Landscape theory: post-68 revolutionary cinema in Japan

Hirasawa, G.

Chapter One: Landscape and the Landscape Theory

The landscape theory was initially proposed by film critic Matsuda Masao in the latter half of 1969, and subsequently developed by filmmaker Adachi Masao, script writer Sasaki Mamoru and photographer Nakahira Takuma, causing an enormous controversy. In this chapter, I review how landscape was conceptualized in the process of the modernization which began after the Meiji Restoration in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and was positioned in various cultural domains, by outlining the genealogies of various concepts of landscape with reference to their historical, theoretical, cultural and political backgrounds. Through these comparisons, the position of the landscape theory proposed by Matsuda and others is highlighted.

1. The Birth of Landscape

In the midst of modernization after the Meiji Restoration, the concept of landscape had been discussed in various forms politically, economically, socially, as well as culturally. The discussions were diverse in content, ranging from *Nihon fukei ron* (Discourse on Japanese Landscape) by Shiga Shigetaka, published in 1894, *Chijinron* (Discourse on the earth-human relation) by Uchimura Kanzo, to a series of travel writings by Yanagita Kunio from the 1920's-30's, *Fudo* by Watsuji Tetsuro, and *Nihon Fukeibiron* (Aesthetics discourse on Japanese landscape) by Uehara Keiji in 1943, encompassing geology, philosophy, ethnology, sociology, as well as urban studies; and cultural theories in literature, art, photography and film. The landscape theory proposed by Matsuda and Adachi in the late 1960's through early 1970's, however, discussed issues that were significantly different from the aforementioned ones developed during the early Meiji to the postwar period. Mediated through the analysis of cinema and images, as well as through the joint production of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, Matsuda along with others, discovered the structure of power, not within either specific or symbolic political space, but rather within homogenized and mundane quotidian landscapes. As the trends of the movements symbolizing 1968 were gradually declining, they attempted to define horizons for the theory of power, state, or revolutionary being that were prepared for the new era of the seventies. Previous concepts of landscape, discourses and

theories of landscape prior to those of Matsuda and others in their respective contexts, of course, were closely connected to politics and society. However, their arguments basically revolved around perceptible landscapes. The new landscape theory on the other hand thrust invisible as well as visible landscapes into the foreground. By aiming for this inversion of landscape=power, it attempted to reinscribe the concept in the context of theories of movements and revolution.

This discussion originally unfolded when the word "landscape" was used for the first time in an essay titled *Fukei toshite no sei* (Sex as Landscape) published in the December 28, 1969 issue of *Asahi Journal*. Matsuda used the term "landscape" in introducing the work, *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, which was still being filmed. *A.K.A. Serial Killer* is a documentary film consisting solely of shots of the landscape that nineteen-year old Nagayama Norio, the perpetrator of a series of murders that had taken place in Tokyo, Kyoto, Hakodate and Nagoya from October 1968 to April 1969, may have seen while wandering, from his birth until his arrest. In addition to Matsuda, this film was produced by filmmaker Adachi, script writer Sasaki, producer Iwabuchi Susumu, as well as cinematographer Nonomura Masayuki and Yamazaki Yutaka. Shooting began in July 1969 upon Nagayama's arrest, and was completed by the end of 1969. The whole incident had an enormous impact all across Japan, as the young man who was arrested turned out to be one of those young workers who had been lionized as the "golden eggs" of society, and had gone from the poor Tohoku region to the city for work immediately after graduating from junior high school. Referring to this work in which he himself got involved, Matsuda argues as follows:

> Together with Adachi Masao and other peers, I walked all over the eastern half of Japan following the path of (gun) serial killer Nagayama Norio, starting from Abashiri, to Sapporo, Hakodate, Tsugaru Plain, Tokyo, Nagoya, Kyoto, Osaka to Kobe, and even further to Hong Kong. Calling it a documentary film, we single-mindedly kept filming the landscape of each region that Nagayama also may have seen with his own eyes. We are now creating a strange work that can only be called an actual landscape film because the landscape itself has been first and foremost perceived as a <power> that we are at war with. Perhaps Nagayama shot bullets to tear apart the landscape. State power would recklessly sever the landscape to clear paths, for instance, for the Tomei Highway. While we are enjoying a pleasant drive on that highway, it is at that very moment that the landscape haunts us, and <power> can seize us. So, whether or not it is a

> merciless situation or status quo, we venture to say that it doesn't matter to us. Have we not even transcended the landscape?[24]

At the beginning of the essay above, on the work of Wakamatsu Koji, Matsuda discusses Wakamatsu's *Yuke yuke nidome no shojo* (Go, Go, Second Time Virgin, 1969), which was scripted by Adachi, using the concept of the 'locked room' to analyze the film. The film tells a unique love story about a young couple, set on the rooftop of an apartment building. Comparing it with *Taiji ga mitsuryo suru toki* (The Embryo Hunts in Secret, 1966), Matsuda points out that both are locked-room dramas shot in the closed interior spaces of a single house and a single room. He further argues that, in contrast to *The Embryo Hunts in Secret*, where a literal locked room in an apartment was used, the 'locked room' in Go, Go Second Time Virgin was an artificial space constituted by being locked at midnight, which is characterized by the 'locked room' of the rooftop, which, paradoxically, is infinitely open to the sky and linked to the brightly colored urban landscape. He pulled the concept of 'landscape' from the last sequence in which the couple throw themselves off the roof, to step out of this locked room to the outside.

> It is only out into the landscape that a young boy can step. There is nothing that the young boy and girl can do but lightly jump over the wire fence, throw themselves into the landscape, and die.[25]

Matsuda indicates that, by pushing the inquiry of the locked room to an extreme, Wakamatsu and Adachi depicted that even the act of 'sex,' which is extremely personal and internal, can be contained by the external 'landscape'. Discovering the concern shared between his argument and *A.K.A. Serial Killer* which was then being filmed, Matsuda suggests that the quotidian landscape was indeed a manifestation

---

[24] Matsuda Masao, "Fukei toshiteno Sei - Wakamatsu eiga to misshitsu no yutopia" [Sex as landscape: Wakamatsu films and the utopia of the locked room], *Asahi Janaru* [Asahi Journal] 11, no.52 (28th December 1969): 12-17, in *Bara to Mumeisha* [A Rose and the Nameless] (Tokyo: Hagashoten, 1970), 123-124. *Bara to Mumeisha* is Matsuda's second book of film criticism, in which this essay is included, with the revised title "Misshitsu/fukei/kenryoku -Wakamatsu eiga to 'Sei' to 'Kaiho'"[Locked room/landscape/power: Wakamatsu film and 'sex' and 'liberation']. Though the essay attests to the origin of landscape theory, it was not included in *Fukei no Shimetsu* [Extinction of landscape], his third book, compiling essays on landscape. However, it is included as an opening essay in *Zohoban: Fukei no Shimetsu* [Newly expanded edition: Extinction of Landscape] (Tokyo: Koshisha, 2013).

[25] Matsuda, *A Rose and the Nameless*, 125.

of power. Furthermore, in *Fukei toshiteno Toshi* (City as Landscape) published in the April, 1970 issue of *Gendai no Me* (Contemporary Eye), he began to clearly present the theory of landscape as a theory of power. Adachi responded to the theory of landscape through roundtable discussions and interviews, as well as his own essays on films. In response to *Sex as Landscape*, Nakahira immediately embarked on developing his own photographic work and a theory based on the theme of landscape, thereby expanding the discussions beyond the framework of cinema to theories on photography and art. Film Director Oshima Nagisa also selected filmmaker Hara Masataka (Masato), and based on a script co-written with Sasaki, he produced *Tokyo Senso Sengo Hiwa* (The Man Who Left His Will on Film, 1970), which also dealt with the theme of landscape. It was within this series of actions and trends that such terms as landscape and the theory of landscape—which had almost never been discussed after the war—came to prominence in film, photography and art, as well as in journals of various fields, thereby causing large controversies as a keyword for the new era.

2. *Nihon Fukei Ron* by Shiga Shigetaka and *Chijinron* by Uchimura Kanzo

Modernization through the Meiji Restoration started, and new forms of writings on nature, culture, as well as travel writings by authors became popular. In the genealogy of landscape it is Shiga Shigetaka 's *Discourse on Japanese Landscape* that first formalized the new writings in the form of essays on landscape theory.[26] *Discourse on Japanese Landscape* was originally issued in the journal *Ajia* (Asia) in 1893, and published as a book in 1894. It became a bestseller, going through fifteen editions in twenty years. Shiga rode on a naval training ship and visited New Zealand, Australia, Hawaii and so forth, for research. Impacted enormously by the colonial rule of the western powers he witnessed, and feeling a sense of crisis as a member of an Asian country of lesser powers, he published *Nanyo Jiji* (Current events in the South Sea Islands), immediately after returning home. In 1888 he co-founded Seikyosha (the

[26] Of course, prior to this, the theme of landscape can be found in essays, including *Makuranososhi* [The Pillow Book] by Sei Shonagon, Essays in *Tsurezuregusa* [Idleness] by Yoshida Kenko in the Heian Period, as well as *Oku no Hosomichi* [The Narrow Road to the Deep North] by Matsuo Basho in the Edo period, as well as in the tradition of *Sansui-ga* (landscape paintings) in the domain of visual art. Here, however, I would like to focus on the post-Meiji period, in which the concept of landscape had become established through the process of modernization.

Society for Political Education) with Miyake Setsurei and others and published its journal *Nihonjin* (Japanese) to advocate conservatism based on national essence (*kokusui hozonshugi*). The journal featured contents to address the sovereignty of the nation and the idea of *fukoku kyohei* (enrich the country, strengthen the armed forces). It aimed for a uniquely Japanese modernization, one not based on exclusionism, but on a scientific understanding of Japan and the world in terms of geographical conditions, and the establishment of constitutionalism, rather than the *Hanbatsu Seiji* (clique politics) led by the Satsuma and Choshu domains. These thoughts, along with populism (Heimin Shugi) of Tokutomi Soho, which was promoted during the period of *Jiyu Minken Undo* (The Freedom and People's Rights Movement), became a major trend on both the left and right in the twenties of the Meiji Period.

Under those circumstances, the publication of *Japanese* was suspended due to its stance against the policy of Europeanization promoted by the new government. Shiga subsequently published the journal *Ajia* (Asia) as a successor to *Japanese*. However, when that was also suspended, he resumed publication of *Japanese*. It was through the strategy of directly criticizing politics in *Japanese*, and developing philosophical and cultural discussions in Asia, that *Discourse on Japanese Landscape*, discussing the beauty of the Japanese landscape, was created. In his argument on landscape, Shiga proposes the three concepts of elegance, beauty, and openness. After giving examples of their characteristics, he cites their four bases as follows.

1. There is diversity of climate and ocean currents in Japan
2. There is a great amount of water vapor in Japan
3. There are many volcanic stones in Japan
4. There is intense erosion by flowing water in Japan[27]

Shiga detailed geographical characteristics of Japan, such as: its diverse climate, its ocean currents, its being a long and narrow archipelago extending from north to south, its humidity, its numerous volcanoes, and the severe erosion of land by flowing water. He provided a historical overview of the landscape in Japan, and recommended mountain climbing. As a result, notable and classical

[27] Shiga Shigetaka, *Nihon Fukeiron* [Discourse on Japanese Landscape](Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1937), 35.

landscapes or descriptions of nature were thrust to the background, and instead, a powerful, peripheral alpine beauty, characterized by big and tall mountains, stones, rocks, and mountain streams was discovered. Through his discussion, Shiga redefined nature itself as landscape, and elevated it to an aesthetic concept, opening up landscape theory as a new horizon. His writing, however, contained seemingly irreconcilable elements; his discussion of landscape on the one hand introduced scientific viewpoints, and used antiquated literary expression, imitative of classical Chinese, on the other. Shiga argued that the Japanese landscape was the most beautiful in the world, as follows:

> However, the Japanese people describe the beauty of the Japanese mountains and rivers not because they exist in their home country, but because they, in fact, hold absolute beauty in comparison to foreign countries. [28]

This new discovery of the Japanese landscape served the attempt to build nationalist spirit and sentiment, and thereby to support culturally the establishment of Japan as a modern nation that could compete with Western countries. Paradoxically, it strove to oppose Western power by introducing a concept of landscape born of Western modernity to indicate the superiority of Japanese beauty. It was eclectic in terms of its aesthetic values; instead of tracing history prior to the Meiji era, with the western notions of the sublime and beauty in mind, notions of elegance, beauty and openness were juxtaposed, while Mt.Fuji was still cited as representative of traditional beauty. Therefore, despite the differences in policies from the existing administration, it had the same ideological bases in nationalism and ethnocentrism, and as Japan was rapidly establishing itself as a modern nation-state through the victory in the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, and interest in this book grew enormously, it gradually lost its initial critical ground. Furthermore, Shiga's theory of landscape became institutionalized by being assimilated into the imperialistic discourse of the Meiji government, which advanced into the invasion of Asia under the banner of Pan-Asianism (*koa-ron*). The new discovery of the Japanese landscape through the eyes of

[28] Ibid., 28.

the modernity similar to Japan's modernity itself, with various contradictions unresolved, ended up being established in the nationalistic and ethnocentric context, limiting the direction of subsequent debates.[29]

On the other hand, another important book, contemporaneous to *Discourse on Japanese Landscape* was written, called *Chirigaku-ko* (Thoughts on Geography Study), by Uchimura Kanzo. The book discussed Japan and its landscape from a geographical perspective. Uchimura, a geographer and Christian thinker, published it as a book of geography in 1894, and renamed it *Chijinron* (Discourse on the earth-human relation) when the book was reprinted in 1897. While introducing the aims and history of geography as a new discipline, he analyzed the continents of Asia, Europe, and the United States respectively, which were further examined through categories such as Orient and Japan.

> If this is compared to the infinity of space, the fineness of dust would still be large, and if this is compared to the sun—which should not be called large among all the heavenly stars, it is less than one 1.3 millionth. If this is compared with Jupiter, its sister planet, it is like a little bean in proportion to an orange. However, a single point of this small space of dust, an earth of size of a tiny bean, is indeed the place where our life becomes connected. I have my life here for the first time, I am raised here, I comprehend here, I love here, I am loved here, and I die here, leaving my corpse here. The earth that provides life to me, the earth that gives my life, the earth where my remains are entrusted. I will not rest until I have researched this earth.[30]

Since the target of his discussion is the world at large and just including Japan as part of it, and the Japanese landscape is not discussed exclusively, his book is rarely mentioned in the context of the landscape theory. However, it attempted to show the universality of the concept of landscape in terms of the scale of the earth and planets, beyond the geographical framework of the West, the East, Japan, and the nation. By setting aside preconceived notions about Japan and locating its basis in a global context, his analysis crossed domains, including politics, economy, culture, history and religion, as its geopolitical

---

[29] A number of writers discussed essays on landscape by Shiga. For a pioneering re-examination after the war, see Irokawa Daikichi, "Toyo no kokuchisha Tenshin —sono shogai no dorama," ed. Irokawa Daikichi, *Nihon no meicho 39 Okakura Tenshin, Shiga Shigetaka* [Masterpieces of Japanese Literature 39: Okakura Tenshin and Shiga Shigetaka](Tokyo: Chuokoronsha, 1970), 5-63. See also: Inose Naoki, "Hyoden Shiga Shigetaka to 'Nihon Fukeiron,'"[A Critical Biography: Shiga Shigetaka and 'The Theory of the Japanese Landscape'] in *Nihon Fukeiron Kaidai* [Bibliographical Introduction to The Theory of the Japanese Landscape](Tokyo: Iizuka Shobo, 1977), 29-123. Omuro Mikio, *Shiga Shigetaka "Nihon Fukei Ron" Seidoku* [An Explication of The Theory of the Japanese Landscape](Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 2013).

[30] Uchimura Kanzo, *Chijinron*[Discourse on the earth-human relation](Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1942), 11.

conditions. [31] Uchimura, a non-denominational Christian who was known for claiming to be a pacifist during the time of his treason incident and the Russo-Japanese War, and Shiga, a nationalist, were at the opposite ends in terms of thought, politics, and process of conceptualizing landscape. However, they were friends, as a senior and a junior during their school days at Sapporo Nogakko (Sapporo Agricultural College), which was established for the purpose of training engineers to develop Hokkaido. Hokkaido, a subarctic region located at the northern tip of Japan, was the land of the indigenous people called Ainu, but through modernization it had become an active target for development, providing a setting for Uchimura and Shiga to pursue new geography. While in his review of On the Japanese Landscape, Uchimura praised Shiga highly, calling him a 'Japanese Ruskin,' (referencing John Ruskin, a British art historian who discussed the history of landscape paintings in Modern Painters in the mid-19th century), he was critical of the praising of the landscape in connection to Japanese beauty.

> Japan is beautiful, beautiful garden-wise, and beautiful park-wise, but I believe there are other beautiful places. Namely, an image of Monte Rosa seen from Aosta, or a view of Mount Everest glimpsed from Darjeeling. Magnificent beauty is indeed what is lacking in the Japanese landscape. The landscape of our country makes people feel entranced (due to too much detail), and the beauty that elevates people, that is, the beauty that makes people rise above themselves, I believe, cannot be sought in every country. I think Mr. Shiga did not mention this as a result of his literary skills, however, I say this here as a critic, and as patriotism is rising today, the task of the critic to say words from a non-state perspective is also difficult.[32]

Uchimura critiqued Shiga's discussion of Japan's superiority through comparisons between Japanese and European landscapes, but without providing a full justification of his critique. He further challenged Shiga's aesthetic criteria itself, which juxtaposed the sublime with the aesthetic. At a time of rising patriotism, he even called his own statement a "non-state statement" and sharply criticized the nationalist tone of Shiga's argument. The series of historical changes that had taken Western Europe more than a century to undergo took place in the case of Japan's modernization in an extremely condensed

[31] For studies that reassessed Uchimura in the context of landscape theory, see Uchida Yoshiaki, *Gendaini ikiru Uchimura Kanzo* [Uchimura Kanzo living today](Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1991), *Fukei no Hakken* [Discovery of Landscape](Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 2001). Uchida argues that Uchimura's theory moved towards establishing a cosmology based on landscape theory beyond the framework of a nation, world or the earth.
[32] *Uchimura Kanzo Zenshu 3* [The Complete Works of Uchimura Kanzo vol.3] (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1981), 154.

manner and timeframe. This extreme modernization produced significant strains, leading to events such as Imperial Japan's invasion of Asia and its plunge into the Second World War. Viewed based on these aspects of Japan's negative history, Uchimura's geography and discourse of landscape—which had rigorously critiqued them—indicated a theoretical possibility to contest a 'landscape' that had become sequestered and embodied by Imperialism, ethnocentricism, and politics with a capital 'P.'

3. Before 'Landscape'

Before Shiga's Theory of Japanese Landscape, and also before the Meiji Restoration, the term 'landscape' existed, and in this sense, it is not that landscape was born for the first time through modernization. Furthermore, historically various terms that are similar to landscape had been used in Japan as well. Augustin Berque, a French geographer who advocated climatology (*fudo-gaku*), described how landscape had been constituted in Japan as follows.

> The term "landscape", like its synonyms "sight (kokei)", "scenery (keshiki)" and also "landscape with mountain and river (sansui)", comes from China. Along with these words, a set of aesthetic schemes was introduced from China, and penetrated the thinking of Japanese elite class deeply. These schemes established the Japanese landscape in the Heian period. As in the Chinese maxim "Picturesque landscape", we perceive the landscape through our trained gaze, educated by paintings and poetry, etc. Without such education, what we perceive is merely an environment.[33]

According to Berque, the idea of landscape in Japan, which was introduced from China, where the concept had already been created by the late third century, differed significantly from ideas of landscape in Europe. As for the term 'landscape' in Western languages, the word '*landschap*' developed in Dutch at the end of the 16th century and spread to neighboring countries. It corresponds to 'landscape' in English, '*Landschaft*' in German, and '*paysage*' in French. Words such as 'land' and 'pays,' which represented "land" and "region", are those from which the concept of "landscape" was derived. On the

[33] Augustin Berque, Nihon no fukei, seio no keikan, soshite zokei no jidai [Japanese Landscape, Western Scenery and the Age of the Created Landscape] (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1990), 49. For a history of *sansui-ga* (landscape paintings) that had existed much longer than western landscape paintings, see also, Michael Sullivan, *The Birth of Landscape Painting in China* (University of California Press, 1962); Aoki Shigeru, Shizen o utsusu——Higashi no sansuiga, nishi no fukeiga, suisaiga [Reflecting Nature: Landscape Paintings in the East, Scenic Paintings and Watercolor Paintings in the West] (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1996).

other hand, landscape or *fukei* in Japanese can be divided into two kanji characters, 'wind' (*fu*) and 'scenery' (*kei*). The former represents a dynamic atmosphere in the air, and the latter is associated with an ancient Japanese word, '*keshiki*', which represents the state of nature or people. Both refer to certain environments and conditions, but do not include the specificity of a particular land or region. On the other hand, poems in *Manyoshu*, the oldest collection of Japanese waka poetry, compiled at the end of the Nara period (CE710-794), shows that expressions in which one's feelings are metaphorically entrusted to the changes of seasons can be thought of as something landscape-like that preceded the concept of landscape from China. These pre-landscape expressions, and the concept of landscape from China, together took root over a long period of time, and the western realistic landscape notion was introduced subsequently, in the late 19th century. Berque argues on this history as follows:

> Neither 'forest' (silva) nor 'mountain' had long been a natural landscape in the same sense that we conceive of today. In other words, they were not landscapes that were granted aesthetic value. In Europe, it was necessary to wait for the arrival of the Romantic aesthetic in the Eighteenth century for a mountain to become a beautiful landscape. In Japan, the aestheticization of the "mountain" took place in two stages. The new one dates back to the introduction of European landscape schemes during the Meiji period. The older one had been established since the Nara period, under the influence of models of literature and painting from China. Of course, at either stage, the new scheme had connections to older elements.[34]

He argues that the introduction of new ideas of landscape from China and the west gave the impetus for the Japanese notion of landscape to be formed, in relation to a pre-landscape, or a *sansui*-like landscape. Completely new concepts of landscape were introduced from China and the west, however: instead of the perception that the idea of landscape was rewritten entirely, it became established rather in the context of traditional landscapes. *Utamakura* (literally "poem pillows") that refer to famous place names used in poetry have long been established as terms that describe landscape beauty, and the above-mentioned *Manyoshu*, *Kokin Wakashu*, and *Shinkokin Wakashu* have been referred to as three representative *waka* (poetry) anthologies in Japan, and classical poets such as Otomo no Yakamochi, Saigyo in the Heian period (794-1185), Minamoto no Mitsuasa and the Emperor Gotoba have been

[34] Berque, *Nihon no fukei, seio no keikan, soshite zokei no jidai*, 90-92.

widely recognized as representative poets who read landscapes. However, *utamakura* do not represent landscapes as they were literally seen. Instead they reflect the emotions and feelings of the poets associated with the landscapes, and were used to indicate stylistic beauty, or as symbols that conceptually express the beauty or mystery of nature, rather than an individual landscape. Though *yamato-e*(英語), *meisho-e*(英語) and *shiki-e*(英語) paintings based on *utamakura* were born under the influence of Sansui-ga or Chinese-style landscape paintings, despite depicting the same landscape, they differed formally from realistic, or perspective landscape paintings.

Meanwhile, in the Edo period (1600-1868), poet Matsuo Basho traveled throughout the nation and published *Oku no Hosomichi* (Narrow Road to the Deep North). In addition, traveler and naturalist Sugae Masumi conducted nationwide fieldwork, and compiled his reports as *Masumi Sugae Yuranki* (Masumi Sugae's travelogue) indicating an attitude towards landscape that suggests a theory, before modernization. On the other hand, *ukiyo-e* (commercially published prints) was invented as a development from *Yamato-e*, and with themes depicting the customs of the same period as its characteristics, many *Meisho-e* or pictures of famous places were drawn. Katsushika Hokusai's *Thirty-six Views of Mount Fuji* in the late Edo period is known as a representative work. Hokusai is said to have adopted perspective in his picture-making, however, the technique can be seen in some of the True View Paintings from the same period, which were in the line of *Meisho-e*. Though Japan remained isolated from outside countries for a long time in the Edo period, Western landscape paintings and science were introduced through Dutch culture, which was informed through Dejima, the Dutch trading post located in Nagasaki, the only place where trading was possible, and *Dainihon enkai yochi zenzu* (The Coastal Map of Great Japan) was created by Ino Tadataka as well. It could be said that the background of the emergence of this new approach was to defend the land against western countries that were pressuring Japan to open the country. With the arrival of Matthew Perry of the U.S. Navy in 1853, and the following year, the isolation was forcibly lifted, and Western culture started to be introduced into Japan in earnest. The movement to overthrow the Tokugawa shogunate led by the Choshu and Satsuma clans led to the end

of the three hundred year Edo period. The Meiji government was born in 1868, starting the course for modern reform or the so-called Meiji Restoration. During this rapid modernization, the Japanese landscape underwent significant transformations from the Chinese-style or utamakura-based landscapes to western landscape paintings and theory.

4. Genealogy of Landscape Theory after Shiga

In the genealogy of Shiga's *Nihon Fukeiron*, a book by Kojima Usui titled *Nihon Sansuiron* (Discourse of Japanese landscape) discussed Japanese landscapes systematically. Kojima climbed the mountains of the Chubu region, the so-called the Japanese Alps, one by one, and in 1905, with the cooperation of British missionary and climber Walter Weston, he co-founded *Sangaku-kai* (Alpine Club, later *Nihon Sangaku-kai* (Japan Alpine Club)) with scientists Tsujimoto Mitsumaru, Takeda Hisayoshi, agricultural chemist Tsujimura Isuke and mountain painter Nakamura Seitaro. He became its first chairman, and published the book along with their journal *Sankei* (Alpine). The view of mountaineers looking down from high mountains—which had been the object of worship and awe—was introduced to the public through their mountain travel literature, mountain paintings and mountain photography, and thus, a new landscape was literally acquired.[35] The phenomenon in Japan was similar to what had happened a century earlier in 18th century Europe, when Alpine landscapes had been discovered and mountaineering gained popularity. In his commentary for the Iwanami Bunko edition of *Discourse on Japanese landscape* published in 1937, Kojima praised Shiga's theory on landscape as pioneering for alpine history. He was influenced by the book, and started to become active as a mountaineer, and thereby he inherited the discovery of alpine beauty in practice and theory.[36] However instead of assuming the human being as subject, who unfairly conquers the unexplored mountains as other, Kojima discussed the importance of the integration between humans and nature through practical climbing experiences. In 1902,

[35] For Kojima, see the following. Kojima Usui, *Nihon Sansuiron* [Discourse of Japanese landscape] (Kyoto: Ryubunkan, 1905), and ed. Yokohama Bijutsukan[Yokohama Museum of Art], *Kojima Usui Hanga Korekushon: Yama to Bungaku, Soshite Bijutsu* [World of Kojima Usui Collection], (Tokyo: Taishukanshoten, 2007).
[36] Kojima Usui, Kaisetsu [Introduction] in Shiga, *Nihon Fukeiron*, 3-17.

in *Yarigatake Exploration Report*, in which he described the climbing of Yarigatake, which was significant in the history of modern mountaineering, he notes as follows in discussing his yearning and love for Yarigatake, as well as for the spirit of mountaineering:

> Alas, this evening, when the sun goes down, causing a shift from the real world to the other world, a human figure standing here is pressed by the shadow of one giant towering high over there, which then falls flat to the earth, and here becomes harmonized with it, as if I were part of this world, as if the mountains were part of me.[37]

Kojima differed significantly from Shiga in his inverting the process of seeing and being seen—instead of discovering the landscape based on an assumed subject or on the practice of modern mountain climbing, he assumed a reciprocal relationship with the landscape, positioning himself as part of the landscape.[38] Though he encountered the alpine landscape of Japan through the discovery of modern landscape, he bracketed the notion, viewed nature as it was, and described it.

Another noteworthy book on landscape is *Nihon Fukei Shinron* (New discourse on Japanese landscape) by Ito Gingetsu, published in 1910. The Russo-Japanese War began in 1904, and Japan won a dramatic victory in the Battle of the Sea of Japan the following year. *Kaikoku Nippon* (Maritime Nation Japan,) was published during the heightened period of this war. Ito discussed the beauty of the marine landscape, based on sailing, as opposed to the alpine beauty and climbing and proposed by Shiga and Kojima. It is said that the Russo-Japanese War was the first war in which the lesser power beat the stronger power, but Japan, despite being a newly born modern nation, established sovereignty through successive victories in wars with Qing and Russia. The discovery of the Japanese landscape was further promoted to bolster aggression towards Asia. Subsequently, specialization and fragmentation in approaches to landscape progressed, and landscape was discussed from various viewpoints in books such as *Shinrin Bigaku* (Aesthetics of Forest) by Niijima Yoshinao and Murayama Jozo, discussing the beauty of the forest, *Zoen Gairon* (Introduction to Landscaping) by Tamura Tsuyoshi discussing landscaping in1918, *Fukei no Kagaku* (Science of Landscape) by Watanabe Toshiro, discussing the beauty of

[37] Kojima Usui, *Sansui Mujinzo* [Infinite Landscapes] (Kyoto: Ryubunkan, 1906), 114.
[38] For Kojima's view of nature, see Uchida, *Fukei no Hakken*.

landscape geographically in 1924. Also while in 1931, following the Manchurian Incident, Manchuria was established, and the Marco Polo Bridge Incident in 1937 started the Sino-Japanese War leading up to World War II, in 1943, Wakimizu Tetsugoro wrote *Nihon Fukei no Kenkyu Meisho no Shizenkagakuteki Kosatsu* (Studies on the Japanese Landscape: A Natural-Scientific Meditation on Scenic Locations) and discussed from a geographic standpoint the characteristics and beauty of coastal landscapes that were representative of the "beauty of Japan, the land of gods." In addition, Uehara Keiji wrote *Nihon Fukeibiron* (Aesthetics discourse on Japanese landscape) discussing landscape in the most systematic manner in the pre-war period. Despite differences in disciplinary backgrounds and topics at hand, as well as the level of their commitment to nationalism, these can be pointed out as achievements in the tradition of Shiga's landscape theory.

5. Landscape in Photography

Photography was first imported to Japan in 1848. The daguerreotype, invented in 1839 by a photographer, painter Louis Jacques Mandé Daguerre (who inherited the foundational techniques for this invention through his partnership with a inventor Joseph Nicéphore Niépce), came to Nagasaki via the Netherlands, Japan's only trading partner, in the form of the silverplate photograph. The collodion process invented thereafter was also imported, and the process was called wet plate photography, which took root due to the simplicity of the negative-positive technique. For this reason, it is said that the history of Japanese photography actually started after wet plate photography was introduced in the mid-1850s. Since the invention of such new photographic techniques roughly coincided with Perry's arrival, Japan was captured as the subject of photography by the service photographer E. Brown who accompanied Perry.[39] Brown documented Japanese people, architecture, and the landscape of the cities where he made stops for the purpose of military research, and those were the first landscape photos taken in Japan. In the wake of the Meiji Restoration, under the influence of *bunmei kaika* (literally, civilization and

[39] M.C. Perry, *Narrative of the Expedition of an American Squadron to the China Seas and Japan* (NY: Dover Publication, 2000).

enlightenment) or the westernization process, photography, which was a state-of-the-art technology in Western Europe, spread throughout Japan, and produced many professional photographers. Self-portraits and portraits of families, once a privilege of the upper class, were now less expensive, and could be owned more easily than paintings. In addition, at the largest port in Japan, commercial photographs capturing Japanese landscapes and culture—called Yokohama Shashin (Yokohama Photography), developed mainly by British photographer Felix Beato and others—became popular souvenirs for foreign residents and tourists from overseas. In addition, when the gelatin plate was invented in 1871, the subjects and expression of photography expanded greatly, and when it took root in Japan around 1890, amateur photographers started to appear, and photography for artistic expression rather than just for commercial purposes was born. This marked a shift from object to be photographed, to subject who takes pictures. These innovations in photographic technology and their historical development in Japan proceeded almost simultaneously with the discovery of landscapes. As the concept of landscape was introduced from Europe and America, in photography, mainly Western photographers took initiative in Japanese landscape photography. Also, during the Sino-Japanese War, as well as in Russo-Japanese War, magazines and newspapers aggressively featured war photographs, and newspapers, in particular, dispatched photographers to local sites, thereby establishing the role of photography in newspapers. Requests from these new media have dramatically improved printing technology, creating fads in picture postcards and photo books. However, while landscape photography was permeating, and interest in the individual landscapes of which pictures were being taken grew, there was almost no discussion to articulate what the landscape captured in photography was.

Early amateur photographs, under the influence of pictorialism, were mainly painterly works, in which the landscape shot with a camera was processed with pigments. This was generally referred to as artistic photography, and spread to the point where a photographers' circle was even formed. In contrast to this current in photography, in 1921,Fukuhara Shinzo, a photographer and business owner, along with others established Shashin Geijutsusha (Photography Art Society), and in the journal *Shashin Geijutsu* (Photography Art), they argued for an expression unique to photography, rather than for photography as

an imitation of painting. In his essay on photography, *Hikari to sono kaicho* (Light and Its Gradations), which was published in his book of photography, he introduced his methodology to literally fix—based on observations of nature in haiku—the moment in nature, by condensing light on photographic paper.

> First, if we try to realize light and gradation in the image, when we take a picture, we remove all the lines, shapes, and compositions in the traditional sense from our mind, and discover nature, where light is in harmony with its tone, and we simply try to capture exclusively the nature that gave the impression. In short, this is the harmony of nature and light.[40]

Western music critic Otaguro Motoo and Fukuhara's younger brother Michikusa of the group photographed landscapes of everyday street corners. It can be said that following these new art photography movements, the landscape in photography became an object of theoretical and practical investigation. On the other hand, around 1920, the completion of a railway network throughout the country created a major tourism boom. Various publishing media introduced local tourist sites with photographs, serving to establish postcard-like landscapes. However, in the 1923 Great Kanto Earthquake occurred and devastated Tokyo. In the process of Tokyo's major transformation into an entirely new city through subsequent redevelopment, new journals of photography were launched, including *Asahi Camera*. Neue Fotografie of Germany, which was translated into Japanese as *Shinko Shashin*, as well as Russian Constructivism were introduced, and new discussions, including photography as machine-age aesthetic, started to unfold. In 1932, photographers Kimura Ihei, Nojima Yasuzo, Nakayama Iwata and photography critic Ina Nobuo published the Coterie journal *Koga*, and the movement for new practice and theory accelerated in earnest. Ina made the declaration, "Return to Photography," a scathingly critique of existing art photography.

> Cut off [relations with] "art photography". Destroy every concept of existing "art". Destroy idols completely! And recognize, unmistakably, the unique "mechanism" of photography! The aesthetics of photography as a new art: these two premises must be the foundation upon which the photographic arts are established.[41]

---

[40] Fukuhara Shinzo, *Fukuhara Shinzo Shashin Gashu: Hikari to sono Kaicho* [Photography Book of Fukuhara Shinzo Light and its Gradiation] (Tokyo: Shashingeijutsusha, 1923), 1.
[41] Ina Nobuo, *Ina Nobuo Shashinronshu: Shashin ni Kaere* [Photography Book of Ina Nobuo: Return to Photography] (Nikon Salon Books, 2005), 24.

Looking back on the history of photography, Ina sought photographic expression unto itself, characterized by its mechanical aspects. While partly praising art photographs that focused on the effects of light, he criticized them as being merely imitations of Impressionist paintings. He instead presented the concept of photographic art. Ina did not present it simply as photographic theory, aesthetics or artistic theory. Rather, he developed a theory that the content and form had to correspond with each other, mediated by human beings—social beings—that stand behind the camera.

> Photographic art, though its history is young, and its tradition short, should never be subordinate to other art genres. Conversely, in a society with large industrial and technological aspects like today's, photography is the most suitable art for recording, reporting, interpreting and criticizing social life and nature. However, we must not forget that "a person with a camera" is a social being. Only when he becomes separated from society will photographic art follow the path of decline as any other art, abandoning its brilliant qualification as a "modern chronicler," and seeking again meaningless aesthetic trends.[42]

Based on this new theory of photography, Kimura published in the same initial issue everyday landscapes of people living in downtown Tokyo, *Kojochi Fukei* (Factory Landscape), *Mado(Apato no)*(Window [of the Apartment]), and *Yomise* (Night Stalls). Unlike conventional photographic expressions, in his photographs he linked the landscape to society and class. As photojournalism received worldwide interest, in 1933 Nihon Kobo (Japanese Studio) was founded, centering around Natori Yonosuke, who had returned from Germany, and Kimura and Ina joined the group. The group proposed the concept of news report photos (*hodo shashin*), which gradually took root within Japan through the launch of *NIPPON*, a graphic magazine for foreign publicity. However, under information controls that had been strengthened due to the start of the Sino-Japanese War, organizations were restructured into a system for the support of Imperial rule (*Yokusan taisei*), and the group distanced itself from its initial philosophy of news photography, and took on a role producing propaganda for national defense.

It was under these circumstances that Domon Ken, who had been actively working as a news photographer since his student days, published the essay, *Taigai Senden Zasshiron* (On Foreign

[42] Ibid., 35.

Propaganda Magazine) in 1943, criticizing the decadence of news photography, which had been relegated to being an ostentatious and intimidating propaganda media arm.

> As for magazines created and published in Tokyo, Japan—which is the center of politics, economics, and culture in the Great East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere—we only need the ones that have formats and content sufficient to be truly representative of Japan. The editorial policy must also be changed from the conventional greedy "propaganda" to the robust "news report."[43]

However, such a genuine proposal resulted in a ban on magazines, and the resignation of Domon from the association. The question of landscape in photography, proposed in the changing context from photographic art to art photography, and to news report photography, was swept away by nationalism and the wartime regime, similar to what was seen in other cultural discourses on landscape, until the arrival of new expressions that came out of the postwar ruins.

6. Landscape in Film

Although cinema was invented as a visual art following photography, it was introduced to Japan at almost the same time as Shiga's publication on landscape. The prehistory of cinema was based on the performance of *utsushi-e*, a moving picture projected on a screen, which was an adaptation of a magic lantern imported from the Netherlands in the early 19th century, which gradually took root in as popular entertainment in Japan. In 1896, the Kinetoscope and the Vitacope were introduced to Japan, a few years after their invention, and cinema as a new media took its place when the Lumière brothers' cinematograph was released to the public in February 1897. Film shooting was also conducted in Japan for the first time in early 1897 by Constant Girel, a projectionist and technician dispatched to Japan by the Lumière company. With the cooperation of businessman Inabata Katsutaro, who was responsible for its import, Girel filmed the daily life and customs of Japan, such as family dining, parties, and cityscapes. He also documented special events such as plays, swordsmanship, and festivals. In October 1898, Gabriel Veyre, who had also been dispatched by the Lumière company, succeeded the position of Girel, documenting

[43] Domon Ken, "Taigai Senden Zasshiron," *Nihon Hyoron* [Japanese Criticism] (September 1943): 65.

landscapes of all over Japan. Between these two, there was a man named Shibata Tsuneyoshi, who filmed the landscape of Tokyo at the request of Lumière.[44] Partly because the scientific equipment had been imported from Europe, as had happened in photography, the initial landscape of Japan was filmed from the perspective of the western gaze. Inaugural filming in Japan by Japanese was conducted in the fall of 1897 when the Konishi Photo Shop purchased a projector cum camera. The young engineer Asano Shiro filmed landscapes at tourist sites such as Nihonbashi and Asakusa, as well as performances by entertainers. It can be said that while Girel and Veyre pointed their cameras at everyday ordinary landscapes of Japan, Asano in contrast, tried to capture landscape as signs or icons. However, it can also be pointed out that, from the western perspective, daily life in the Far East was itself a spectacle. The methodology of Lumière's dispatching technicians all around the world, and documenting it in films had its basis on a structure of colonial exploitation and expropriation.[45] The discovery of the landscape, in which Japan was filmed, or in early Japanese cinema, therefore was two-fold; through the introduction of the Western concept of landscape, and that of its latest science.

Inabata introduced the cinematograph to Japan, but soon sold the rights to Yokota Einosuke, a promotor who later started the Yokota Shokai. In the midst of various event promoters competing to introduce cinema, in 1903 Yoshizawa Shokai opened the first Denki-kan, a dedicated movie theater in Asakusa. When the Russo-Japanese War broke out the following year, and the company sent a team to the battlefield to film, and the footage they shot was screened at the theater. In 1912, four companies—including Yoshizawa Shoten and Yokota Shokai—started The Nippon Katsudo-Shashin Kabushiki Kaisha (Japan Movie Co., Nikkatsu). With film studios in Tokyo and Kyoto, a full-fledged film company was born for first time in Japan. So-called *Shimpa* (modern plays) were shot in Tokyo, and Jidaigeki

[44] For the relationship between the Lumière Company and Japan, as well as early Japanese cinema, see, ed. Yoshida Kiju, Yamaguchi Masao, Kinoshita Naoyuki, *Eiga Denrai- Shinemagurafu <Meiji no Nihon>* [The Introduction of Cinema: Cinematographs and <Meiji Japan>] (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1995), ed. Koga Futoshi, Tsuda Makiko, *Hikari no Seitan Ryumieru* [Lumière: The Birth of Light] (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 1995), ed. Hasumi Shigehiko, *Ryumieru Gannen – Gaburieru Veru to Eiga no Rekishi* [The First Year of Lumière: Gabriel Veyre and the History of Cinema](Tokyo: Chikumashobo, 1995).

[45] Komatsu Hiroshi, a historian of the early cinema, clearly defined cinematograph as an ideology apparatus. See, "*Shinematogurafu towa Nani de attaka – Ideorogi Sochi toshiteno Eiga*" [What was Cinematograph – Cinema as an Ideology Apparatus] in *Meiji Denrai,* 103-123

(period dramas) were shot in Kyoto. Thus cinema gained popularity. But due to the fact that cinema developed based on a background of theater and history, in the late 1910s, film critic and film director Kaeriyama Norimasa and others launched *Jun Eiga Geki Undo* (Pure Film Movement), advocating for the uniqueness of cinema. *Katsudo Shashin Geki no Sozo to Satsueiho* (Film Creation and Its Shooting Method), published in 1917, was a research book that discussed a new theory of and techniques for filmmaking, ranging from a shift from stage script to film scenario, the use of women actors rather than onnagata or male kabuki actors playing female roles, improvements to film and editing techniques, and the use of subtitles instead of *benshi* (kinema interpreter). The aim was to modernize Japanese cinema in order to compete with European cinema, and the emerging Hollywood cinema. These were important as the initial theories and methodologies in the early period of Japanese cinema, as well as in the pursuit of theories and methodologies unique to cinema that were not imitations of theater. However, given the fact that cinema as a medium of expression was invented by the West, these precepts did not exactly serve as an essential critique of the modern framework.[46] Meanwhile, in 1912, the new medium of cinema surfaced as a social issue when the French film *Zigomar*, based on a crime novel, was banned from cinemas by the Metropolitan Police Department, due to their concern about the impact of the film on youth; discussions of cinema's possibilities and problems ensued. This prompted the necessity of an immediate modernization in which the Japanese film industry would establish the concept of cinema as art, similar to other fields of expression such as literature and fine arts, rather than as degenerate entertainment. In addition, when montage theory, centered on Sergei Eisenstein, was introduced to Japan in the late 1920s, the critique of existing methodologies in Japanese cinema expanded, and thus Western methodologies and theories were included for the progress and development of Japanese cinema.

Under these circumstances, various discussions about film were had, not only in light of art and technology, but also sociology, psychology and philosophy. Discussions on landscape gradually became

[46] See Aaron Gerow, "*Nihon/Eiga/Riron* [Japan/Cinema/Theory]" in *Nihon Eiga wa Ikiteiru* [Japanese Cinema is Alive], vol.1, ed. Kurosawa Kiyoshi, Yomota Inuhiko, Yoshimi Shunya and Lee Bongou (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 2010), 159-199; *Visions of Japanese Modernity: Articulation of Cinema, Nation, and Spectatorship, 1895-1925* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2010).

popular, but landscape in film was almost never brought up in discussions. The genres and methodologies, between fiction and documentary, silent and sound film, and studio versus street filming, differ greatly. However everything that was shot on film can be defined as a landscape, transcending such differences in the context of the visual art of cinema, and hence formulating a question about "landscape in cinema" was quasi-tautological. In order to address the issue of landscape in cinema, what was necessary, in effect, was to discover landscape within the history of cinema. In addition, the fact that the concept of landscape and the introduction of cinema took place almost simultaneously in Japan made it even more difficult to consider this issue.

Under these circumstances, it was pioneer filmmaker Mizoguchi Kenji who diligently explored the expression of landscape in film. Mizoguchi joined Nikkatsu in 1920, making his debut in *Aini Yomigaeru Hi* (The Resurrection of Love, 1923). Though the film was censored due to realistically depicting the poor protagonist's life, he nonetheless continued to create his work with a focus on class conflicts thereafter. While most of his early works do not survive, in *Tokyo Koshinkyoku* (Tokyo March, 1929), a partially surviving example of his work, documentary footage of the street was inserted at the beginning and end. The film is a melodramatic story about the tragic love between an upper-class man and a geisha woman set against the background of modernized urban landscape of Tokyo. Depicting agony and conflict of people living in the city, the film, beyond the framework of the story, highlights issues of class and social inequality through the landscape. These were also visually articulated through contrasts (e.g., a mansion and a shack, a tennis court on top of the cliff and shacks down below). In the same year, Mizoguchi produced *Tokai Kokyogaku* (Metropolitan Symphony) one of the so-called *'Keiko Eiga*' (tendency films), which were born out of a proletarian art movement. The film, which no longer exists, can be called a Japanese version of Walter Ruttmann's *Berlin: Symphony of a City* (1927), a non-narrative film (*Cinéma Pur*) which depicted a day in the city of Berlin in five chapters, and thus, the approach towards urban landscapes in Tokyo March was presumed to have been more radicalized artistically and politically in this film.

One of the major characteristics of Mizoguchi's films is the use of the long take, by using the one-scene-one-shot technique using a crane and a dolly. In order to shoot the flow of the actor's action without depending on camera blocking, he used many long shots instead of close-ups, creating direction filled with tension. This technique became noticeable in *Gion no Shimai* (Sisters of the Gion, 1936)[47], and characteristically is not seen in his films from the 1920s. It can be said however, that the approach to landscape based on the theory of class, and the long take or one-scene-one-shot technique were not unrelated. There was much debate at that time over techniques such as long take and one-scene-one-shot, however, in the context of landscape theory, what should be referenced is *Eiga Kosei-ron* (Theory of Film Composition) published in 1941 by film critic Sugiyama Heiichi. In his essay Sugiyama structurally analyzes films within four categories: frame, image, cross-cutting, and narrative as an extension of photographic media. In the framework of the first category, he discussed photography and the importance of turning attention to what is being photographed and how it is cropped. Furthermore, in cinema, he argues, a moving picture, such as a landscape seen from a car window for example, a film is not constituted as endless landscape, and it is important that the landscape cut out by a frame is filmed. In the category of image, he argues that montage is only one component in film, and it is important to film nature as it is. He then concludes that film art reflects not only the inside that is cut out by frame, but also the tension of that image/content against the outside of the frame. In addition, in the category of cross-cutting, he discusses the expression of trying to fit all elements such as space and time into a narrow frame regardless of the fixed camera field of view as follows.

> As images become abundant not only in quantity but in every sense, the quality of the frame [*waku no seishin*] that tightens around them begins to shine. As Rilke writes, balance can be achieved well when captured by the frame. And time and meaning are filled up. This frame defines the expectations of all spectators. And finally, the camera flows like low running water, while meeting the demands of the spectators that are about to be overcome. Alternatively, the editing is executed like preparing a container to receive what one is overcome with. Movement

[47] Kishi Matsuo, "Hyoden: Mizoguchi Kenji," [Critical biography of Mizoguchi Kenji], *Kinema Junpo* [The Movie Times], no.80 (1st January 1954): 45-47.

> and cross-cutting should be understood in this way. Techniques such as these should not exist first as a foundation; first of all, there is an image.[48]

He argued that various techniques were not used in order to compensate for the inconvenience of directing and photographing, these techniques were defined conversely by giving positive values to the concept of frames. He tried to understand film art not from the outside of the frame, but from the inside. While cinema is characteristically considered capable of depicting anything in contrast to the stage in theater, it was deliberately through the constraint of frames that he attempted to discover cinematic possibilities. As one of the characteristic examples of this, he refers to long take:

> The image moves, transforms, and what defines it all the way to the end, and what makes the image truly the way it is, is the banal rectangular-shaped frame mentioned earlier. For this reason, I firmly believe that film art can become established by movement alone, without any interruption to the film. Because I understand that the foundation of film art lies in the car window.[49]

Since in those days montage theory was popular, and there were also films which were made by filming a play on a stage in a long take with a fixed camera, techniques such as this were considered characteristically pre-modern, and became objects of criticism.[50] On the other hand, many local film directors, represented by Itami Mansaku, had negative views on the introduction of film theory imported from overseas.[51] In the midst of these circumstances, Sugiyama sought to defend a methodology specific to Japanese cinema, developing his own theory rather than criticizing Japanese cinema through foreign film theories. Although a specific name was not mentioned in this text, he later used the concept of the

---

[48] Sugiyama Heiichi, "Eiga Koseiron" [On Film Composition] in *Eiga Bunkaron* [On Film Culture] (Kyoto: Daiichi Geibunsha), 183-184. Sugiyama's study was preceded by aesthetic investigation into film by professor of aesthetics Nakai Masakazu, and theorist Hirabayashi Hatsunosuke, duiring the proletarian arts movement of the thirties. Sugiyama has the analysis particularly made by Hirabayashi, including the limitation of vision by framing, and the emphasis on perspective by the camera in common. "*Geijutsu no Keishiki toshiteno Shosetu to Eiga* [Novel and Film as Art Forms]" in *Hirabayashi Hatsunosuke Ikoshu* [Collected Writings of Hirabayashi Hatsunosuke] (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1932). However, whereas Nakai and Hirabayashi's main focus was to introduce theory of montage, Sugiyama's contribution was significant in terms of its specificities of Japanese film theory.

[49] Sugiyama, "Eiga Koseiron," 185.

[50] As theories of film critics representative of Marxism, see Iwasaki Akira, *Eiga to Genjitsu* [Cinema and Reality] (Tokyo: Shunyodoshoten, 1939).

[51] See Itami Mansaku, "*Tempo toiu koto ni tsuite,*" [On the issue of tempo], in *Itami Mansaku Zenshu 2* [The Complete Works of Mansaku Itami 2] (Tokyo: Chikumashobo, 1961), 5-10.

gaze to discuss Mizoguchi's film aesthetics, which are serene and static.[52] Landscape theory was not their main focus, but the attempt was to discuss the discovery of landscape in Japanese cinema through notions of frames, windows, and gaze.

Another theoretical discussion concerning the techniques of Japanese cinema, including the long take was attempted by theorist Imamura Taihei in *Nihon Geijutsu to Eiga* (Japanese Art and Cinema), published in 1941.[53] Imamura analyzed the relations between painting and film in the sections of the same book titled, *Nihon Kaiga to Shashin Geijutsu* (Japanese Painting and Photographic Art), *Zoku Nihon Kaiga to Shashin Geijutsu* (Japanese Painting and Photographic Art Part Two), and *Nihon Geijutsu to Eiga* (Japanese Art and Film). Based on the relationship between modern painting using perspective and traditional Japanese scroll paintings, he juxtaposed montage with long take, pointing out the specificities of time and space in Japanese cinema. Although the issue of landscape was not directly referenced, this was another attempt to examine landscape in cinema through a comparison of modern paintings and scroll paintings.

7. Landscape in Documentary Films—Kamei Fumio

The domain of documentary and newsreel films—concurrently with commercial narrative films—grew through the documentation of military services in the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-5, the Antarctic expedition in 1912, and took root through the nation-wide release of documentary footage of the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923. When the sound era began, newsreel films, in partnership with newspaper companies and news agencies, began to flourish, and when the Sino-Japanese War began, immediate news footage was even more in demand. Landscape was an essential element in the genre of documentary and news films, and Kamei Fumio developed it theoretically and politically.[54] In 1929, Kamei went to the

[52] Sugiyama Heiichi, "*Mizoguchi Kenji*," *Eiga Hyoron* [Film Review] (August 1951): 38-39.
[53] Imamura Taihei, *Nihongeijutsu to Eiga* [Japanese Art and Cinema] (Tokyo: Sugashoten, 1941).
[54] Concerning Kamei, see Tsuzuki Masaaki, *Tori ni Natta Ningen* [A Man who Became a Bird] (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1997), Tsuchimoto Noriaki, "Kamei Fumio 'Shanghai' kara 'Tatakau Heitai' made" [Kamei Fumio From Shanghai to Fighting Soldiers] in *Koza Nihon Eiga 5 Sengo Seiga no Tenkai* [Lecture Japanese Cinema 5: Development of Postwar Cinema] (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1987), 322-341. For Prewar Japanese documentary films including Kamei, see Noda Shinkichi, *Nihon Dokyumentari Eiga Zenshi* [Prehistory of the Japanese Documentary Cinema]

Soviet Union to study film. He was influenced by new film theories, focusing on montage theory. In 1933 after returning to Japan he joined PCL (Photo Chemical Laboratory, later Toho), and became responsible for direction for the Production Department (later Cultural Film Department), which handled documentary films. Kamei made his debut with a PR movie for electric power company called *Sugata Naki Sugata* (Invisible Appearance, 1935). He then made documentary film about the voyage of a warship, *Doto o Kette* (Through the Angry Waves, 1936), which was sponsored by the Navy Ministry, and gained him acclaim. A trilogy of feature-length documentary films, *Shanghai*, *Beijing*, and *Nanjing* was produced in 1938 as the recording of the Sino-Japanese War which began in 1937, and Kamei was responsible for *Shanghai* and *Beijing*. The project was brought to him by a former kinema interpreter and war journalist Matsui Suisei. Matsui hoped that, since the war had often been reported in newspapers and stories of hardship and heroism were pervasive, providing commentary on them in motion pictures would attract great interest. At that time the Culture and Film Department had a unique production system in which directors and producers did not go to filming locations, but created the film structure and scenario upon which the filming division conducted on-location filming. The film they brought back was then edited. Kamei, therefore, completed the work in Tokyo, based on footage shot by cinematographer Miki Shigeru and recording engineer Fujii Shinichi.

In 1842 the port of Shanghai was forced to open, following the defeat of the Qing Empire by the United Kingdom in the Opium War. The French and Americans also arrived, and they each governed a concession or foreign enclave. In July 1937, following a military clash at the Marco Polo Bridge, the Japanese army launched an attack on northern China, and then occupied Shanghai in August. The filmmaking team arrived in Shanghai in October, but could not film the battle itself, since the front line had already moved to Nanjing. At the time, cameras and recording equipment were large, making mobility difficult while filming. Traces of intense battles remained everywhere: mountainous terrain with pillboxes, trenches, and sandbags, abandoned urban areas, and countless tombs. Miki and his team aimed

---

(Tokyo: Shakaishisosha, 1984), Abe Mark Nornes, *Japanese Documentary Film: The Meiji Era Through Hiroshima* (University of Minnesota Press, 2003).

their camera straightforwardly at everything from rural scenes to cityscapes, from former sites of battlefields to people's daily lives. By looking thoroughly at the landscape after the war, rather than filming the battles themselves, they intended to conversely highlight the landscape before the war. Reportedly, when the first undeveloped negatives were delivered from Shanghai in December, and the film print preview was held, there was an austere silence among the personnel viewing them. Far from content that was celebrating the victory, the film depicted a series of dark and grim landscapes, reminiscent of fierce battles and death. Because of this, however, Kamei was convinced of the film's success. Speaking about the film after completing the editing, and also when he spoke about it after the war, he noted the following.

> The most important point in the editing was the eyes of Miki-san, who walked around Shanghai in order not to weaken the effect of documentation, and to use the individual materials filmed by the camera's eyes as on-site materials and communicate them directly to the audience. In that case, we avoided our own subjectivity as much as possible. By doing that, I believed that the audience, looking at these materials, could freely play with their own creative imagination.[55]
>
> Rather than losing myself into the battlefield, I wanted to do the editing, so that I could see the war a little more from a bird's-eye view.[56]

As the footage and photographs of the Sino-Japanese War were intended to provoke military fervor, in order to conform to that political goal, there were many restrictions on what could be filmed, so it was rare that local landscapes were represented exactly as they were. Kamei therefore connected the landscapes taken by Miki literally, in the order they were filmed. Since the trilogy—including *Shanghai*—was produced as military-sponsored propaganda, in the film the occupation of Shanghai is praised through narration and subtitles, and scenes of the Naval Air Squadron's heroics, forced interviews with captives, and a local priest cheering the liberation of China by Japan are used dramatically. Thus these films cannot strictly be called anti-war films, however in the crushing reality of the wartime era, the propaganda-like deception was exposed. Kamei did not refer to landscape itself either at that time or after,

[55] Kamei Fumio, "Shanghai Henshu Koki," [Editor's Afterword for *Shanghai*], *Shin Eiga* [New Cinema] (March 1938): 72.
[56] Kamei Fumio, *Tatakau Eiga* [Fighting Cinema] (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1989), 27.

but he did frequently use the word landscape in his production diaries.[57] Despite documenting of war, by eliminating the directions that praise it, the film indicated the possibility of a landscape different than nationalism.[58]

Despite being critical of the war in content, it was a rare newsreel film documenting the Sino-Japanese War, so it had great box-office success. After the film, *Beijing*, which was shot and edited in the same way as *Shanghai*, upon receiving a request, Kamei went on location site to work on a feature-length documentary film about the Battle of Wuhan called *Tatakafu Heitai* (Fighting Soldiers, 1939). The content was similar to *Shanghai*, in which a series of bare landscapes was shown repeatedly. However it was considered negative towards the war, and as soon as the film was completed, it was banned. Kamei was forced to resign, and in 1941 he was jailed for violating the Peace Preservation Law. This incident took place in the film industry at a point when a law had been enacted in 1939 requiring the mandatory preliminary censorship at the production stage of all National Policy Films. As a result, Kamei's approach to landscape remained contained until the end of the war. The print of the film *Fighting Soldiers* went missing after the war, and so its reassessment had to wait until the actual print was found, and the film was rediscovered in the 1970s.

8. Literature: Kunikida Doppo, Tokutomi Roka——Landscape of Musashino

A shift in the concept of the landscape took place in literature as well in the Meiji Period. Since

[57] In a short diary, the word 'landscape' appears more often than the terms, 'scene' and 'scenery,' in a total of five places. "Arrived in Shanghai, shot coastal landscape," "Filmed sceneries of hustle and bustle in Japantown, and mainly landscapes of restoration," "Filming of scenes of reconnaissance officer dispatch and airfield landscapes in battlefield respectively completed," "Chorus of Chinese children with organ. Rural landscape. Simultaneous recording and filming of other landscapes completed." Kamei Fumio, "'Shanhai' Seisaku Nisshi" ['Shanghai' Production Diary], *Kinema Jumpo* [The Movie Times], no.632 (1st January 1938): 340-341.

[58] In the context of landscape in documentary films, the documentation of the movement by *Nihon Puroretaria Eiga Domei* (Japanese Proletarian Cinema Union) from 1929-34 is noteworthy as a pioneer. In addition, *Shanghai* was re-screened during a symposium series called "War and Revolution," organized by Nippon Documentarist Union (NDU) in September, 1971, and was placed as a pioneering work, as a precursor of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* and *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*. "The stance of staking one's thoughts on editing the actual film without making a concept in advance already begins with *Shanghai*." See, Hiraoka Masaaki, "Senso no Eiga ka Kakumei no Eiga ka"[Cinema for/of War or Cinema for/of Revolution], *Eiga Hihyo* [Film Critisim], no 15(December 1971): 16. During this event, in addition to the screening of two films by NDU, and *Wasurerareta Kogun* (The Forgotten Army, 1963) by Oshima, Matsuda, Oshima and Hiraoka joined the discussion. At a separate venue, Adachi and Takenaka Ro also had a talk titled, "With Arab Guerillas."

ideas of landscape in literature were not necessarily based on what one actually sees for oneself, in this sense it is not easy to discuss it in the context of landscape theory. This, however, needs to be examined, since it was especially through literary expression that different views of landscape were provided and defined at the time. Kunikida joined the journal *Seinen Bungaku* (Literature for Youth) in 1894, and began working as a poet and writer in 1894. He made his debut in 1897 with *Gen Oji* (Uncle Gen). With Tayama Katai and Yanagita Kunio, he co-edited *Jojoshi* (Lyric Poetry), while from September 1896 to March 1997, he sought out Musashino in Tokyo, walking around the area and observing nature. He published *Imano Musashino* (Musashino Now, later renamed *Musashino*), based on the diary he kept at that time, in the journal *Kokumin no Tomo* (Nation's Friend), which became representative of romantic literature. Kunikida, who was living in Shibuya, went to Musashino, on the outskirts of Tokyo, and recorded what he saw straightforwardly based on his new depiction of landscape. Musashino is the western region of Kanto Plain, which extends to Tokyo, Saitama and Kanagawa, and during the Meiji and Taisho eras it was still a vast rural area.

> September 7: "Yesterday and today the south wind blows strongly, bringing rain clouds and blowing them away, so it rains on and off. When it stops, sunlight begins shooting through clouds, shining trees in the woods, [...] This is the beginning of autumn in Musashino today. Although the woods still remain green in summer, the sky looks completely different from summer. Rain clouds are carried by the south wind, covering the sky of Musashino and causing frequent rain. But during that fine day, the sun light shines on the trees that are still wet with rain, so they appear to be shining bright. I thought again and again. If I could glimpse the entire Musashino on such a day, it/that would surely be a very beautiful sight.[59]

This method of portraying nature as a landscape objectively, including the changes in climate, the sunlight, and the sound of the wind did not previously exist in Japanese literature. This method was only made possible by recognizing the landscape before your eyes as 'landscape.' Kunikida also noted that what characterizes Musashino is woods rather than forests, deciduous woods that are rich in color, rather than evergreen woods.

[59] Kunikda Doppo, *Musashino* (Tokyo: Shinchobunko, 2017), 9-10.

> It is said that Musashino used to be a place known for the exquisite beauty of the landscape of its endlessly growing grass fields, but Musashino now is [made up of] woods. We can say that the woods is truly a characteristic of Musashino today. It is mainly made up of trees of the oak family, whose leaves completely drop off in winter, and sprout fresh new buds in spring. The changes of the trees occur all at once in the field, which extends tens of kilometers east of the Chichibune. The splendor of the woods, which present various scenes influenced by haze, rain, fog, drizzle, and snow, as well as by the shade of trees, and the leaves changing color throughout the seasons, may not be well understood by people in the western or Tohoku regions. Originally, the Japanese may not have known much about the beauty of deciduous oak woods. Because, speaking of the woods, only pine forests have been accepted in Japanese literature and art, and I have not heard of a work in waka poetry such as 'listening to the sound of rain deep in the oak forest.'[60]

Ideas about the traditional beauty of the Japanese landscape are said to have been formed in western Japan, which is the zone for evergreens, such as pine trees. He in turn contrasted this by discussing a landscape of deciduous broad-leaved woods in eastern Japan. Geographically the region mainly includes the Tokyo area, but Kunikida insisted on the importance of specificities of Musashino.

> Where is such a place in Japan except Musashino? Of course, it does not exist in the wilderness of Hokkaido, not even in Nasuno, where else is it? Where is a place where the woods and the field are so well jumbled up, and life and nature exist so closely? This is why there is such a special passage in Musashino.[61]

As mentioned by Kunikida himself, Musashino at that time was no longer the same Musashino as in the past. Rather than an unspoiled wilderness, a landmark-like area of natural beauty, or a city even, Musashino was a plain and faceless landscape where life and nature existed so closely with each other. Thus, Kunikida saw the contradictions of modernization that were concentrated at the border between city and nature, or Tokyo and the rural, that are somewhere in between the two.

> It is strange that describing not only Dogenzaka but also Shirokane, that is, somewhere located at one edge of the urban area of Tokyo, or the area where Koshu Kaido, or Ome-do, or Nakahara-do, or Setagaya Kaido leads into the countryside woods of the suburbs, an area that is neither a city nor a post, an area where a sight like a mixture of a kind of life and a kind of nature is present—really wakes up my poetic inspiration. Why do areas like these attract our feelings? I can answer that simply, this way: that is, the sight of the outskirts of a town like this makes people think that somehow they see a microcosm of society. To put it differently, it seems likely that there are a couple of stories that are inspiring for both people in the countryside and people in the city, minor

[60] Ibid., 13.
[61] Ibid., 22.

> stories, pitiful or funny stories hidden under the eaves. It also seems in particular, that the remnants of big city life and the aftermath of rural life meet here, gently swirling.[62]

Shiga's wrote his first essay on the landscape in 1893-94, and it is unmistakably clear that Musashino, written several years later, shared its philosophical and historical background. Kunikida, however, by discovering the landscape as something that did not exist externally but could rather be found in the relationship between life and nature, attempted to indicate the recognition of a landscape that is neither of the pre-modern nor of the modern. He turned his microscopic view on visual, spatial, and temporal changes, incorporating the naturalist descriptions found in "Rendezvous" by Ivan Turgenev translated by Futabatei Shimei, as well as from poems of William Wordsworth. Kunikida is regarded and positioned as one of the leading authors of Romanticism and Naturalism in the history of modern Japanese literature. With the beginning of the Meiji as a new era, young people who used to be tied to their status and *chien* (bonds among neighbors) migrated from rural areas to cities aiming for success in life. However with the establishment of the modern social system, many young people suffered setbacks, and Kunikida was no exception. It was against the background of the establishment of self in modernity, and its subsequent setback causing a new blockage, that the landscape of Musashino was discovered.

In the literature of the same period, Tokutomi Roka also opened a new horizon for the landscape. In 1889, he joined his older brother, Soho's Minyu-sha, and made his debut in 1898, *Fujoki/Hototogisu* (The Cuckoo). The same year, he recorded his observations and experiences of nature in his diary, without missing a single day from New Year's Day to New Year's Eve, and published his book, *Shizen to Jinsei* (Nature and Life) in 1900. Roka himself wrote in his autobiographical novel Fuji that his reason for doing this was Kunikida's suggestion to keep a diary of observations of nature. *Nature and Life* consists of a total of five stories; a short novel, "a biography of the landscape painter Corot," and three prose poems written about the nature he observed. In the chapter titled, *Zokibayashi* (Thicket) he notes, on the nature of Musashino:

[62] Ibid., 34-35.

> There are a number of hills and valleys before reaching the Tama Stream located in the western suburb of Tokyo, and some of the traffic routes run up and down this hill, winding. The valley is a rice field, and generally a brook is flowing. In rare cases there is a water wheel on the streaming. The hills can be developed and turned into rice fields, but there are many thickets divided by corners here and there. I love those thickets. There are many trees, such as oak, hazel, chestnut, and smoke tree (*haze*). There are few large trees, and many are young trees growing in clusters from stumps.[63]

Roka depicted subtle seasonal and daily changes in Musashino through various colorful expressions. Also, upon the publication of the book, Roka wrote the advertisement himself, expressing his thoughts as follows.

> With nature as the master, people as guests, excerpts from old manuscripts, compiling outstanding new works that could be called small articles, short stories, or rhymeless poems, or watercolor paintings, about one-hundred stories in one volume.[64]

As discussed by far, modern landscapes were discovered as an exteriority that had resulted from the establishment of the human as subject. Roka's attempt was to discover landscape by further inverting this relationship i.e. assuming nature as subject, and human as object. Nature of course does not tell anything about itself as a landscape, and it is ultimately the writer, that is, an object, who describes it. However, through this epistemological inversion, the literary method of discussing the landscape as if creating a landscape painting was developed. On the other hand, in the premodern literary tradition Japanese poets and painters used to represent nature and man not as a binary opposition, but as a unified totality. In this sense, it could be said that Roka only returned to the pre-modern view of nature. However, that Roka reached his inversion through the analysis of the two, was, in fact, a significant difference from previous expressions. It was important that immediately after the emergence of landscape theory in the midst of modernization, Roka presented the issue of the subject in landscape through reexamining the individual site of perception in pre-modernity as well. Roka moved to Chitose-mura (Chitose village), on the outskirts of Tokyo, in 1907, the year after returning from his trip to Europe, and he lived a semi-

[63] Tokutomi Roka, *Shizen to Jinsei* [Nature and Life] (Tokyo: Iwanamibunko, 1986), 64.
[64] Ibid., 244.

farming life until his death. He lived with the questions he had set himself and faced them in practice, trying to resist the landscape that was becoming a nationalist concept through successive wars.[65]

9. Yanagita Kunio and Landscape

In the Taisho (1912-26) and Showa (1926-89) eras after the Meiji era, Yanagita Kunio discussed the landscape anew, not from a nation-based perspective, but from the standpoint of the lives of commoners. Yanagita, the founder of Japanese folklore studies, left his post in the government bureaucracy in 1919, and traveled around the nation, from Tohoku, Tokai, Kinki, Sanyo, Kyushu, Okinawa to the Nanto Islands for about three years while serving as a member of the editorial committee of *Asahi Shimbun*. He experienced the life, religions, and customs of rural, mountain and fishing villages, and described what he saw in *Kainan Shoki* (Notes on the Southern Islands, 1920), *Yukiguni no Haru* (Snow Country's Spring, 1928) and *Shufu-cho* (Notes on Autumn Winds, 1931), and compiled other travelogues written thereafter in *Mame no Ha to Taiyo* (Bean Leaves and the Sun, 1943). He also published books, including *Toshi to Noson* (Cities and Rural Areas, 1929) and *Meiji Taisho Shi Seso Hen* (Meiji Taisho History: Social Conditions, 1931), in which his notes were compiled by theme, and many discussions of landscapes were included. In *Snow Country's Spring*, Yanagida sharply criticized the worship of classic famous places, such as the three most beautiful views of Japan, as "useless constraints."[66] He also pointed out that guide books and postcards mainly in travel literature are harmful, as they stereotype our perception of the landscape, explaining the importance of genuinely seeing the beauty of the landscape in front of his eyes.

---

[65] However, discussed by Kunikida and Tokutomi, Musashino became a new famous area, and tourism and redevelopment of this area were promoted. Tokutomi described changes to the landscape as follows. " Tokyo has been closing in on us. [Musashino], twelve kilometers west of Tokyo, is a village that depends on Tokyo. It is natural that the consequence of the tide flowing into a sea of two million people is reverberating in the village. The use of gas in Tokyo has led to a decrease in demand for firewood, and perhaps as a result, the significant part of the thickets in the village was developed into a wheat field. Sawtooth oaks and nara trees on the roadsides were cut down and dug up, and rectangular-shaped rough fields are made one after another. The fact that the thickets characterizing Musashino were brutally cut down makes me feel like having my body stripped of flesh, but that is the act for the sake of life. It is inescapable." Tokutomi Kenjiro (Roka), *Mimizuno tahagoto* [Earthworm's nonsense] (Tokyo:Iwanamishoten, 1938), 18

[66] Yanagita Kunio, *Yanagita Kunio Zenshu 2* [The Complete Works of Yanagita Kunio 2] (Tokyo: Chikumashobo, 1989), P72

> Landscapes do not always have the same look as scroll paintings or frames. First of all, the times change this. The seasons we encounter throughout our lives, the color of nimbus clouds, as well as the amount of clouds moving in the sky, and the direction of the wind, all affect their appearances.[67]

Also, concerning travel and travel writing, in the introduction to *Notes on Autumn Winds*, Yanagita argued that the development of the transportation network brought about by modernization had enabled long-distance travel, and made it possible for everyone to see previously inaccessible landscapes. On the other hand, a new problem surfaced—as the business of touring was developed, a 'hollowing out' of landscapes occurred. Striving to discover landscapes that were different than those seen by means of 'products' such as the railroad or the streets that were developed by modernization, Yanagita utilized the convenience of the railroad, but traveled aimlessly. Rather than unilaterally objectifying the landscape that he saw, he attempted to describe the totality—including the lives of the people who inhabited it—as landscape. He also argued that texts written in such a way should be returned not only to the readers, but also to local people in the future.

> The purpose of travel had to change with time. My observations may not have been accurate, but in any event, they were in response to this new demand, and as long as they did not misrepresent the facts, they would eventually be recognized by the local people, or remain as a document of a regional community without [other] records. [68]

Through its conceptualization of landscapes, Shiga's *Discourse on Japanese Landscape* pushed the classical view of the landscape into the background. However, it also created new stereotypes, such as the beauty of the Japanese Alps. The subsequent theories of landscape, despite differences in approach—except Roka's theory of literature—basically inherited this structure. Landscape discussed in this aspect was an object to be recognized and objectified, it assumed the existence of a subject who saw and described the landscape. Landscape was an object that is given a proper name of 'landscape' only by the readers-writers who name it as such. Yanagita, on the other hand, did not define the superiority of the

[67] Ibid., P73
[68] Ibid., 193-194.

landscape aesthetically, but described the autonomous beauty that each landscape possesses through traveling across the country. In addition, he placed himself in daily lives of commoners in the regions he visited, and tried to reinterpret the concept of landscape not as something fixed, but as something that was constantly changing depending on the eyes of the people living there. In other words, Yanagita assumed the local people who had created and changed the landscape as an object to be described, as well as a potential subject who reads the landscape. Also, in his discussion of nature in *Bean Leaves and the Sun*, Yanagita specifically argues that what had historically been named landscape, as opposed to so-called 'nature' which is extremely harsh to human beings, is constituted for the first time by human intervention.

> The man made some adjustments to this with his own power, and became capable of enjoying the so-called mountain of the benevolent man, and enjoyed the water of the wise man. It seems that there has never been a thing that we call landscape that did not require human negotiation to a certain degree.[69]

Later, as an agent of local popular culture and tradition, Yanagita proposed the concept of commoners (*jomin*), not the people (*kokumin*), and examined it as a whole, culturally and historically. The travel writings that have been referenced so far were the major foundations that would create folklore studies, and Yanagita's landscape should be understood in a similar context. In other words, rather than discussing the landscape as an object conceptually, Yanagita attempted to situate the landscape coexisting with people in the changing times. This is evident from the story titled, *Fukei no Seicho* (Growth of landscape). Thus Yanagita's goal was to redefine landscape—discovered and discussed in various ways after the Meiji Era—as a concept that was not static, but was in constant flux.

10. 'Climate' by Watsuji Tetsuro

Watsuji Tetsuro was a philosopher, who, with the concept of climate (*fudo*), proposed a theory that was different either from landscape theory or geography. During the turbulent period of modernization Watsuji published studies on Friedrich Nietzsche and Soren Kierkegaard, as well as on

[69] Ibid., 542.

Buddhist art and the intellectual and spiritual history of Japan from 1910, with a goal of integrating non-western and western philosophies, or sublating them, and he laid the foundation for ethical studies and Japanese cultural theory in Japan. In 1935, as his response to Martin Heidegger's *Being and Time*, he published *Fudo: Ningengakuteki Kosatsu* (Climates and Cultures: A Philosophical Study)[70], his meditation on human existence from its spatial as well as temporal aspects. He argued that the climate was not simply a part of the natural environment, but was embedded into the mental structure of human beings, as a means to understand the self. He classified climate into three categories: monsoon (including Japan), desert, and ranch—in order to examine climate in each of those categories vis-a-vis their society, culture, thoughts, and history.

> I use our word Fu-do, [.....] as a general term for the natural environment of a given land, its climate, its weather, the geological and productive nature of its soil, its topographic and scenic features. The ancient term for this concept was Sui-do, which might be literally translated as "Water and Earth". Behind these terms lies the ancient view of Nature as man's environment compounded of earth, water, fire, and wind.[71]

He then discussed the need to meditate on the space and time of human existence, not as nature, but from the side of the climate, to further understand its history. The meaning of man could be found not in the individual, but in his involvement with society. Based on the historicity built upon this, he critiqued an anthropocentric view of the subject.

> We must accept that it is only through the interpretation of historical and climatic phenomena that we can show that these phenomena are the expression of man's conscious being, that climate is the organ of our self-objectivization and self-discovery, and that the climatic character is the character of subjective human existence. Thus as long as this inquiry is directed to the distinctiveness of distinctive being, it is an existential comprehension; but in so far as it treats this distinctive way of life as the condition of man's conscious being, it is ontological comprehension. Thus a grasp of the distinctive historical and climatic make-up of the human being becomes an ontological existential comprehension.[72]

---

[70] *Fudo no Gensho* [Phenomenon of Climate], the first chapter of the book was written in 1929, and after revision, published in the August, 1935 issue of the journal *Bungaku* [Literature], a special issue on naturalism.
[71] Watsuji Tetsuro, *A Climate A Philosophical Study*, ed. Japanese National Commission for UNESCO, trans. Geoffrey Bownas (Printing Bureau, Japanese Government, 1962), 1.
[72] Ibid., 16.

However, this uniqueness to revise ontology with the concept of climate in order to juxtapose Japanese thought against Western philosophy also embodied an issue wherein praising the Japanese value of *ie* (house) led to the support of the nationalist state under the emperor system.[73] Despite its theoretical incoherence, Watsuji's concept of climate was extremely insightful theoretically and historically, in that it shed new light on discussions of nation, land and race, which were in fact what Watsuji relied on as a framework of his own argument.[74] In addition, a concept of climate much broader in scope than that of landscape was informative in reexamining theories of landscape of the same period which had been assimilated into state nationalism. Also, inspired deeply by Watsuji, Terada Torahiko, a physicist and literary scholar, published *Nihonjin no shizenkan* (The Japanese View of Nature) in the October 1935 issue of the journal *Toyo Shicho*, laying out his own discussion of nature, everyday life and spiritual life, to tackle the philosophical and scientific questioning of Japan as different from the West.[75]

11. Yasuda Yojuro——Landscape in Nippon Roman-ha

Yanagita and Watsuji each criticized post-Meiji theories of landscape in their own ways. Literary critic Yasuda Yojuro, on the other hand, denied those theories altogether, from the standpoint of classicism. In 1935, Yasuda launched the journal *Nihon Roman-ha* (The Japan Romantic School) with Kamei Katsuichiro and others, and the following year he made his debut as a critic with *Nihon no Hashi* (The Japanese Bridge). Influenced by German Romanticism, Yasuda advocated a critique of modernity and a return to Japanese classical beauty. His literary thought, which differed from so-called *Kokokushikan* (Emperor-centered view of history) or nationalism, had a great influence on war-time Japan. In 1943, he published *Fukei to Rekishi* (Landscape and History), which included his studies on

[73] Marxist philosopher Tosaka Jun sharply criticized the nationalistic aspects of Watsuji's argument. See "Watsuji Hakase, Fudo, Nihon," [Dr. Watsuji, Climate and Japan], in *Sekai no ikkan to shite no nihon* [Japan as part of the world] (Tokyo: Hakuyosha, 1937), 227-245.
[74] For a book which succeeded Watsuji's notion of climate and discussed its contemporary possibility, see, Augustin Berque, *Le* sauvage et *l'artifice : les japonais devant la nature* (Paris: Gallimard, 1986), *Écoumène* : *introduction à l'étude des milieux humains* (Paris: Belin, 2000).
[75] This text was included in Terada Torahiko, *Fudo to Bungaku* [Climate and Literature] (Tokyo: Kadokawashoten, 1950).

travelogues and landscapes. Due to his inclusions of mythological stories in his praise of Japanese classical beauty, there are some aspects that are difficult to examine, however, as a landscape theory by Japanese Romantics, the book raised many issues. Yasuda denounced the theory of landscape in Japan after the Meiji Restoration as depraved, and stated his intention in the foreword as "to restore the true national characters of Japan, first we must save our view of the landscape."[76] He argued that the view of the landscape is not something that changes depending on the era, but is historically universal. Yasuda discussed the meaning of landscape and history in Japan dating back to the poets of the Nara and Heian periods.

> Thus, this is where "history," according to my idea of landscape, existed. However what is referred to as the history of ideas of landscape is not a kind of chronological list of such and such person's ideas of landscape; furthermore, it is not something like the ideas of landscape of this time period, or that era. When we say history, we take successive traditions of ideas of Japanese landscape into consideration. More specifically, it is the history of *utamakura*.[77]

Yasuda thoroughly criticized modernist theories of landscape that destroyed landscape beauty through the introduction of Western landscapes, as well as Watsuji's theory of climate, while praising *monono aware*, or the empathy towards things read by court culture, poets such as Otomo no Yakamochi, Murasaki Shikibu, and Emperor Go-Toba as *utamakura*-based tradition.

> The interpretation of cultural-philosophical theories of landscape—which was created by the joint work between [the act of] replacing the word ‘landscape’ with ‘climate’, and trendy mountaineers, under the invocation of the power of words to preach historicity and ethno-nationality—massacred them. They lost the traditional aesthetic of Utamakura, and also lost our country's alpine views. Already it was a blasphemy of history. [...] When thinking of landscape in terms of culture and thought, as is true with thoughts of homeland (*kokyo*), landscape is the womb for the creation of cultural literary thoughts.[78]

Juxtaposing the 'gaze' (*nagame*) derived from the Heian Period against the western concept of landscape, Yasuda argued that traditionally in Japan, there is an aesthetics in which the writer's interior is

[76] Yasuda Yojuro, *Fukei to Rekishi* [Landscape and History] (Nara: Tenrijihosha, 1943), 3.
[77] Ibid., 396-397.
[78] Ibid., 40.

expressed through the depiction of the outside landscape. He then denied the discovery of landscape itself, as well as logical structure of landscape constituted on dichotomies of subject and object, or seeing and being seen, and discussed the theory of Japanese landscape as different from that of the West.

> If we see landscape as something that is merely outside of humans, consider it as something that confronts humans and affects the spirit from the outside, and also consider its relation to history simply as a stage for historical incidents, the philosophy of climate and geopolitics are sufficient. However, the idea of landscape that was born in the land of Japan was not such a thing. The landscape of our homeland means a history that is always in our hearts.[79]

Though the beauty of the landscape mentioned above had been denied by modernist landscape since the Meiji era, a return to the Japanese tradition was advocated in the midst of modernization and World War I. However, this return was not just an imperial restorationism, but a renaissance of Japanese culture required by the process of accelerating modernization.[80] Notwithstanding the fact that there are descriptions that are difficult to validate today—including the descriptive confusion of mythology with history, and colonialist discourse—the praise of classical beauty did not in principle necessarily accord with the Emperor-centered view of history, or the with imperialism of the time. By defining the notion of landscape as that which encompasses history, culture, and thought, Yasuda indicated landscape as an ideal separate from real politics. For the Japanese romantics, landscape was not something that was to be perceived as external object or aesthetic term, but a concept or spirit that supported the nation or race, and was integrated with war. Yasuda's argument that "war and culture are not two separate principles but an expression of one principle,"[81] was strongly criticized after the war due to its cultural and philosophical support of expansionist policy of Japan over Asia. In reality, however, Yasuda's idealism made clear the close relationship between landscape, and nation and race, with an angle different from that of modernist theory of landscape.

---

[79] Ibid., 410.
[80] Hashikawa Bunzo, *Nihon Romanha Hihan Josetsu* [The introduction to the criticism of Japan Romantic School] (Tokyo: Miraisha, 1960).
[81] Yasuda, *Fukei to Rekishi*, 400.

12. Dazai Osamu and Sakaguchi Ango

If Yasuda discussed the Japanese landscape as an ideal during the war, the literary writer, Dazai Osamu, approached it from an opposite perspective. After his participation as a student in the Communist Party, which was illegal at the time, Dazai gained attention when he published *Gyakko* (Against the Current) in *Nihon Roman-ha* in 1935. Describing the suffering of human beings, including the author himself, Dazai criticized the existing literature and its system, and searched for new forms of literary expression. He wrote the autobiographical novel *Fugaku Hyakkei* (Hundred Views of Mt. Fuji) at a teahouse near Lake Kawaguchi, where he was spending some time in the fall of 1938. In the beginning of the novel he refers to Mt. Fuji, a landscape symbolic of Japan as follows:

> The slopes of Hiroshige's Mount Fuji converge at an angle of eighty-five degrees, and those of Bun-cho's at about eighty-four degrees, but if one makes vertical cross sections based on survey maps drawn by the army, one finds that the angle formed by the eastern and western slopes is one hundred twenty-four degrees, and that formed by the northern and southern slopes is one hundred seventeen. And it's not only [Utagawa] Hiroshige and [Tani] Buncho, but most paintings of Mt. Fuji, in fact, depict the slopes meeting at an acute angle, the summit slender, lofty, delicate. Hokusai's renditions even resemble the Eiffel Tower, peaking at nearly thirty degrees. But the real Mt.Fuji is un-mistakably obtuse, with long, leisurely slopes; by no means do one hundred twenty-four degrees east-west and one hundred seventeen north-south make for a very steep mountain. If I were living in India, for example, and were suddenly snatched up and carried off by an eagle and dropped on the beach at Numazu in Japan, I doubt if I'd be very much impressed at the sight of this mountain. Japan's 'Fujiyama' is 'wonderful' [to foreigners] simply because they've heard so much about it and yearned so long to see it; but how much appeal would Mt. Fuji hold for one who has never been exposed to such popular propaganda, for one whose heart is simple and pure and free of preconceptions? It would, perhaps, strike that person as almost forlon, as mountains go. It's short, really. In relation to the width of its base, quite short. Any mountain with a base that size should be at least one and a half times taller.[82]

Mt. Fuji, Japan's tallest independent mountain, had been an object of worship since ancient times, and had since been described and represented in various forms of expression, including poetry, stories, picture scrolls, and Ukiyo-e paintings. Its role as a symbol of the beauty of the Japanese landscape remained unchanged even after the new concept of landscape was established in modern times, and after the Meiji Restoration, it additionally served as a sign in helping to unify the state and the nation. For instance, Shiga, in his book on landscape, even proposed naming China Fuji, for high mountains, in order

[82] Dazai Osamu, *Fugaku Hyakkei* [Hundred Views of Mt. Fuji] (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1972), 10.

to universally use the name of Fuji. In contrast, Dazai deliberately borrowed the title of Katsushika Hokusai's *Fugaku sanjurokkei* (Thirty-Six Views of Mount Fuji, 1823-35), a masterpiece series of famous landscape prints, for his book, and described his own daily living and struggles using Mt Fuji only as the background. He criticized the shapes of Mt. Fuji depicted in ukiyo-e paintings as exaggerated, and pointed out that, in order to be mythologized, Mt Fuji has to be even taller than the mountain actually is. Furthermore, Dazai sharply criticized a view from the Misaka Pass, which was considered to be one of the three best views of Mt. Fuji.

> Far from being pleased with the view, however, I found myself holding it in contempt. It's too perfect. You have Fuji right in the middle and, lying at its feet, the cold, white expanse of Lake Kawaguchi cradled by hushed, huddling mountains on either side. One look threw me into blushing confusion. It was a wall painting in a public bath. Scenery on a stage. So precisely made to order it was mortifying to behold.[83]

The wall painting at the bathhouse or the backdrop for the play, drawn based on the Three Views of Mt. Fuji, naturally resembles the actual view of the mountain, however, Dazai felt that the image of Mt. Fuji itself, since it took root as commonplace, was mortifying. It could be said that in 1939, during the war, criticizing Mt. Fuji was synonymous with denouncing the Japanese culture or state. Despite such a repressive situation, Dazai's attempt was to dismantle the myth of Mt. Fuji in the form of an autobiographical novel. As one of Dazai's representative novels from the middle period of his career, *Hundred Views of Mt. Fuji* is generally known for its literary expression moving toward his mature style. As was evident in appropriating Hokusai for the title and quoting *Nihon Sansui-ron* by Kojima, *Hundred Views of Mt. Fuji* was no doubt written in the context of landscape theory. His inquiry on landscape continued after that, and after *Ogon Fukei* (Golden Landscape), a story about his reunion with his former maid the same year, Dazai published *Tokyo Hakkei* (Eight Views of Tokyo) in 1941, with the subtitle "Gift to a person with hardships."

[83] Ibid., 12.

> Eight Views of Tokyo. I had wanted to try such a short story someday, writing slowly, with great care. I had wanted to tell the story of my ten years in Tokyo, with the events of my life tied to the places I had lived at each time. I am thirty-two years old this year. According to Japanese ethics, this was the age when one should already have started to enter into the solidity of middle age. The middle-aged time in life. And sadly enough, when I looked into my own body and spirit, I could not deny that it was happening. You'd better remember this: you have already lost your youth. You have the face of a serious adult. "Eight Views of Tokyo." I would write it as my farewell to adolescence, without prettying it up.[84]

In 1927 the *Tokyo Nichi-Nichi Shimbun* and the *Osaka Mainichi Shimbun* publicly sought as a joint project, "New Eight Views of Japan," symbolizing the new era of Showa. The final decisions were made by literary authors, including Izumi Kyoka and Tayama Katai. In response to this, Dazai selected eight views of Tokyo himself, looking back on his ten years of living in Tokyo as a writer.

> The spring rains in Totsuka. The twilight in Hongo. Festivals in Kanda. The first snow in Kashiwagi. The fireworks in Hatchobori. The full moon in Shibaura. The cicadas in Amanuma. Lightening in Ginza. The autumn flowers at the mental hospital in Itabashi. The morning mists in Ogikubo. The evening sun in Musashino. The dark flowers of memory scattered and danced, and wouldn't fall into place. Then again, I thought, it would be vulgar to organize everything and force it unreasonably into just eight views. In the meantime, this spring and summer, I came across two more views.[85]

The New Eight views of Japan had been selected to widely promote Japan as a country full of great landscapes, but Dazai's Eight Views of Tokyo, on the other hand, were unique and personal, selected not from an aesthetic perspective, but by looking back on his own struggles and disappointments in life as a writer. Dazai thus demonstrated his resistance to the state-based, or popular trend that had attempted to assimilate landscape into a grand narrative of Japan. It was by describing Mt. Fuji and the eight views of Tokyo very privately that he attempted to recover the concept of landscape back to the individual side. Of course, concepts such as 'individual' or 'subject' were modern constructs, and landscape likewise was no exception. Through the institutionalization of those concepts, the modern state and modern literature were born. It can also be pointed out that Dazai's radical expressions were even part of the institutionalization. However, expressing his practical trial and error process—including his own

[84] Dazai, Osamu, *Tokyo Hakkei* [Eight Views of Tokyo] (Tokyo: Jitsugyononihonsha, 1948), 8.
[85] Ibid., 38.

living—in literature was his attempt to dismantle the established notions of the modern, individual, and landscape from within. Dazai, along with Sakaguchi Ango and Oda Sakunosuke, were called the *burai-ha* (Decadent School). He is often praised or criticized based on his biography, due to the unique contents of his writing and his writing style, as well as his personal history, including drug addiction, repeated suicide attempts, and ending with him taking his own life along with his mistress. However, re-examining Dazai in the context of landscape theory reveals a potential different from modernity with a capital 'M', or the subject.

Along with Dazai, Sakaguchi Ango was another writer critiquing literature and landscape during the same period. In 1931 he made his debut with the novel, *Kaze Hakase* (Doctor Wind). He also drew acclaim with his essays on culture and literature, such as *Seishunron* (On Youth, 1942) and *Bungaku no Furusato* (Homeland of Literature, 1943). In *Nihon Bunka Shikan* (Private View on Japanese Culture), he aggressively denied traditional Japanese culture and beauty, even during the war, describing changes of landscape as follows:

> And now, we do not even feel sad that the wooden bridge has been replaced by the steel bridge, and that the width of the river has become narrower; furthermore, we think that it is quite natural. But I am not the only one who sees these changes. Many Japanese feel joy, rather than sadness, every time an old building in their hometown is destroyed and Western-style buildings emerge. We need new transportation and also an elevator. More than traditional beauty or intrinsically Japanese forms, we need convenience in our daily lives. The destruction of the temples in Kyoto or the Buddhist statues in Nara wouldn't bother us in the least, but we'd be in real trouble if the streetcars stopped running. The only thing that is important to us is the 'necessity of life'. Even if the ancient culture is destroyed, our life will survive, and as long as our life itself does not die, our uniqueness will remain healthy. For we do not lose our own needs, nor do we lose our desires, according to our necessities.[86]

Refuting the trend in which western cultural figures came to Japan and discovered traditional Japanese beauty on one hand, and lamented its losses on the other, Sakaguchi looked back on how his childhood hometown had been remodeled through the process of modernization. He lamented it back then, but now he thought it should be affirmed, in light of living. Furthermore, looking back on his brief life in

[86] Sakaguchi Ango, *Darakuron* [Discourse on Decadence] (Tokyo: Shinchosha, 2000), 41-42.

Kyoto, and criticizing the cultural forms and aesthetics found in temples, shrines, as well as other landmarks, Sakaguchi listed the landscapes that he considered beautiful.

> Kosuge Prison and a dry ice factory. I had some thoughts about the relation between these two, but I have never had a thought, except that each of them had a strong sense of beauty that made me feel nostalgic. They are completely different from the beauty of Horyuji or Byodoin. Moreover, Horyuji or Byodoin has such a beauty that you must be somehow convinced of, by taking into account ancient times and history. It is not something that moves me directly and bites into my gut. Unless we make up for something that is not enough, you can't be convinced. Kosuge Prison and the dry ice factory impact me more directly, with nothing to be compensated for, and have the power to immediately bring nostalgia to my heart.[87]

He described that he was drawn to a prison glimpsed from a streetcar traveling from the town where he lived at the time to Tokyo, and also to a dry ice factory, as a similar experience. These places, one could say are the extreme opposite of traditional Japanese beauty, or even of the range of what is generally called 'beautiful,' but, with a battleship that he saw on his trip to peninsula added to the list, Sakaguchi argues for them from an anti-aesthetic perspective.

> Why are these three things so beautiful? There is absolutely no element here that was fabricated in order to make them beautiful. There is no pillar or steel added from the standpoint of beauty, and no pillar or steel removed because it is not beautiful. Only what was needed was placed where needed. That way, all unnecessary things have been eliminated, and a unique form demanded only out of necessity has been created. It is a form that does not resemble anything else but itself.[88]

Using the concept of "necessity," Sakaguchi regards rational and non-decorative architecture and vehicles such as prison, factory, and battleship, as opposed to traditional beauty, as beauty for himself. He further argues that his literary work should also eliminate frills out of 'necessity.' These, however, did not simply attest to his affirmation of modernism. Sakaguchi rather insisted on being a thorough rationalist against utilitarianism, swaying between tradition and modernity, while benefiting from them, attempting to conversely illuminate what beauty and culture in Japan really were. He continuously argued that new culture and tradition were born out of everyday life.

---

[87] Ibid., 69.
[88] Ibid., 69-70.

> I would not be troubled if both Horyuji and Byodoin burned to the ground. If the need should arise, tear down Horyuji and put in a parking lot. The brilliant culture and traditions of our race never die. The quiet sunset in Musashino is gone, but the sunset falls on the roofs of the barracks, and the sunny days also look cloudy due to dust, and instead of the landscape of the moonlight at night, neon signs are shining. As long as our actual life settles our soul, what would it be if not beautiful?[89]

Musashino, described by Kunikida and Roka, underwent large-scale development in the 1920s, and as a result, a number of private railways started running, and its natural beauty disappeared. Sakaguchi on the other hand argued that barracks and neon signs, produced as unfavorable legacy of modernization, should be called beautiful. Whereas with Mt. Fuji and representative views of Tokyo, Dazai criticized the Japanese landscape from within, Sakaguchi, introducing landscapes that were at opposite ends of traditional beauty, defamiliarizing it to rediscover a new beauty, or beauty itself in the Japanese landscape. It was by Sakaguchi's materialist recognition of landscape that beauty, or landscape different from institution, was discovered. Both Sakaguchi and Dazai tried to re-inscribe the grand narrative of traditional and nationalist landscape even during the war, from the side of everyday life and human existence. Sakaguchi is widely known as a post-war literary author for essays and novels such as *Darakuron* (Discourse on Decadence) and *Hakuchi* (Idiot), published in 1946. It is however important to note that those works were not suddenly created after the war. Rather, under the wartime fascist regime, attempts had been made in literature and thought to resist it, and such resistance continued even during the turbulent postwar period. The war turned Japan into a burned-out field, and the landscape underwent enormous transformation after the major postwar restoration, during which neither the Japanese tradition nor beauty of the landscape had been reviewed. It could be said that Sakaguchi foresaw and discussed the postwar landscape in the prewar period. While landscape apart from nationalism as such was discussed, the Emperor System remained intact even after the war, and with the issue of the Japanese Empire's war responsibility on hold, a new post-war political system was advanced, and as a result, landscape, was significantly reinscribed after the war. Along with the development of capitalism, its relationship to the

[89] Ibid., 71.

state, in comparison to that in the prewar times, became further complicated and invisible, making itself even more robust against the background of visible postwar transformation.

13. Post-war Landscape——Hanada Kiyoteru

Literary critic, Hanada Kiyoteru wrote a number of essays on literature, theater, and film, leading the postwar avant-garde art movement. He published essays on Dazai and Sakaguchi in which he discusses issues of landscape. In his essay, *Nijusseiki niokeru Geijutsuka no Shukumei* (Artists' Fate in the Twentieth Century), included in his book, *Sakuran no Ronri* (The Logic of Confusion) in 1947. He casts light on content and form in Dazai's writing, which had been created out of the diametrically opposed poles of the causality and necessity found in modern novels, and the teleology and free will in premodern folklore. He argues that Dazai, rather than choosing either western-style modern novels or a Japanese-style premodern folklore, sought the possibilities of different expressions that derived from neither one, and introduced *Hundred Views of Mt. Fuji* as a rare example of sublating this dichotomy.

> What I am adhering to is simply that, despite being constantly aware of the conflict between the two, he wrote modern novels with the spirit of folklore, or folklores with the spirit of modern novels. However, very rarely, but I would not say that there is no remarkable work that fuses Japanese things and Western things. *Hundred Views of Mt. Fuji* is one example. In it, neither Picasso nor Ernst is present, but Degas is. It is Hokusai as seen through the eyes of Degas. Degas as seen through the eyes of Hokusai.[90]

Hanada argues that Dazai set the novel, a product of modernization, against the traditional folklore that had existed prior to modernity not to represent the opposition between the two as such, but to express them side by side simultaneously. Clearly, what is referred to as 'tradition' is not one based on a grand narrative or history of the Japanese state, but rather that of popular tales or storytelling that had existed on the periphery, as was discussed by Yanagita. Thus, according to Hanada, *Hundred Views of Mt. Fuji* was an exceptional work that successfully depicted the modern and the premodern. He argued his

[90] Hanada Kiyoteru, *Hanada Kiyoteru Chosakushu 1* [Collected Writings of Hanada Kiyoteru 1] (Tokyo: Miraisha, 1964), 356. For Hokusai's influence on Degas, as well as influences of Japonisme on Impressionism, see Kobayashi Taichiro, *Hokusai to Doga* [Hokusai and Degas] (Tokyo: Zenkokushobo, 1946).

point through the relationships between French Impressionist painter Edgar Degas and Katsushika Hokusai, or between the painting and ukiyo-e drawn by them, respectively. This comparison holds due to the fact that the landscape of Mt. Fuji—which Hokusai also depicted—occupies the significant position in *Hundred Views of Mt. Fuji*. Dazai, living in modern times, i.e. times after the discovery of landscape, attempted to describe the times before and after the landscape had come into existence simultaneously. Rather than assuming the present i.e. the postwar era as the basis of his thinking, through Dazai's work, Hanada examines postwar times from the perspective of prewar thinking, or the postwar not as a break from, but as continuation of, the prewar period. Hanada separated postwar thought from the discussion of it as freedom from war, or as political or social confusion, and discovered it on its own merits.

Meanwhile, during the same period, Hanada also wrote *Dobutsu, Shokubutsu, Kobutsu——Sakaguchi Ango nitsuite* (Animals, Plants, and Minerals: On Sakaguchi Ango) discussing his work and individual creativity as a response to criticism of Sakaguchi by the critic Oi Kosuke. Analyzing *Discourse on Decadence* and *Idiot* using his own unique metaphors, Hanada praises Sakaguchi on one hand, and criticizes his view of art that works of art and life should be integrated.

> In other words, I cannot but sincerely agree with Sakaguchi's determination to be a literary author as an artist, but I am quite skeptical of his belief that art equals real life, which is just like that of a moralist. If he thoroughly recognizes his own vulnerabilities by becoming aware of the break between the body and the soul, and not as a judge but rather as an accomplice, tries to be a playwright, with "service for entertainment in mind" with infinite tolerance, I consider that he should inevitably pay attention to the break rather than to the integration of art and real life.[91]

Hanada pointed out that if art and real life are synonymous, then Sakaguchi as a 'decadent' writer should act decadently in real life as well; however, in actuality he is a mere good citizen, and furthermore, an easy unity of art in real life would, on the contrary, divert his attention from problematizing them. He argued that it was rather important to accept differences between the two as they are. Sakaguchi himself did not claim that this unity of art and life was something that should genuinely be understood, either. Rather, he addressed this as criticism towards the literary scholars who had separated art from everyday

[91] Hanada, *Hanada Kiyoteru Chosakushu 2*, 372.

life excessively, and neglected the relationship between the two. Though Hanada praised Sakaguchi's work, he was critical of the logic that Sakaguchi had employed to sublate contradictions between art and real life. On the other hand, Sakaguchi focused his attention on the division between the body and the soul, which he referred to as "devil's eyes" or "eyes without thought," and Hanada insisted that this was indeed the eyes of true artists and thinkers.

> But the prevalence of erotic art, like the flight of seabirds signaling the arrival of a storm, frequently predicts the approach of a revolution. This is not necessarily because the decadent social conditions are mirrored in those works, but the eyes of the revolutionary writer properly identify the division between the human soul and body, and capture the human body as animal, plant, or mineral, and depict it quite coldly on its own merits, showing no emotion.[92]

Sakaguchi produced a number of works with his realistic eyes to observe the human body as matter, and Hanada argued that Sakaguchi's materialist gaze and observation would foresee a revolution. To depict human beings straightforwardly, as they were, required extreme effort, given the political and social situation, and everyday needs arising not only during the fascist wartime regime, but also under the post-war chaos and challenges. It was under these circumstances that Sakaguchi continued to gaze at Japan from within, and as a result, discover the landscape of the prison and the dry ice factory. Hanada discussed landscapes that Sakaguchi had depicted in contradictory settings between the premodern and the modern by stripping them down to the core, developing further his own theory of avant-garde art and revolution. Ten years later, Hanada, again, discussed Dazai in an essay, *Fukei ni tsuite* (Concerning Landscape), written in the wake of the struggle against the Japan-US Security Treaty. In it, he critically reviewed *Eight Views of Tokyo* in terms of the very relationship between the eight views selected by Dazai, and the landscape.

> ——With sceneries listed one after another, it almost makes me think that it looks like a Showa version of Kobayashi Kiyochika's ukiyo-e prints, however, those sceneries jumbled together, which seemingly came out of his memory, seem to have been colored with overwhelming sorrow, radiating a kind of unique glow in his inner world. However, even though I have been living in Tokyo for more than a quarter of a century, I am not able to remember any such landscape. Dazai

[92] Ibid., 338-339.

> Osamu wrote that he wanted to write about landscapes as expressions of his life (*seikatsu*), however, for someone whose life has already been lost, like myself, the landscape is also completely meaningless. I ignored my life. Almost despised it.[93]

Dazai selected eight views from the landscape of Tokyo where he actually lived, through which he described his own life in Tokyo. Hanada argued, in contrast, that despite living in Tokyo for so long, there was no life for him to tell about, and thus landscape through which to express his life likewise did not exist. Recalling a time when he did not bother to look at the view from the vehicle in which he was riding, Hanada further introduced an anecdote that at the end of the war period, when commuting from Kamakura to Tokyo by train, oblivious of the air raid alert, he was left alone in the car, but for the want of nothing better to do, he immersed himself in studying Latin. Despite this story, Hanada chose an ordinary stone wall in Akasaka, where a publisher that he had worked for before and after the war, was located, as the only one example of landscape. He stated that even that landscape was now gone, and returned to Dazai's landscape.

> I don't particularly mean to adhere to Dazai Osamu. Due to the circumstances of the story, if I dare say, I cannot help feeling that some sort of security of a person, who is not entirely deprived, is following his expression of "Tokyo life." Therefore, I have no home at all. Furthermore, I have no brothers, either.[94]

Dazai's attempt was to depict both art and life simultaneously from an angle that was different from that of Sakaguchi. By rejecting the unity of life and landscape, Hanada sought to recapture materialistically the landscape in and of itself, rather than as a medium for narratives or art. Landscape was purposely treated as matter rather than being recognized as a composite of various elements. In 1956 a government White Paper declared that it was "no longer the postwar era," and as Japan entered a period of high economic growth, the postwar landscape changed drastically. Furthermore, along with the New Leftist movement, which was established towards the struggle against the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, as an alternative body to the old Communist Party to which Hanada belonged, an oppositional concept of

[93] Hanada Kiyoteru, *Mohitotsu no Shura* [Another Carnage] (Tokyo: Chikumashobo, 1961), 100.
[94] Ibid., 108.

landscape that was different from that of the modern eras such as prewar or postwar was demanded. It was within these contexts and against these background that Hanada praised *Hundred Views of Mt. Fuji* from 1939 immediately after the war, and rejected *Eight Views of Tokyo* from 1941 in the midst of the Anpo struggle. In this transition period, Hanada proposed the potential of landscape-as-materiality, or the materialist concept of landscape.

Although changes in landscape theories that transpired from the era of Japan's modernization through the postwar period were examined, the landscape theory of Matsuda and his associates almost never referred to those previous discussions. This is because most of the existing theories and discourses of landscape were inseparably tied to nationalism, and Matsuda and associates deliberately circumvented the old discussions in an attempt to develop their theory in a completely different context. While not directly discussed by Matsuda and others, arguments made by Uchimura, Kamei, Yanagita and Watsuji, who had tried to resist the landscape and state under Japanese Imperialism—which had remained in place from the Meiji Restoration to the Second World War—had many common characteristics with the new landscape theory. It can be further pointed out that the new landscape theory owed much of its theoretical inheritance to the notion of landscape that Hanada proposed through the literary work of Dazai and Sakaguchi, who had thoroughly rejected Japanese exceptionalism and nationalistic narratives and history during and after the war.