, Yamaga’s tapestry is implicitly stating as if Chinese or Manchurian people were no longer capable of representing their own artistic heritage; they had to be represented (vertreten) – by the Japanese. A sense of self-importance is imbedded in Japan’s prise de conscience of its own historical mission. Such self-esteem is unpretentiously emanating from Yamaga’s tapestry fabricated for public exhibitions.

One paradox must be mentioned here. Neither of the three (Yasui, Umehara and Yamada) depicts explicitly military scenes. And yet the seemingly peaceful setting hides the reality of military control. Instead, an apparently respectful attitude toward the glorious past is carefully demonstrated. And yet, underneath the surface, in front of the decrepit and decline of modern Asia, a subtle feeling of pity creeps in. And this sense of pity secretly sustains Japanese self-righteousness. To use the terms of dramaturgy, it would not be easy to tell whether such a highly sophisticated ‘screen setting’ and ‘choreography’ was an intentional concealment by the stage director or not. The maîtres may have preferred avoiding any possible censorship by carelessly touching upon military secret; but the selection of non-military subject-matters may also account for the “political unconscious” (Frederic Jameson) of those Japanese establishment in art. Such questions are worthy of investigation.

between the 1930s and 1940s,” (in Korean with English summary), Art History Forum, Center for Art Studies, Seoul, Kroea, No. 28, June 2009, pp. 111–140.
19 A typical example may be found in the case of Tôyama Ichirô 藤山一郎, Director of the Manchuria Museum, who sent his painting of a Bird-eye view of Chende to his personal friend, Benito Mussolini. See, Shin-Hakubutsukan-Taisei, What Manchukuo’s Museums Tells to Postwar Japan 新博物館態勢 – 満洲国の博物館が戦後日本に伝えていること』 (in Japanese), Nagoya Prefectural Museum, 1995, p. 95.
20 “l’Orient propose, l’Occident dispose” was itself was a parody from the Bible: The human being proposes and God disposes, or “l’homme propose, Dieu dispose.”
21 Exhibition catalogue, Yamaga Seika 山鹿清華展, Kyoto Prefectural Museum 京都府立美術館, Asahi Newspaper 朝日新聞社, 1985, pp. 1, 6, 19, 26, 28, 36, 40 show Yamaga’s strong aspiration to Chinese history.
Whatever the case, the presence of the camel family in front of the Chêngde Tapestry cannot be innocent, as camel was an important iconography with highly political charge sustaining the idea of "Royal Road leading to the Earthly Paradise" 王道楽土. In fact, Numata Ichiga 沼田一雅 (1837–1954), trained in the factory of Sèvre, and his disciple Funatsu Eiji 船津英次 (1911–1984) executed in the same year of 1937, a series of *Trips in Desert 《胡砂の旅》*, ceramic sculptures representing camels.²³ Such a sudden proliferation of camels in decorative arts cannot be explained without taking the current political situation into account. A typical subject-matter of Orientalist painting, camel was singled out to celebrate the accomplishment of institutional Westernization of the newly founded puppet Monarchy.

It must also be noted that the Chêngde tapestry superimposes the symbol of Mongolia (i.e. Camels) over the architecture symbolizing Manchuria (i.e. Tibetan Buddhist Temple). The same combination can be observed in contemporary tourist advertisement. This visual emblem exemplarily stands for the cultural properties of the newly integrated territory, as its superficies now cover the entire Manchuria and a part of Mongolia. It will be relevant to note here that the term “Manchuria-Mongolia” 滿蒙 currently used at that period is not a neutral geographical designation. As Tanaka Katsuhiyo, specialist of Mongolian language and language politics under Stalin regime has already suggested, “Manchuria-Mongolia” could not be the combination of the two ethnic entities but the expression of a particular political will of integrating the Eastern part of Mongolia into the territory of the Manchurian Empire.²⁴

One more element must be added so as to fully recognize the role camel was to assume in the image-politics of Mānhząguó. In 1938 Kwabata Ryūishi 小早川秋声 (1885–1966) executes a huge piece consisting of six panels and more than 7 m long, with the title, *Minamotono Yoshitsune 源義経* (1159–1189) a highly popular historical hero of the 12th Century who tragically ended his short life. But why is the young samurai on camel back? The popular legend goes that Yoshitsune, instead of being killed at the age of 30, could escape Japan and somehow reached Mongolia to become Temujin or the future Genghis Khan (1164–1227). In modern era, the popular baseless belief had been propagated in dead earnest by Suematsu Norizumi 末松謙澄 (1885–1920) or Oyabe Zen’ichirō 小谷部全一郎 (1868–1941).²⁵

Suematsu got married with a daughter of Itō Hirobumi 伊藤博文, Japan’s First Prime Minister and First Resident-General in Korea. A famous diplomat, Suematsu accomplished the mission of explaining Japanese position to the Western statesmen during the Russo-Japanese war, and he is also known as the first translator of the *Tale of Genji* into English. Oyabe Zen’ichirō 小谷部全一郎 (1868–1941) is also famous for his imaginary identification of the Ainu with the Jewish peoples. Author of a highly popular book, *Genghis Khan is Nobody Else than Minamotono Yoshitsune* (1924), Oyabe reiterated his conviction in his *Manchuria and Minamoto no Kurou Yoshitsune* (1933).²⁶ Referring to a fake historical document of the Edo period, Oyabe deploys pseudo-scientific analysis of natural anthropology so as to persuade the readers of his forced identification of two historical heroes.

And yet, fantasy often overshadows reality. Kwabata’s huge panel eloquently testify to this fact, and several other artists, like Kobayakawa Shāsēi 小早川秋声 with *The Earth is Calling* (1940) or Shibata Yoshio 柴田儀蔵 *Tapestry of the Aurora Light* (1940) followed suite.²⁷ The imaginary identification of the Japanese worrier with the founding father of the Mongolian nomadic Empire could not help exercising vast mythological effect. Camel as an exotic animal stimulated the Japanese imagination and induced them to a fictional travel into the deep moon-lit night Desert. A temptation to adventures in search of unknown treasures became favorite subject of popular literature. Bidding a farewell to the tiny archipelago seems to promise the Japanese to appropriate a vast and fertile Manchurian field at their disposal.²⁸ In their illusory representation of the Mānhząguó, the vague yearning to the caravan expedition into the Mongolian desert was somehow mysteriously connected with the dream of prosperity of Manchurian Forest and Field which seem to await the immigrant settlers.²⁹

Such association of imageries encouraged the Japanese to psychologically legitimize their disproportionate ambition of building up a second Mongolian Empire, like an atavism, under the banner of “Five Races in Harmonious Collaboration”. The Slogan “Gozoku Kyôwa” 五族協和 was a homonymous replacement (at least in Japanese pronunciation) of “Gozoku Kyôwa” 五族共和, the Republican slogan put forward by Sūn Wēn 孫文 (1866–1925) in 1913 at the declaration of Independence of the Republic of China. Of the five ethnic groups Sūn Wēn had in mind, three, namely, Chinese, Mongolian and Manchurian were kept as they were, while Moslem and Tibetan were replaced by Korean and Japanese in the Mānhząguó version. What kind of allegory was attempted so as to celebrate the slogan of racial collaboration?

---


²⁸ See, for example, Kimura Ihei 柴田儀蔵 (photo) Hara Hiroshi 原弘(Rayout), *Royal Road and Earthly Paradise 『王道楽土』* Aris, 1943. Analysis of Manchuria Graphic 『満洲グラフ』 is worth accomplishing (reprint forthcoming).
5. Allegory of Ethnic Conciliation

Kawabata Ryushi was one of the painters who made the sky tour around the Baektsosan. The serial feuilleton in the *Tokyo Daily News* (東京日々新聞) includes his bird-eye-view sketch and text (August, 3 1937). In the following period, Rûshi realizes four huge panels under the general title of 大陸策 or Continent Projects. The first *Paying Tribute to the Rising Sun* is based on the Great Wall. The second is *Yoshitsune* on the Camel back (1937–8), the third *Kôrohô* 香炉峰 (1939) and the last one *clouds collecting Flowers* 花摘雲 (1940). Kôrohô refers to a Classical Chinese poem by Bîi Jîi (776–846), which has been extremely well known in Japan, but the panel directly echoes the painter’s experience of looking down the Lúshān 蘆山 mountain from the sky. A Japanese fighter aircraft was specially provided for the painter’s observation by the army. Curiously the air plain’s body is rendered translucent, which seems to prelude the forth panel where the spring winds passing through the Mongolian Steppe are allegorically personified into transparent heavenly maidens, who are blowing up wild flowers. Buddhist female divinities flying in the sky might be counted among possible sources of inspiration.

While allegorical representation of human figures was a commonplace in Western Fine Arts academy, it was not easily understood nor widely accepted in the East. For long, the Japanese artists were rather reluctant to appropriate that part of the Western tradition. The only exceptions were the pieces prepared for decorations in Western style public buildings. Among possible precedents of Ryushi’s allegorical panels, one may point out the mural painting of Hagoromo (1921–24) by Wada Sanzô (1883–1967), destined for the Korean Government General Building in Keijô (actual Seoul). The legend of the heavenly maiden who had to stand on earth for lack of feather robe (‘hagoromo’ which served as wings) was a type of folklore the artist selected because the story was widespread all over the East-Asia, including Japan and Korea.

Generally speaking female figures have been preferred in allegory. In the case of Mânzhûguó 滿洲國, Ôki Toyohira’s *New Country Manchuria* (1934) represents a woman accompanying two children, all dressed in Manchurian fashion, all dressed in Manchurian fashion. Two years later Okada Saburôsuke (1869–1939) executed *Peaceful Collaboration of the Races* 民族協和 for the decoration of the Grand Hall of the State Department of Mânzhûguó 滿洲國. Five Women dressed in ethnic fashion in alignment allegorically represent five races composing the country. It is not clear if the game played in the scene was supposed to be understood by the public, for the game stems from the ‘anti-humanistic’ negotiation in the female slave trade. Unless the theme was neglected or overlooked, it could hardly be an appropriate theme for the public decoration to promote interracial cooperation of five ethnic groups! During the precedent Rèhé operation, a similar propaganda is known to have been diffused. There, five men from different ethnic background forming a sort of scrimmage. The possibility of re-appropriation of this poster by way of ‘feminization’ of the five male figures cannot be excluded. Although the treatment of the subject is rather mediocre, the image seems to be widely reproduced and diffused with some variations both in postcards and mailing stamps.\(^{31}\)

Most problematical among the allegorical formulation of the Manchurian Ideal may be the case of 興亜曼荼羅 or Mandala for Aisan Prosperity (1940) by Wada Sanzô. As Nishihara Daisuke observes, numerous local manners and customs of Bali, India, Tibet, Micronesia, Malay, Mongol, Korea, China etc. can be discerned in stereotypical representations. But they are juxtaposed in a montage which defies any principle of classification. In the middle of these confusions there stands a podium on which a winged angel-like person handles two while horses drawing a carriage.\(^{32}\) It seems as if Apollo in Greek Mythology were combined with the symbol of the Rising Sun in such an unusual syncretism that its archetypal precedent model is not easily found. Unless new proposals are made as for the source of inspiration, all that can be said on this piece for the time being remains hypothetical: The dream of Manchurian utopia requested a colorful cacophony to which the conventional combination of Orientalism in the motif selection and Occidentalism as a template was not enough to propose any convincing unifying principle. Remodeling the Western style allegory fell short of expectation, and replacement was still to be searched.\(^{33}\)

6. The Khalkha River

Let us turn our attention to the Mongolian border in the period following the break out of Chino-Japanese War in 1937. The area along the Khalkha River was the Western frontier of Mânzhûguó 滿洲國 facing Mongolian People’s Republic. The Eastern part of the Inner Mongolia or Nêi Mênggû 内蒙古, as it used to be called in China, belonged to the territory of the Qing Dynasty. However no agreement had been reached as of the borderline, which caused frequent minor military conflicts (the notion of nation-state border was lacking among the Mongolian clans). In reality, the Mongolian People’s Republic (1924–1996) was a de facto satellite state of the Soviet Union, whereas Mânzhûguó (1931–1945) including part of the Outer Mongolia was internationally regarded as a puppet monarchy of the Japanese Empire. As Owen Lattimore put it, this situation was enough to make Manchuria “a cradle of conflict”.\(^{34}\)

The COM-intern was convinced by 1932 that Japan had made determination to open massive aggression vis-à-vis the Communists regimes in the near future. This conviction was based on the so-called Tanaka memorandum, allegedly attributed to the Prime Minister Tanaka Giichi 田中義一 (1929), al-

\(^{31}\) Kishi Toshihiko, op.cit., pp. 194–197, 205–207. However Kishi does not question the ambiguity of the subject-matter.

\(^{32}\) Nishihara Daisuke, art.cit. p. 208.


though the document lacks in authenticity. 35 Japan in fact was far from being ready for the military maneuver suspected by Moscow. Yet Tokyo revealed its incapacity of controlling the disobedient adventurous repeated at the Kanto gun headquarters in Manchuria. The lieutenant-colonel Tsuji Masanobu is regarded as being the main responsible person for the arbitrary decision making in Kanto gun staff.36

These circumstances resulted in the so-called Nomonhan incident which broke out on May 11, 1939. The battle ended with the cease fire on Sep. 16, reporting Japan’s devastating defeat with more than 20,000 deaths on the field. Recent studies revealed that the casualties in Soviet camp were no less important than the one recorded by the Japanese side.37 And yet the tactical failure on the battlefield as well as the strategic loss was taken seriously by the Imperial General Staff in Tokyo: the polity of the North Strike Group (favored by the army) was judged untenable and gave way to the South Strike Group (favored by the navy), which eventually resulted in the attack of Pearl Harbor by the Japanese Navy on Dec. 7, 1941.

The most famous painting reporting the incident is undoubtedly the Battle of Khalkha River 《哈爾哈河畔の戦闘》(1941) by Fujita Tsuguharu 藤田嗣治 (1886–1968). Let us have a brief look at his artistic career. Being the author of an early Landscape in Korea (1913), Fujita stayed in Europe for a long period, experiencing the First World War before returning to Japan in 1932 after a tour in Latin America. Based on his experience in Beijing in 1934, he painted Wrestlers in Peking (1935). He also enjoyed a round trip in Manchuria in April 1935 together with Ishii Hakutei and Taguchi Jotei. Their disembarkation at the Port of Dalian is reported in the Daily Manchuria on April 23, 1935. One photographic bromide of the period, presumably distributed by the painter himself with his own handwritten signature, is found in my grandfather’s archives, hinting at Fujita’s sociability as well as the popularity he enjoyed.

The Battle of Khalkha River presents a vast panorama of the Mongolian steppe under the blue sky. The huge canvas of 448 cm long and 140 cm high represents Japanese soldiers capturing a Soviet tank. The scene does not evoke any possibility of Japanese defeat. Originally the painting was not officially commanded but was executed by a personal order of the lieutenant-general Ogisu Ippei, who had been put into reserve but was executed by a personal order of the lieutenant-general Ogisu Ippei, who had been put into reserve and assumed responsibility of his failed command in the operation. The piece of work is said to be treated as the “document of the military operation” only later when the souls of fallen soldiers in the

Nomonhan Incident were to be buried in the Yasukuni Shrine, near the Imperial Palace in Tokyo.

From the night of July 2nd to the following morning, Japanese 23rd Infantry Division crossed the Khalkin Gol to the West by making use of the unique pontoon bridge and occupied Baintsagan Hill. It is said that almost one hundred guns and five anti-tank guns were dismounted on the east bank and remounted on the west bank. However, the Russians, perceiving the treat, launched a counter attack with ca. 450 tanks and armored cars. Unable to confront with the defended Soviet force, the Japanese force had to withdraw, re-crossing the river on July 5th, leaving behind “thousands of dead solders, a huge amount of the dead horses and countless guns and cars” according to the report by the commander, General Georgy Zhukov.38 Many soldiers were reported to be drawn while crossing the river back to the East bank. The two armies continue to spar with each other over the next two weeks along a 4 km front running along the east bank of the Khalkyn Gol to its junction with the Holsten River.39

Kaneko Maki supposes that Fujita’s painting depicts the Japanese assault on the Soviet armored force near the above mentioned junction. Japanese 23th Infantry Division encircled the Soviet armored force detached from the 11th brigade and tried to annihilate it. 40 It is reported that the Japanese soldiers, for lack of heavy artillery, mainly relied on a quasi-suicidal attack of throwing Molotov cocktails or manually putting the mine in the caterpillar so as to immobilize enemy tanks before capturing them. The tactic was partly effective at this stage as the Soviet force was not sufficiently supported by infantry. On July 25 the Japanese disengaged from the attack due to mounting casualties and depleted artillery stores. To this point they had suffered over five thousand casualties. The battle drifted into stalemate.

Several people reported that beside the publicly known piece, Fujita secretly executed another hidden and ‘negative’ version, so to speak, of the Battle of Kharlka River. Rare eyewitnesses agree to have recognized the appalling scene of the definitive annihilation of the Japanese infantry in their desperate counter-attacks. 41 While Japanese army officers wielding swords so as to lead their men into the final charge, aux armes blanches leaving behind their ultimate trenches, Advancing Soviet tanks relentlessly crash countless bodies and scatter arms

36 Alvin D. Cox, Nomonhan, Japan against Russia, 1939, in 2 vol. Stanford University Press, 1985 remains the classic. In 2009, at the 70th anniversary of the incident, several scholarly international meetings were held so as to examine the issue. “Battle of Khalkhin Gol” in Wikipedia (Sep. 20, 2010) gives a high-quality professional description, to which I refer here.
40 B. Baabar, From World Power to Soviet Satellite: History of Mongolia, University of Cambridge Press, 1999, marks one of the first revisions of the issue in Western language.
and legs of the fallen Japanese soldiers, victims of repetitive artillery and air attacks. Presumably the scene depicts the end of the Japanese 26th Division on 25th August, when it was pinned down and encircled by two wings of Zhukov’s massive armed forces. By the 31th August, the overwhelming Soviet mechanized unit controlled the entire battle.

The defeat was kept secret to Japanese public. This forbidden representation of the Japanese infantry in destruction had never been publicly exhibited but kept concealed in the private house of the army general who had ordered the painting. The whereabouts of the piece remains unknown and specialists suppose that it has already been destroyed for good.

The war painting as a genre in Western tradition used to officially represent the border area or the front line of the Western conquest of the Non-Western world. This institutional apparatus was originally invented to celebrate the Western domination over the Rest of the world. For this reason it constituted one of the important sub-genre of the Orientalist painting. However Asia in 20th Century appropriated the Western apparatus so as to represent Asian struggle for political legitimacy and power hegemony in the international scene.

The military confrontation between the Red Army and the Japanese armed forces touched the limit of pictorial representation with Fujita’s doomed painting. In a sense the merging of the Orientalism with the Occidentalism reached the point of ir-representability. Far from celebrating the military victory, for which the genre was intended, Fujita’s hidden work reveals that the truth of in-human reality of the war stands in opposition to the purpose of enhancing fighting spirit and militaristic patriotism. How is it possible to call the painter a collaborator of the war? And yet Fujita was accused of war time collaboration by his colleagues after the war and had to choose to exile himself. This brings us to our final topic.

7. Political Exiles Crossing the frontiers

So far, the paper briefly examined three major territorial issues of Manzhouguo in chronological order. It aimed to examine the overlapping of Orientalism and Occidentalism in (1) the Gando Problem (1876–1931: Eastern border), (2) the Réhé operation (1933–37: Southern border) and (3) Nomohan Incident (1939: Western Border) by taking account of the geopolitical conditions and historical background. In the frontiers of the artificial puppet monarchy that Japan fabricated, the politics of Asian image reveals its problematical profiles. Among the five ethnic groups officially constituting the new monarchy, Korean, Manchurian, Han, and Mongolian positioning toward the Japanese military rule has been respectively highlighted. The visual documents examined above witness to the residing challenges that attempts of demonstrating the ideals of trans-ethnic identity of Asia-ness had to face in the socio-historic context of the modern Manchuria. Let us now return to Gando area before concluding the whole discussion.

On March 1, 1932, the very day of the declaration of Independence of Manzhouguo, a Japanese proletarian poet, Makimura Hiroshi (1912–1938) published a long poem, The Song of Kando Partisan to be arrested immediately in charge of the violation of the Peace Preservation Law. Indeed, Gando was famous for anti-Japanese partisan movement, in which Kim Il-sung (1912–1994) made himself conspicuous. Yamamoto Sanehiko 山本真彦 (1885–1952) president of the Influential intellectual monthly, Kaizô Reform visited Lyonjuong the same year of 1932. Japanese underground activists and secret agents, including several members of the clandestine Communist members penetrated the region. Such incident as Minshengtuan 民生団 affair (1932–35) is reported in which the Chinese Communist Party purged and executed many Korean activists as anti-Communist spies. A distinguished journalist, Ōya Sōchi 大宅壮一 (1900–1970) also visited Gando in 1935, testifying to the importance of the region.

In the meanwhile, the expedition of the Kyoto Imperial University lead by Imanishi Kinji 今西錦司 (1902–1992), famous ecologist, successfully climbed the summit of Baektosan for the first time in winter season in January 1935. Stimulated by this success, the Mountaineering Club of the Third High School team reached the mountain in the summer 1940, to find out the source of Second Songhua Jiang 第二松花江. Among the members was Umeao Tadao 梅棹忠夫 (1920–2010), founding father of the National Ethnological Museum in the future. It is no exaggeration that some of the most original scholarly contributions in ecological studies as well as in ethnological writing of Mongolia in the post-war period Japan find their origin in the pre-war expedition in the Gando region.

The frontier area around the town of Lyonjuong was also famous for its high standard in education. It was partly because of the Japanese implementation in education, as Shinoda Jisaku 信田静克 proudly stresses, but it should not be overlooked that Kando was also a place where “many anti-Japanese rebellious Koreans have crept in” so as to escape from the pursuit in the peninsula. As a typical “rebellious Korean,” Shinoda points out the case of Yi Sang-Seol 李相說 (1870–1917), one of the main figures of the Haag Secret Emissary Affaire in 1907, which resulted from Korean Emperor Gojong’s sending confidential emissaries to the Second Peace Conference at The Hague, Netherlands in 1907. Yi Sang-Seol opened a private school in Hague to conduct patriotic teaching. The famous Korean national poet also appeared from the same intellectual background of Lyonjuong. Yun Dongji 尹東柱 (1917–1945) graduated from the Kōmyô Gakuen Middle school 光明学園中学部, a school of Japanese private initiative located in the city, in the year of 1938.

On June 13, of the same year, 1938, General Genrikh Samoilovich Lyushkov (Генрих Самойлович Лушков) (1900 – August 19, 1945), NKVD boss of Russian Far-East in the Soviet Union, crossed the Manchuria-Korean border near Hunchun 虎春 by driving a car in search of political asylum. Upon arrival, he transmitted the news that a huge scale purge and executions had begun in the Soviet Red Army. It was only one month later that a military colla-
sion took place between the Soviet Army and the Japanese Army. The incident is known as the Battle of Lake Khasan (July 29, 1938 – August 11, 1938) in Russia and known as the Changkufeng Incident (張鼓峰事件) in China. The incident may be interpreted as constituting a pair with the Nomonhan incident of the following year. If the Changkufeng Incident happened on the North-east border, the Nomonhan Incident was to occur at the extreme-Western border of Manchzhuguo. While the Kando problem stemmed from the concern about the “protection” of the Korean population spreading on the border zone, the Nomonhan problem was deeply rooted in the Mongolian clans subdivided by the vague border area (imposed by the nation-state system) between Inner and Outer Mongolia. Two months later than Rushikoff’s (Lyushkov – ed.) defection, captain Vinberg (or Byanba) fled to Manchuria from the People’s Republic of Mongolia. His narrative of The Escape from the Inner-Mongolia (1939), published in Japanese made a sensation. But this key-person and invaluable source of information seems to be killed abruptly in a combat near the front line of the battle shortly before the cease-fire of the Nomonhan War.46

8. Toward the Northern Border

These elementary knowledge will help us better understand a painting by Ishii Hakutei (石井柏亭 1882–1958), Manchurian Western Border to Soviet Union (1943). Previously Fujishima Takeji 藤島武二 (1867–1943) went so far as to Dolon-nur (多倫湖) to record the camel caravan proceeding in the desert under the rising sun (1937). The Romantic taste of the painter adds to the allegorical representation of the rising sun, as the “symbol of national glory”, which Fujishima also tried to enhance in his depiction of the Yú-shan (p.i.) Jade Mountain in Formosa (1935).47 The picture of Baektosan taken from a airplane in 1936 (which we have examined at the beginning) partakes of a similar sublime feeling that Fujishima wanted to transmit.48 However nothing of such spiritual exaltation can be found in Ishii’s landscape of the vast plain spreading over the deserted border area. One may detect here another limit of the Orientalist painting. No relevant Oriental motif can be seen in this empty space. Theatrical setting requested by the Western academy cannot be tenable here, except for a vague sense of uneasiness with which the stillness of the horizon line is menacing us, letting us anticipate an omen of catastrophe to come. What is menacing is the lack of clear demarcation of the border-line. Oriental perception of the Occident is no longer discernable from the Occident view of the Orient. The Japanese Orientalized Orientalism seems to be at a loss in front of this northern border. Within two years, the catastrophe comes to true: on August 8, 1945, a massive Soviet armored force of Subbaikal unit, with 2359 tanks and self-propelled guns will rush into Manchuria through this border area so as to put a definitive end to the Orientalist illusion that Japan has fostered in its effort of transforming itself in an Occidentalized colonial empire.49

44 “The Incident is interpreted as an attempted military incursion of Manchukuo (Japanese) into the territory claimed by the Soviet Union. This incursion was founded in the beliefs of the Soviet side that the Manchukuo army would not defend the demarcation border. The Japanese side misinterpreted the demarcation of the border made by the Treaty of Peking between Imperial Russia and the Manchu Empire (and subsequent supplementary agreements on demarcation), and furthermore, that the demarcation markers were tampered with.” (“Battle of Lake Khasan” from Wikipedia, Sep. 20, 2010.)


46 Tanaka Katsuhiro, op. cit., ch.7. The book gives detailed a bibliography including publications in Russian and Mongolian languages.


48 The mountain was renamed in Japanese as Niitakayama 新高岳, or New-High-Mountain, a codename for the Pearl Harbor surprise attack by the Japanese Navy on Dec. 7, 1941, showing the symbolic importance of the site for military operation.


50 Of course this was only the beginning of another story, which I should address on another occasion. Let us just mention the most famous painter who returned alive from the Siberia detention camp, Kazuki Yasuo 香月泰男 (1911–1974), and note an album, Committee for the publication of the paintings by the Siberia detainees (ed.), Kirameku Hokutosei no shita ni 『煌めく北斗星の下に』 (Under the Flickering Seven Stars Indicating the North-Pole), 1989. Ishihara Yoshirô 石原悦郎 (1915–1977), a Japanese poet who survived the detention camp, left Bôkyo to Umi 『望郷と海』 (Nostalgia of the Homeland and the Sea), 1972, probably the ultimate limit of the description of the Gulag, which deserves comparison with Vasily Grossman’s Life and Fate, trans. Robert Chandler, Harper & Law, 1986. On this issue, see Shigemi Inaga, “Resistance to Western Modernity and Temptation of Oriental Absorption,” (English original not published, Japanese translation is forthcoming in, Isomae Ken’ichi (ed.), イメージのなかの戦争: 明治の政治的近代化と大東亜帝国の形成, 以文社, 2010–11.)
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