



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Landscape theory: post-68 revolutionary cinema in Japan**

Hirasawa, G.

### **Citation**

Hirasawa, G. (2021, September 28). *Landscape theory: post-68 revolutionary cinema in Japan*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3243318>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3243318>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

### **Chapter Three A: On Adachi Masao**

In this chapter I will discuss Adachi Masao who co-directed *A.K.A. Serial Killer* and *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*, both of which were crucially important films in the development of landscape theory. First, I will trace the historical and cultural background relevant to Adachi's artistic and political formation, then, by analyzing *A.K.A. Serial Killer* in light of film theory—as well as referencing the process of its production—landscape theory will be critically examined. This will be followed by an analysis of *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* based on theoretical developments from landscape theory to the theory of reportage.

## 1. Film Historical Background

Adachi entered Nihon University's Art Department in 1959, and joined the film study group. *Nihon Daigaku Geijutsu Gakubu Eiga Kenkyukai* (Nihon University Art Department Film Study Club) was established in 1957 and just one year later produced *Kugi to kutsushita no taiwa* (Conversation Between Nail and Socks, 1958). This film was produced collectively, with all members participating equally, regardless of roles such as production, directing/scripting, filming, lighting, assistant director, etc., and thus the hierarchical production style with the director on top was eliminated. Also it was made as a strictly independent production of the Film Study Club, deliberately not seeking a profit through screenings, and eliminating any commercial requirements that might arise. In addition, though the titles 'director' and 'script writer' of the initial film can be ascribed to Hirano Katsumi and Ko (Taniyama) Hiroo, the production was strictly based on a collective effort, and was not attributed to participants' specific names.

The currents of Japanese independent and experimental film which started in the late 1950's can be explored first by categorizing them into three groups: first, student films centering around the Nihon University Film Study Club—with Hirano, Ko, Jonouchi Motoharu, Adachi and Okishima Isao etc., the Tomon Scenario Study Club of Waseda University (Shinaken)—including Yamatoya Atsushi and Tanaka Yozo, the Kyoto University Film Study Club— Tanabe Yasushi and others, and the Kansei Gakuin

University Film Study Club—including Yamano Koichi. The second group is represented by films of Teshigahara Hiroshi, Terayama Shuji, *Jikken kobo* (Experimental Laboratory) of Yamaguchi Katsuhiro, the *Gurafikku Shudan* (Graphic collective) of Otsuji Kiyoji, etc., who were influenced by contemporary avant-garde art discourse, and promoted by critics such as Hanada Kiyoteru and Takiguchi Shuzo. The third group consists of personal films by filmmakers such as Obayashi Nobuhiko and Takabayashi Yoichi, who shot on 8mm and 16mm film. In addition, filmmakers such as Tsuchimoto Noriaki, Ogawa Shinsuke, and Iwasa Hisaya from Iwanami Eiga productions had a connection to *Ao no kai* (Blue Group).

Teshigahara Hiroshi, who belonged to the second group, formed “Cinema 57” with Hani Susumu, Matsuyama Zenzo and others, and they collectively produced *Tokyo 1958* in 1958. This collective—consisting of filmmakers and critics—had been known for organizing independent film screening events, but decided to produce the film in an attempt to get into experimental film festivals abroad. Though that was the only film they produced as a group, it was an exceptional example of exploring the new possibility of producing and screening a film without any commercial basis at the Sogetsu Art Center. The role of Sogetsu Art Center, established in the same year, was particularly noteworthy in the domain of experimentalism in all fields of art, including film, exemplified by its early introduction of John Cage and Fluxus to Japan by Yoko Ono.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, in the fifties, various strains of criticism took shape concerning the theory and practice of postwar art, with a focus on the fine arts. In film, the theoretical and practical developments began to emerge in 1957, the year the magazine *Eiga Hyoron* (Film criticism) was published by Kasu Sanpei, and in 1958, when *Eiga to hihyo no kai* (Film and criticism societies)—in which people like Oshima and Yoshida, who at the time were working as assistant directors, participated—came into being. Furthermore, the magazine *Kiroku Eiga* (Documentary film) was issued by *Kiroku eiga sakka kyokai* (Association of Documentary Filmmakers), led by Noda Shinkichi and Matsumoto Toshio. The theory—aiming for a fusion of avant-garde and documentary—was put into practice with Matsumoto's *Anpo joyaku* (Japan-US Security Treaty, 1959), with *Documentary Film* at the center of the debate. Meanwhile Oshima and Yoshida made their debuts with *Ai to kibo no machi* (A

Town of love and hope, 1959) and *Rokudenashi* (Good for nothing, 1960) respectively. However, the works clashed violently with theory and criticism. This development can be said to have had a big influence on independent filmmakers, but at the same time it is a fact that films such as *Conversation between Nail and Socks* and *Tokyo 1958* preceded them, so rather than a one-way influence, we can say that it is appropriate to understand the work as part of a larger movement, with the late 1950s as its turning point.

1958 was also an important year in terms of the film industry: attendance at the cinema reached over 1.2 billion, the largest attendance in the history of Japanese cinema. In 1960 there was a peak of 548 films produced and shown on 7,457 screens, thanks to the establishment of a network among Japan's six major film companies—including a system for screenings, serial works being produced by the so-called 'great masters,' and the rapid advance of rival independent productions. After that, however—partly due to the emergence of the new medium of television—the number of moviegoers and theaters steadily decreased, and the major companies began to downsize.

Meanwhile, following Oshima and Yoshida several directors made their debuts at Shochiku: Shinoda Masahiro with *Koi no katamichi kippu* (One way ticket for love, 1960), Takahashi Osamu with *Kanojo dake ga shitte iru* (Only she knows, 1960), Tamura Tsutomu with *Akunin shigan* (The Samurai Vagabonds/Desire to be a bad man, 1960), and Morikawa Eitaro with *Bushido Muzan* (The Tragedy of Bushido, 1960). Soon they were called the Shochiku Nouvelle Vague by journalists, as a comparison to French directors who had made their first films at a young age, such as Francois Truffaut, Jean-Luc Godard, Claude Chabrol and Louis Malle. However, as Oshima pointed out, these filmmakers were actually employees of film companies and made films for a living. In this sense it is not accurate to compare them with new wave filmmakers of the world (including France)—it is only because the major film companies wanted to find their way out of a business slump and draw new audiences that they turned to auterism. Examples of this are not limited to Shochiku, but can also be seen in Toho's promotion of Sugawa Eizo and Onchi Hideo.

On the other hand, Nakahira Ko had depicted the lusty rebellion of youth, selecting Ishihara Yujiro for the lead role in *Kurutta Kajitsu* (Crazy fruit, 1956), accelerating the Sun Tribe-boom (*Taiyo-zoku bumu*), which had been engendered by Yujiro's older brother Ishihara Shintaro's novel *Taiyo no kisetsu* (Season of the sun, 1956). Furthermore, with *Kuchizuke* (Kisses, 1957) Masamura Yasuzo, who had studied at the Centro Sperimentale in Italy, similarly had conceived a new image of youngsters who laid bare their desires and evoked a lot of sympathy. In retrospect, it could be said that it is these films that led the way for the Shochiku Nouvelle Vague. Of course, since the protagonists of the so-called "sun-tribe" films were bourgeois youth, there is a significant class difference from films by Oshima and other similar filmmakers. In addition, this way of appointing young directors was due to various internal struggles among young assistant directors within the film companies, and this is undeniably important in the context of film history and the film industry. However, if we want to strictly review the concept of 'new wave' it seems more appropriate to discuss Adachi and his peers associated with Nihon University Film Study Club, Teshigawara and Obayashi, and the filmmakers surrounding them, since they came from outside the existing Japanese film system.<sup>216</sup>

As the 1960 security treaty approached, The Nihon University Film Study Club documented the struggle constantly. All of the Film Study club members joined the protest as volunteers so that the struggles could be portrayed from the point of view of participants. The resulting work negates the notion of a completed work, and begets instead a methodology in which the presentation of the work is part of the process of the action and struggle. After the *Anpo* struggles, five people, including Jonouchi and Adachi, established VAN *Eiga Kagaku Kenkyujo* (VAN Film Science Research Center) at Ogikubo in Tokyo as a place to both live and produce films together, along with artist Yoshimuras Masunobu's studio of Neo Dada Organizers, which was formed by Yoshimura, Shinohara Ushio, Akasegawa Genpai and a

---

<sup>216</sup> See Oshima Nagisa, *Sengo eiga: Hakai to sozo* [Postwar Cinema: Destruction and Creation] (Tokyo: Sanichishobo, 1963); Yoshida Kiju, *Jikohitei no ronri: Sozoryoku ni yoru henshin* [Logic of Self-denial: Metamorphosis through Creativity] (Tokyo: Sanichishobo, 1970); Ishido Toshiro, *Taida eno chohatsu* [A provocation to indolence] (Tokyo: Sanichishobo, 1966); Takahashi Osamu, *Kenran taru Kagee: Ozu Yasujiro* [Brilliant Shadow Picture: Ozu Yasujiro] (Tokyo: Bungeishunju, 1982); Onchi Hideo, *Kinuta Satsueijo to boku no seishun* [Kinuta Film Studio and My Adolescence] (Tokyo: Bungeishunju, 1999).

few others. The VAN Film Science Research Center became a space of communication where not only filmmakers, but people from all modes of expression—including arts, photography, music, theater, and design—could meet, and the joint experiment between VAN and the *Kyosanshugisha domei* (Communist league) i.e. BUND, the new left groups, was conducted. Many Nihon University Film Study Club members also got involved in BUND at Nihon University, and, equating expression with vanguard practice in politics, Jonouchi, Kanbara Hiroshi and his peers began documenting the *Anpo* struggle from the side of the movement early on. The footage of the struggle was screened as *Dokumento 6-15* (Document 6-15, 1961) at the 6/15 memorial assembly hosted by *Zengakuren* (All Students Federation) in '61. While executive board members of BUND called for the cancellation of the assembly based on a policy change, VAN took a stance against the cancellation, attempting to make an artistic intervention against the decision. Adachi reminisced about the day of the assembly and the screening of the film:

As the open assembly moved forward and the memorial speeches continued, finally the film was screened. The excitement of the images temporarily absorbed the atmosphere inside the memorial site, and a chant of "We fight" began in harmony with the brave figures from the student demonstrations. Meanwhile when the leaders of the All Student League repeatedly chanted "We must fight!" at the outdoor site, everyone said, "Right on!" and began to focus. The screening of the film and the sound, which was initially designed to be a call and response session, with two tracks of comments which should be played correspondingly fell apart, and some of the sound went indoors and others went outside the venue, continuing to venomously agitate the students, and when a communist party song was played in a strange chorus, "Bbbbbuy Japan Press Weekly!" the students indoors shouted "Nonsense!" and took over the podium, whereas the students who only heard the comments supporting dispersing outdoors shouted "do not disperse!" and rushed inside, forming a line. They all began to shout in unison "All Students League, fight," and "We keep fighting!" The momentum reached a height at which it became unstoppable. The VAN group cheered with excitement "we did it! Let's get out of here!" then quickly collected films and tape recorders, and ran off, dispersing.<sup>217</sup>

Despite the fact that it was a memorial assembly for Kanba, who was killed in front of the Diet during the protest, as well as a memorial of the *Anpo* struggle, rather than showing a 'documentary' film, an inter-media experiment based on the concept of a one-time happening was carried out, wherein scenes reenacting police violence were symbolically inserted in documentary footage, and western paintings

---

<sup>217</sup> Adachi Masao, "Subete wa 'VAN eiga kagaku kenkyujo' kara hajimatta," [It all began with the VAN Film Science Research Center] in *Underground Film Archives*, ed. Hirasawa Go (Tokyo: Kawadeshoboshinsha, 2001), 98.

were projected on top of the screen with slides, while objects were dangling from the ceiling, and two different and conflicting soundtracks were played, clashing against each other in the hall. As a result the hall was turned into utter confusion, and the order to disperse was postponed. With happenings such as this, the assembly became a form of collective expression. Even though VAN was accused of being a modernist revisionist group by the BUND leaders, they did accomplish an artistic intervention in politics.<sup>218</sup> Importantly, however what is referred to as art here was not posited in terms of a dichotomy between art and politics, or the juxtaposition of the two, but an attempt at art=politics. It could be said that the practice of art=politics was demonstrated even more clearly at a symbolic space like the *Zengakuren* assembly, rather than at movie theaters or galleries.

Also, born out of such experimental currents as this were the LSD public experiment by Nihon University Film Study Club, a happening event called *Soko Zero* (Zero de conduite), and black mass ceremony. Also in 1963, VAN produced *Sain* (Closed vagina) in which feelings of blockage and stagnation after the defeat of the 1960 *Anpo* struggle were symbolized by an absent vagina, and as a performance happening/screening *Sain no gi* (Ritual for Closed Vagina) in Kyoto the following year. On the initiative of Adachi, Jonouchi, artists Akasegawa, Kazakura Sho, musicians Tone Yasunao and Kosugi Takehisa from *Gurupu Ongaku* (Group Music) and the like participated, and extreme and radical happenings took place at an ‘evening of the ceremony’ wherein a piano in the hall was played with a whip and eventually destroyed, some papers were scattered and set fire, and so on. On the day of the ceremony, one of the film reels was stolen by an avant-garde political group called *Hanzaisha domei* (Criminals league), so the screening itself was impossible. However it was assumed that that incident was part of the event, and the event went on, eventually culminating in one big uproarious brawl, in which the whole audience participated. In the end the commotion got so intense that the venue was surrounded by riot police, and was raided.

---

<sup>218</sup> There was a dispute in *Nihon dokusho shimbun* [The Japan Reader’s Newspaper]. One of the writers was Matsuda Masao writing under his penname Hirosawa Mina. See “Dismantling the Convention of the Dark—Critique on 6.15 Document” and “What Should Be Seen?—Again on 6.15 Document” in *Japanese Expanded Cinema and Intermedia: Critical Texts of the 1960s*, ed. Hirasawa Go, Ann-Tasch Adachi and Julian Ross (Berlin: Archive Books, 2020), 97-104.



Meanwhile, just before this event, Akasegawa exhibited a very realistic imitation 1,000 yen note as a work of art, and a police report about a counterfeit yen note had been sent to the Public Prosecutors Office. Other currents of radical movement besides the New Left were also beginning to take place, such as the Independent School and Tokyo Action Front under the leadership of Matsuda Masao and Yamaguchi Kenji, in which Adachi and the others participated. Such attempts to traverse the space between art and politics—whether artistic or political—were faced with a new stage in which there was direct confrontation with the police and the state, and the concept of direct action became a primary focus. Though it could be said that *the Ritual for Closed Vagina* presented ‘chaos’ which went beyond even the framework of art and politics, that in itself made the development of Document 6·15 possible, and was symbolic as it embodied the philosophy of the VAN group as a nexus of communication.

## **2. On Adachi Masao**

After dropping out of Nihon University, Adachi, centering on VAN, got involved in production sites for film and TV, and in 1966 he joined Wakamatsu Production which run by Wakamatsu Koji in order to pursue further experiments in the field of cinema. In the previous year, Wakamatsu had caused a sensation when his film *Kabe no naka no himegoto* (The Secret behind the wall, 1965), despite being a ‘pink film,’ was officially entered in the competition at the Berlin International Film Festival, and he was suddenly thrust into the spotlight as a leader of dissident films. At that time, in order to be submitted to the three major film festivals, Japanese films had to be examined and approved by the Motion Picture Producers Association of Japan, who would then select and recommend films to represent Japan. Since this low-budget pink movie—which had been submitted through a distribution company in Germany—pushed aside the official recommended works and became the representative film of Japan, not just did the film industry react strongly against it, but the controversy grew to the point that the Japanese

government boycotted the film festival and campaigned against the film, calling it a national disgrace.<sup>219</sup>

The so-called 'pink film' began as low-budget soft-core pornography in 1962, and developed into its own genre. With the existing film industry in decline, this new form of independent film production and entertainment achieved commercial success, surpassing the five major film companies' productions. However, due to the explicit sexual content of pink films, they were criticized by the existing film industry, as well as by conscientious *culturati*, even leading to a police intervention and crackdown. Despite the fact that pink films were produced with an disproportionately low budget of 3 million yen, Wakamatsu took advantage of the system of mass-producing and quick shooting, and began producing his films, which reflected political and social situations, under the aegis of the pink film system. Wakamatsu Production is also known for many talented collaborators among its production team. From around the time of *The Secret Behind the Wall*, Yoshizawa Takao and Terashima Mikio from *Gekidan Shinen* (New Drama Theatrical Company), who collaborated with Oshima on the theater movement during their time at Kyoto University and made appearances in Oshima's *Nihon no yoru to kiri* (Night and Fog in Japan, 1960) became the script writers. Also Yamatoya and Sone Chusei, who were to become the core members of script writers collective, *Guryu Hachiro* by Suzuki Seijun, also joined the production team from Nikkatsu. Finally, with Nihon University Film Study Group, including Adachi and Okishima who joined in '66, Wakamatsu production developed into a creative movement whose guerilla style productions spawned a number of radical works which went far beyond the framework of the Pink Film genre. Immediately after his participation in Wakamatsu Production, Adachi produced a number of scripts for Wakamatsu, including numerous masterpieces and controversial films such as *The Embryo Hunts in Secret* depicting a sado-masochistic world enacted by a couple in a locked room, *Nihon boko ankokushi ijosha no chi* (Dark History of Violence in Japan: The Blood of a Pervert, 1967), in which the story of four generations of a family afflicted by 'cursed' blood is overlapped with the Japanese Emperor system, and *Violated Angels*, an improvisational play based on an incident in Chicago in which several nurses

---

<sup>219</sup> Roland Domenig, "Shikakerareta Scandal,"[Planned scandal], *Wakamatsu Koji: Hankenryoku no shozo* [Wakamatsu Koji: A portrait of Anti-authority], ed. Yomota Inuhiko and Hirasawa Go (Tokyo: Sakuhinsha, 2007),42-76.

were murdered, featuring Kara Juro, the standard-bearer of the small underground theater movement.

Adachi made his debut as a director with *Datai* (Abortion, 1966) following Yamatoya's directorial debut, *Uragiri no kisetsu* (Season of Betrayal, 1966), in which the fundamental issue of violence is addressed against the background of the Vietnam War. *Abortion* is a parodic sex education film with a gynecologist named Maruki Sadao – a pun on Marquis de Sade, struggles to develop an ultimate contraceptive device for sexual pleasure. From around 1968, when the anti-authority, largely student-organized movement *Zenkyoto* began to expand nationwide, Adachi continued to make films that were intrinsically linked to the movement, including *Sei yugi* (Sex Game, 1968) depicting the sexual and political revolution in a strange relationship between non-political students and female activists; *Jogakusei gerira* (Female Student Guerilla, 1969), a story of high school student activists who conduct guerilla warfare by establishing a military base in the mountains and attempt to destroy their graduation ceremony; or *Funshutsu kigan - 15-sai no baishunfu* (Gushing Prayer: A 15-Year Old Prostitute, 1970), which depicts the decline of the student movement through the life of young prostitute in high school. Adachi continued to produce works such as these that were intrinsically tied to the movement. Importantly, however, the content of these films—as well as his scripts for Wakamatsu films such as *Running Madness Dying in Love*, *Sex Jack* and *Tenshi no kokotsu* (Ecstasy of Angels, 1972) with activists and terrorists as their protagonists—is his critique of the movement. Therefore, Adachi's strategy in film was two-fold: since the pink film genre necessitated portraying sex, Adachi made it possible to create highly politically charged stories even while meeting this requirement; at the same time, he used sexuality to expose the narrowly-defined political authoritarianism and phallocentrism of the existing movement by introducing depictions of sexuality into political narratives.

Meanwhile, while working on pink films, in collaboration with former Nihon University Film Study Club members, Adachi self-produced the film *Gingakei* (*Galaxy*, 1967), an epic conceptual drama, which portrays the death of a protagonist called “M” and the dream of self-liberation. It was also the first film that was screened at *andaagraundo Sasoriza* (Theatre Scorpio) a venue established specifically for underground cinema and theater. Together with his film *Closed Vagina* and *Galaxy* became known as a

representative work of Japanese underground cinema. Also around this period Adachi made a unique cameo appearance as the security officer who conducts the execution in Oshima's *Death By Hanging*, the first ATG film production. He also helped produce trailers for the film, and co-scripted *Three Resurrected Drunkards* and *Diary of a Shinjuku Thief*, with members of Sozosha, thus extending his activities from Wakamatsu Production to Sozosha. It is through this collaboration that Adachi co-produced *A.K.A. Serial Killer* with Matsuda and Sasaki, to propose landscape theory. Also in 1971 Adachi and his peers completed *Red Army-PFLP Declaration of World War*, a newsreel film that was meant to serve as a text for global revolution. The film portrayed the everyday life of Arab guerillas. The red bus screening troupe was formed around the idea of the negation of the conventional film screening, and making manifest that the screening itself is a facet of the movement. The film was also screened in Palestine and Europe, becoming a definitive example of cinema=movement in Japan. Prompted by this work, in 1974 Adachi left Japan to commit himself to Palestinian Revolution.

### **3. Historical Development of *A.K.A. Serial Killer***

*A.K.A. Serial Killer* is a film consisting exclusively of shots of landscapes that may have been encountered by Nagayama Norio, who committed a series of murders between October 1968 and April 1969. In addition to Adachi, the film was co-produced by Matsuda, Sasaki, Iwabuchi, Nonomura and Yamazaki; the music was supervised by music critic Aikura Hisato, and performed by Togashi Masahiko on drums and Takagi Mototeru on saxophone. Shooting started in July 1969 and the film was edited and scored by the end of that year.

The film begins with an intertitle reading: "Last fall four murders were committed in four cities using the same gun. This spring a nineteen year-old boy was arrested. He was called a serial killer." The film ends with the following, almost identical intertitle: "In the fall of 1968 four murders were committed in four cities using the same gun. In the spring of 1969 a nineteen year-old boy was arrested. He was called a serial killer." In between these opening and closing titles, the film intently shows shots of ordinary, banal landscapes that Nagayama may have encountered during his life up to his arrest,

migrating from place to place across Japan. Matsuda discusses Nagayama's footsteps by dividing his nineteen-year drift into three periods: 1-the first fifteen years are the place where he was born and grew up, and how he moved to Tokyo for mass employment; 2-the three and a half years during which he started his life in Tokyo; and finally, the period after which he had acquired a pistol from the U.S. To depict these footsteps, Adachi and Matsuda decided to follow the same footsteps Nagayama had taken for a condensed four-month period based on the diagram below:

The Suburbs of Abashiri City—within Abashiri City—Itayanagi—Runaway) Hiromae—Aomori—Hakodate—Itayanagi—(Runaway) Yamagata—Fukushima—Itayanagi (Moved to Tokyo for mass employment).  
 Shibuya/Tokyo—(Quit his job/illegal migration) Yokohama—Nagoya—Hong Kong—Yokohama—Koyama—Employed) Utsunomiya—(Thereafter moved from one place to another).  
 Osaka—Moriguchi—Haneda/Tokyo—Kawasaki—Yokosuka—Kawasaki—Yodobashi and Nakano/Tokyo—Ikebukuro—Sugamo—Odawara—Atami—Nagoya—Osaka—Kobe—(Illegal migration) Yokohama—Nerima/Tokyo—Nishiogikubo and Higashi Nakano—Itayanagi—Tokyo—Nagano.  
 Yokosuka—Ikebukuro/Tokyo—(Thereafter moved from one place to another) Shiba—Kyoto—Yokohama—Ikebukuro/Tokyo—Hakodate—Otaru—Sapporo—Hakodate—Nagoya—Yokohama—Shinjuku and Nakano/Tokyo—Yokohama—Harajuku/Tokyo.<sup>220</sup>

Summarizing Nagayama's trajectory, he was born in a 'no address area' (*bangaichi*) in Yobito, Abashiri City, Hokkaido in June, 1949. His father was an apple picker and his mother was a wandering merchant. He was the fourth child in the family, with eight brothers and sisters, including a sister who was two years younger. His father, who was a drifter who took pride in his craftsmanship and was fond of gambling, later disappeared. In addition, Nagayama's older brother got a classmate pregnant and then also disappeared, leaving his mother to raise the child. The rest of the family moved to Abashiri City, and began running a retail store, but an older sister was hospitalized in a mental institution for a long time. Due to their dire economic circumstances, when Nagayama was five, his mother began working outside of the home, and the four children spent the whole winter by themselves. Neighbors, alarmed by the situation, filed a report, and they were taken by their mother in Itayanagi, Aomori. In Itayanagi, Nagayama attended elementary and junior high school. However he repeatedly ran away from home in an

---

<sup>220</sup> Matsuda Masao, "Fukey toshiteno toshi," [City as Landscape] in *Fukey no shimetsu* [Extinction of the landscape] (Tokyo: Tabatashoten, 1971), 14.

attempt to see his older sister in the mental hospital. When Nagayama was 13, his father was found dead in *Kansai* area.

After graduating from junior high school at the age of 16, Nagayama moved to Tokyo for mass employment, and began working at a fruit shop in Shibuya. However he quit that job soon after, and attempted to leave the country illegally, only to be found on a ship and deported from Hong Kong. Nagayama was taken in by his older brother and worked at a car repair shop, but was arrested for theft and put in a juvenile detention center. After that Nagayama migrated from place to place, drifting from job to job. He also started attending high school evening classes, however he quickly quit, and attempted to leave Japan illegally again, and was again unsuccessful. In October 1968 when he was nineteen years old, he stole a gun from the U.S. military base in Yokosuka, and committed four indiscriminate shootings over the course of a month—on October 11 in Shiba, Tokyo, on October 14 in Kyoto, on October 26 in Hakodate, and on November 5 in Nagoya. Nagayama then returned to Tokyo and rented an apartment in Nakano and worked at bars and a *jazu kissa* (Jazz cafe). He still kept his gun, and in April 1969 he was arrested after breaking into a vocational school in Harajuku.

The Nagayama incident created an enormous impact on postwar Japan for three main reasons. First, it was a series of indiscriminate fatal shootings committed for no specific reason and which took place across multiple regions. Second, Nagayama was an ‘innocent’ minor at the time of his arrest. Thirdly, he was one of the “golden eggs” (*kin no tamago*) who had been embraced during Japan’s period of high economic growth, and had moved to the city immediately after graduating from junior high school, and thus was deeply rooted in urban society in Japan. His crime was therefore not received as having been committed in some remote area by a criminal who was irrelevant to everyone; this ‘hideous’ crime committed by an underclass worker who had supported Japan’s economic growth from below indeed highlighted Japan’s distorted social structure. Furthermore, on July 2, 1969 immediately after his arrest,

Nagayama began writing “prison notes” that were later compiled as *Muchi no namida* (Tears of Ignorance) in March 1973.<sup>221</sup>

Condemning his own poverty and society, Nagayama began to assume Tokyo Detention House as his school, taught himself to read *kanji*, and read books on philosophy, thought, and history, and became a Marxist and lone wolf terrorist. After the publication of his book, he continued to publish novels, poetry books, and books on thought, and attacked nation states and the capitalist system with intense animosity, developing his own form of expression. In addition, Nagayama repeatedly criticized judges, prosecutors and at times his own lawyers, expressing his fierce fight against the nation state, and for this very reason, he was given the death penalty. This decision was later called the 'Nagayama criteria,' and served as a precedent for assigning the death penalty. For Nagayama, the death penalty was executed in 1997. Even ten years after the trial, the Nagayama incident was referenced whenever a major crime is committed by a minor.

#### **4. The Anti-Aesthetic of Vision-Structural Characteristics as Cinema**

The structure of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* basically consists of long shots - living spaces such as houses, schools, stores, factories, construction sites, and urban spaces centering around transportation networks such train stations, main roads, expressways and ports. By incorporating landscapes viewed from different vehicles - trains, cars, ships and bicycles—or landscapes in which we see those vehicles moving, the surroundings are shot in panning, tilt and dolly shots. Moving landscapes continue endlessly. After the opening intertitle, the first sequence begins with a shot of a festival mimicking *daimyo gyoretsu* (the feudal lord’s procession) in Abashiri City, Hokkaido. the feudal lord’s procession was a ritualistic procession conducted by Edo Period feudal lords who governed their regions with many retainers. Historically, Hokkaido was inhabited by native people called *Ainu Moshiri*, so except for a part of the region, Hokkaido was outside the direct governance of the Edo Shogunate government. In addition,

---

<sup>221</sup> For a more detailed chronology see below: “Nagayama Norio Kanzen nenpyo,” [The complete chronology of Nagayama Norio] in *Bungei Bessatsu Zohoshinban Nagayama Norio* [Bungei supplement expanded version Nagayama Norio] (Tokyo: Kawade Shobo Shinsha, 2013), 248-263.

Abashiri is in the furthest northeast, where the feudal had never been posted. Interestingly, however, since Hokkaido was incorporated into the Japanese state in the process of modernization during Meiji Restoration, a festival mimicking an event in Edo Period was conducted even in Abashiri. As Matsuda pointed out in his *City as Landscape*, a scene of what seemed like a traditional local festival was in fact an image of formerly colonial Hokkaido leaning heavily on its own false history, encapsulating the contradictory strains of modernization embodied in Japan.<sup>222</sup>

Next we see Nagayama's birthplace, an unlabeled plot of land in Yobito, Abashiri City in a long take with a fixed camera, while a group of ten railroad cars travelling in the background are incorporated through editing. While the view of the tenement in Abashiri City where Nagayama and his family moved is captured by a fixed camera, the view of the town is shown in a 360-degree panning shot. A movie theater sign with names of Nikkatsu's big stars such as Ishihara Yujiro located on the right side facing the tenement is shown. A sea port, horses and carts are shown in a tracking shot, and the transition to Itayanagi in Aomori Prefecture is indicated by an image of Abashiri Station, shown with a train departing from it, followed by a long take of the sea viewed from Seikan ferry, crossing from Hokkaido to the main island. Then an image of Shibuya, Tokyo where Nagayama went for 'mass employment', then images of different cities across the nation where he drifted from job to job after quitting his job in Shibuya and attempting to sneak overseas. Then an image of Yokosuka, where Nagayama stole a pistol from a U.S. military housing unit, then a shot of Shiba, then Kyoto, Hakodate, and Nagoya, where he committed a series of indiscriminate murders, and an image of Shinjuku, where he worked as a waiter. Then Nakano, where he rented a small apartment by himself, and finally, the film ends with an image of Harajuku, where Nagayama was arrested for attempted burglary.

The entire landscape chronologically traces the specific places where Nagayama lived, worked, studied and committed crimes. Adachi's narration conveys Nagayama's footsteps, however it is extremely

---

<sup>222</sup> In fact, "Fuukei toshite no toshi", Matsuda's second essay on landscape theory, begins by pointing out the irony of the history of *daimyo gyoretsu* parade. Filming started in concert with the regular festival at the Abashiri Shrine on August 15. See: Matsuda Masao, Hirasawa Go and Yabu Shiro (interviewees), "Matsuda Masao ga Kataru Sengoshiso no 10nin – Shito suru Kakumei," [Matsuda Masao discusses postwar thoughts through 10 people – Revolution of Personal Struggle], *Gendai no Riron* [Contemporary Theory], vol.12 (Summer 2007): 205-219.



brief, and is meant only to communicate facts. At the same time, although famous sightseeing locations are not included, based on the narration, specific names of stations, buildings, streets, people, and organizations that appear in the film, it is possible that someone with local knowledge would recognize the locations. As interest in the incident was particularly high, a good deal of information as to what incidents took place in which locations was shared, therefore one could imagine that it would not have been difficult to read a narrative of Nagayama in the film. In addition, since Nagayama was living in lower class urban neighborhoods in day laborers' housing in Kawasaki, Kogane-cho, Nagoya and Ikebukuro, for example, it would also be easy to find a narrative of poverty in the postwar period.

However, the uniqueness of the landscapes is repeatedly denied by the fact that some visually specific and clear signs—such as transportation networks—bullet trains, expressways and stations—or groupings of high-rise buildings reflected in the background, are components of urban space in spite of it. Likewise, rural villages with greenery imply pesticide-covered produce that is controlled as a circulating commodity. Or main roads covered with billboards; they are not local neighborhood or rural villages outside of the city, but rather the film indicates that rural villages have also been subsumed into cities. In other words, no matter how the specific characteristics of the regions or places are filmed, they are all part of a gigantic urban juggernaut. Instead of being landscapes that evoke memories or histories of unique places, for 89 minutes, the film presents them as homogenized landscapes, utterly without particularity.

A series of these landscapes progresses in a steady rhythm, articulated by beautiful color and carefully structured shots, however uneven sequences and edits are occasionally inserted to create discrepancies or estrangement between the sequences. The steady rhythm created by the series of landscapes is cut off, and the uniqueness that had been attributed to landscapes is flattened, as instead the materiality of homogenized landscapes is emphasized. For instance, close-up shots of apple trees or sunflowers are repeatedly superimposed on shots of Nagayama's place in Aomori, his elementary school, or the landscape of Mt. Iwaki. In addition, each of the four crime sites is depicted with a completely different structure: for the first site, the use of mobile camera and a long shot first documents the entire view of the hotel, and then a jerky, telescopic long shot depicts the crime site. For the second site, after

rhythmically documenting the gate of the shrine, its main hall and inside grounds, extreme close-up shots of the approach to the crime site are repeated. For the third crime, a fast motion sequence of a long shot from the passenger seat of a taxi is shown, and as it gets closer it becomes an extreme close-up of the crime site. For the fourth crime, close-ups of hands and faces of taxi drivers and a fast motion sequence of the transition into those taxis from outside continues, and then the use of a long shot with a fixed camera depicts crime site.

Meanwhile similar strategies were used for the film's sound as well. Whereas on the one hand the use of free jazz improvisation allows long stretches of music, on the other hand it also allows for periods of absolute silence, undercutting a sense of consistency. During the sequences of the first and second crimes, drums and saxophone clash aggressively, and then the third and fourth crimes are accompanied by absolute silence. Thus the clash between visuals and music in *A.K.A. Serial Killer* creates a major discrepancy. The music does not serve the film, but instead it articulates itself as sound, and by being independent from the visuals, it paradoxically emphasizes the materiality of landscape i.e. image. Despite the fact that Adachi's superimposition of landscapes is extremely limited as a method, it does propose a methodology of anti-film or anti-technology, which negates narrativity or the integrity of the film as a whole, or artistic maturity; this sets it apart from documentary films, which are based on conventional realism, as well as from formalist experimental films. In this sense it is also important that Adachi tried to negate the *auterist* concept of film as work.

## 5. On Techniques

Adachi's negation of experimentation and *auterism* can also be seen in the collaborative production style he employed. The roles were assigned as follows: Adachi (directing), Sasaki and Matsuda (production), Nonomura and Yamazaki (cinematograph), Iwasbuchi (directing and production assistance). Nonomura and Yamazaki on camera were collaborators and friends who worked on Adachi's film, *Galaxy* produced by the former members of Nihon University Film Study Club. Both had experience working on Oshima films. However instead of using Yamazaki—who had experience as a

main cinematographer—Adachi had Nonomura act as main, while Yamazaki supported him. Iwasbuchi, who was also a graduate of Nihon University, was slightly younger and not a member of Film Study Club, however, was the action leader of *Geijutsu gakubu toso iinkai* (Art Department Struggle Committee), who participated in Wakamatsu Production, and was also in charge of editing for journal *Eiga Hihyo*.

Meanwhile, though Sasaki was a scriptwriter and Matsuda was a critic, they were present for most of the shooting, except for the overseas locations. Sasaki, who was affiliated with Sozosha, may have attended Oshima's film shoots, however in that case it was most likely only in his role as script writer. Matsuda accompanied many film shoots with Wakamatsu Production, worked as an extra, kept shooting notes, and was also one of the main actors in *Death by Hanging*. Yet in this case he was involved strictly as a critic. This methodology, in which participants work in areas different from their area of expertise and get involved in the work on equal footing, beyond such differences, is reminiscent of the collective production method of Film Study Group. Matsuda reminisced on the time of film shooting as follows:<sup>223</sup>

In placing a camera in front of the train station in Itayanagi, (the town) where Nagayama was born, a film director cannot help but use panning shots; he wants to believe that everything has been documented. But, neither Sasaki Mamoru nor I believe so; what is necessary is a landscape for gazing. We just look. So we decided to set the viewpoint of the camera at the height of the cameraman. But since the two cameramen were tall, even when Adachi stretched up, he could not reach the viewfinder. He then brought a beer case from a liquor shop (to stand on), and as he was about to step up to look into it, we pressed him and told him not to use a panning shot at all. That's how that strange image came into being. After a while gradually Adachi also came to understand, but in any event, our understanding was, let's not be arrogant and think that the entire world is perceivable without effort, until we come to realize that something has finally been found out."<sup>224</sup>

Of course, this does not mean that the film does not include the use of panning shots at all. In fact, many of the cityscapes are shot using pans. Nonetheless it is conceivable that the critical counter-proposal against existing cinematic forms and aesthetic methodologies made by Matsuda and Sasaki in the film helped define ensuing camera work and editing methodologies. This episode is emblematic of their

---

<sup>223</sup> Since *AKA: Serial Killer* was not distributed at the time, almost no reference by people involved regarding the production or film shooting exists. Interviews with Matsuda and others were therefore ones conducted around 2000.

<sup>224</sup> Matsuda, "Shito suru kakumei," 210

unique production process, in which decisions were made by non-directors Matsuda and Sasaki, and consensus with the director Adachi was reached by trial and error and collective discussions. Adachi himself argues on the discussions with cameramen as follows:

Since wherever you look in Japan it looks entirely beautiful like a postcard, do not film beautiful things as beautiful; do not think to look for dirty places to film. That was the only item to be agreed upon, and they started shooting, conducting technical studies towards filming in their own way [...] They also continued filming landscapes in order to return to the origin and accomplished some results. Through the struggle, the cinematographer became all the more enthusiastic, and even to determine a single shot they asked themselves, "Would Nagayama have looked this way? How we should look at this since we are not Nagayama now?" As much as they repeatedly had discussions with me, they retained their purity.<sup>225</sup>

Rather than filming beautiful things or dirty things, it is clear that they put emphasis on capturing the homogeneity of the landscape. Likewise, Adachi discussed how he ended up arguing with cameramen and editors as to why a series of shots building up beautifully captured images, going from the foreground to stone pavement using a telephoto zoom lens, had to be rejected.

However, as (the shot) is too beautiful, I request that everything be disassembled and made jerky. We had an argument, as Mr. Yamada and his editing assistants protested on technical grounds, saying that that would be simply unsophisticated editing, so would be unacceptable. In other words, in the end, they were feeling nervous, since images that were, in the eyes of cameramen, badly shot, and editing techniques that in the eyes of film editors were bad as well were requested.<sup>226</sup>

Evidently, rather than technical perfection or maturity, possibilities of 'expression' in cinema were sought in each shot and sequence, as well as in the entire work. Meanwhile, scriptwriter Sasaki touched upon Adachi's methodology of filming only landscapes from a slightly more withdrawn stance than Matsuda:

So, if you continue filming Japanese landscapes in that way, you believe that the entire country of Japan is filmed within absurd landscapes. That was Adachi's point of observation. It was Adachi

---

<sup>225</sup> Adachi, *Eiga/Kakumei* [Cinema/Revolution] (Tokyo: Kawadeshoboshinsha, 2003), 292-293.

<sup>226</sup> Ibid., 293-294.

who did everything such as cut segmentation and so on. I was just following him from behind (laughs). [...] For instance, I would say something like, why not film that, but he would say, no, that's not necessary.<sup>227</sup>

Sasaki used contemporary incidents in his scripts for his work at Sozosha and his TV productions. Therefore, it is likely that the idea of using Nagayama as material came from him. Furthermore, considering that he was a producer, we cannot take the above statement literally. In other words, it is important that in this case, instead of taking the initiative to tackle current events through his storytelling, Sasaki provided support by taking a stance of “simply following behind,” and that made it possible for Adachi's directing at the production site to move in a more experimental direction. On the other hand, though the ways that Adachi, Matsuda and Sasaki of Critical Front, who had launched the project, and that of Nonomura, Yamazaki and Iwabuchi became involved in the work were different, it should be emphasized again that this work was created based on collective discussions and through free exchanges of opinions among participants, rather than based on participants' hierarchical relationships with a director or producer in charge, as it is in conventional film production.

## 6. Everyday and Non-everyday

In the January 1, 1971 issue of *Nihon Dokusho Shimbun* (Japan Reader's Newspaper), Adachi published a text on Nagayama called *Renzoku shasatsuma" eno kakuu no shitsumon* (Imaginary questions for a “serial killer”). As the title suggests, the text consists of a series of imaginary questions that would be posed to Nagayama.<sup>228</sup>

---

<sup>227</sup> Sasaki Mamoru, "'Renzoku Shasatsuma' wa ikanishite toraretaka," [How was A.K.A. Serial Killer filmed] in *Bungei Bessatsu Nagayama Norio* [Literary Art Extra Issue on Nagayama Norio], (Tokyo: Kawadeshoboshinsha, 1997), 84.

<sup>228</sup> Nagayama Norio, *Muchi no namida* [Tears of Ignorance] was published in March 1971 and immediately before it, a few chapters were published in a literary journal, *Henkyo* [Frontier] the January issue, 1971. As mentioned earlier, filming of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* started in July 1969, three months after Nagayama's arrest; since editing was completed by the end of that year, *Henkyo* and *Muchi no namida* were not referenced for producing the film. Meanwhile, in the September 2 issue, 1969 of *Shukan Pureiboi* [Weekly Magazine Playboy] part of “Prison Note” was published, however due to the sensationalized article for the weekly magazine, it was not until the publication of *Henkyo* and *Muchi no namida* that details of Nagayama's statement became known. The trial started on August 8, 1969, and it is possible that Adachi's text was written as the trial progressed and “Prison Note” attracted interest.

Though Adachi had discussed his film work and landscape theory in interviews, this text was the first publication on Nagayama himself. After an initial silence, at the start of the trial Nagayama began talking about his transformation into a class-conscious Marxist. Adachi asked why Nagayama began to talk about his crime at the alienated site of the trial, believing that, as previous criminals attested, it would only end up proving the conventionality of evil. In other words, Adachi argued that, regardless of the content, when criminals talk about their own crimes, the only possible outcome is that they will be subsumed by the state. Through the interpretation of *AKA: Serial Killer*, he explores those questions and doubts as his own. In an attempt to relive Nagayama's experiences as thoroughly as possible, Adachi paid particular attention to the period of Nagayama's silence after his failed attempt at the fifth crime. Though the first four crimes took place during a two-month period, and thus could appropriately earn Nagayama the designation "serial killer" in terms of the speed at which these events occurred, Adachi indicated that what was important rather was the subsequent 6-month period in which Nagayama rented an apartment and worked as a bartender, hiding his pistol in Shinjuku, and Nagayama's daily life, which, paradoxically meant 'non-everyday' for Nagayama.

And the question is, after transforming the unreality of a 'dream' into everyday life as the serial killer did at the time of his wanderings, and the transformation of reality into the non-everyday through the transformation of evil [*ma*] into the everyday—[which was] realized through the murders he committed in his wanderings—on the same level, what happened when he led a[n ordinary] life which, for him, in general was unrealistic, the best he could, as everyday in general, which was nothing but non-everyday.<sup>229</sup>

By focusing on Nagayama's everyday or non-everyday, Adachi reversed the conventional notion of 'everyday' vs. 'non-everyday', thereby cancelling their dichotomy. In order to grasp Nagayama's everyday or non-everyday, rather than hypostatizing Nagayama as an object, Adachi discovered a methodology of accumulating landscapes of Japan that Nagayama may have seen, and even though his footsteps were traced, Nagayama's absence becomes an invisible presence articulated in those landscapes. In a dialogue with Nakahira Takuma conducted around the same time as the publication of *Imaginary*

---

<sup>229</sup> Adachi Masao, *Eiga eno senryakun* [Strategies for Cinema] (Tokyo: Tabatashoten, 1974), 115.

questions for a “serial killer”, when asked about *A.K.A. Serial Killer* and landscape theory, Adachi made the following statement:

The genesis was that I thought about making a film about Nagayama. But it cannot be possible to make a film about him. If it is “about....” there is nothing but doing something like, sneaking into Tokyo Detention House or becoming Nagayama oneself. At that moment, since the film is about being Nagayama yourself, you draw Nagayama closer to yourself, or conversely, what is included in the process of becoming Nagayama is only filmed as landscapes, so...<sup>230</sup>

As Adachi points out, since, in Japan, defendants who are arrested and jailed are not allowed to be filmed, either in detention houses, prisons or courtrooms, it was difficult to actually document Nagayama with a camera. Furthermore, since the maximum penalty i.e. death penalty was expected to be handed down, it was impossible to document him on film in the future either. Because of this restriction, the film directors, TV producers and journalists who attempted to depict Nagayama tried to fill in the absence of the protagonist with objects that could tell Nagayama’s story and could actually be filmed.<sup>231</sup> What they found interesting was the series of four gun murders and their causal relationships. While pointing out various issues such as the unfortunate family environment of his childhood, or the structure of social and economic discrimination between the Hokkaido or Tohoku region and Tokyo, despite

---

<sup>230</sup> Adachi Masao, “‘Sakuhin’ no kaitai to hakai” [Deconstruction and destruction of ‘works’], Adachi Masao and Nakahira Takuma, *Nihon dokusho shimbun* [Japan Reader’s Newspaper], no.1575, (21<sup>st</sup> December, 1970): 8. The dialogue was printed twice, including in the 14<sup>th</sup> December 1970 issue.

<sup>231</sup> Images of Nagayama that remain are personal photos from his childhood, school photos, photos taken at the time of his arrest by the media, and photos taken within the detention center for public purposes. At the stage of discussion leading up to *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, there was a proposal to compare Nagayama with Mori Shinichi, who migrated to Tokyo for work, and later became a successful enka (traditional style Japanese popular song) singer. See Adachi, *Eiga/Kakumei*, 291. On the other hand, Tahara Soichiro, a director from Tokyo Television produced a documentary called *Dogitsuku ikiyo sengen: Mohitori no Nagayama Norio* (A manifest for living lurid: Another Nagayama Norio, 1970), in which Mikami Kan, who likewise had migrated from the Tohoku region to Tokyo for work, and was working as an underground folk singer, while working days at a factory. Mikami expressed his strong empathy for Nagayama, and declared that he would follow Nagayama through music. Tahara also produced a documentary *Renzoku Shasatsuma to 13 nin no wakamonotachi* (Serial killer and 13 young men, 1969), which documented young people who migrated to Tokyo for work around the same period as Nagayama, and disclosed the fact that most of the young people who migrated to Tokyo for work quit their jobs and then disappeared. In both works Tahara presented the universality rather than the particularity of Nagayama by comparing him with young people of the same generation sharing a similar condition. In this sense, his approach was clearly distinct from approaches taken by other mass media. However, with a sensational method of approaching subjects aggressively, which was characteristic of Tahara’s documentary works, the dichotomy between the individual and society was emphasized, highlighting the otherness of Nagayama and other characters. Similarly, director Shindo Kaneto emphasized the otherness of Nagayama, expressing his complicity and empathy through examining the essential factor of the poverty of Nagayama’s family environment. Despite the differences between film and television, both media shared the same issues in their approach to Nagayama.

differences in whether they were empathic, sympathetic or critical, they all tried to sensationalize Nagayama as a particular ‘other’ who had caused these brutal and extraordinary incidents.

In contrast, Adachi took a completely different approach, articulating Nagayama within an ordinary landscape that had been renewed under high economic growth. That way, Adachi not only emphasized universality of the event exclusively with idea that anyone of the so-called “golden eggs” may have become a Nagayama, but also tried to erase the designation, i.e. ‘criminal=Nagayama’ to bring to the surface the anonymity of the events prior to his arrest itself. In addition, according to Adachi, Nagayama’s loquacity at his trial was not meant to express his typicality, but in fact was a process of the maturation of his madness further toward the sixth and seventh incidents, even in prison. In the structure of the landscape, Adachi discovered what Nagayama referred to as the “uniqueness of being eternally evil that can only be known by someone who anticipates bliss beyond the ‘demonic’ pleasure of the death that is approaching you,”<sup>232</sup> and by contrasting typicality with uniqueness, he tried to explore the common ground that is being communicated to him by means of the landscape.

In order to accept the uniqueness of his evil, I have selected images=landscapes communicable of my uniqueness. They made me investigate language as a medium by which to possess the succession of his madness as emerging ‘landscapes’, in order to grasp the status of the unshakable evil that he experienced.<sup>233</sup>

In order to depict Nagayama, Adachi thought it necessary to accept and internalize Nagayama rather than empathizing with him as ‘other’ from the standpoint of an *auteur*. At the same time, in order to approach his uniqueness and paradoxically acquire universality or anonymity, Adachi chose landscapes rather than a proper person or a narrative as his method or concept. Nevertheless, on the other hand, Adachi considered that landscape as language was unnecessary for Nagayama, since he was already in prison, but is only important to the side of cinematographer including Adachi, thereby along with the impossibility of identifying Nagayama, refusing to privilege landscape as a methodology.

---

<sup>232</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 115.

<sup>233</sup> Ibid., 115.



Language, whichever part is picked, sadly enough, for Nagayama Norio is unnecessary for his new, later madness, and it is only on my side that it remains necessary as an occasion for the madness to continue.<sup>234</sup>

For example, going to the site where Nagayama used to live, I started with his differences from me by asking, what he could have seen or what I can see now, and I was simply filming a “landscape called Nagayama” rather than a landscape based on re-living the experiences of Nagayama.<sup>235</sup>

In addition, in an interview mentioned earlier looking back on those days, Sasaki made a similar but more extreme comment on Nagayama:

Actually, I was not so interested in the incident itself. It is not just about this incident—frankly speaking, I am the type of person who has almost no interest in the incident. [...] In other words, I assume I cannot act like him, or he cannot live like me, and I believe that it will be fine if we recognize in one another that such people are human beings. Having said that, I do not mean either to reject or affirm Nagayama. However, I was more interested in the Japanese landscape...in what form it would be possible to put the presence of Japan into a film, and as one of its materials I thought, this was it.<sup>236</sup>

As I touched upon it earlier, Sasaki produced an enormous amount of scripts based on many of the incidents that took place. Nevertheless, he commented that he had never been interested in the incidents themselves; thus it is clear that he always kept some distance from his subject. Supported by Sasaki’s approach to keep a distance from his subjects, Adachi was able to maintain a critical stance to his relationship with Nagayama, as well as to their own concept of landscape, thereby making connections to theoretical notions such as unrepresentability in film, negation of *auteurism*, the creation of film as a work and refusal of its screening, which I will analyze further later.

## 7. Migration as Post-Class Theory

In the previous section, I discussed the homogeneity of the landscape, but in this section I would like to analyze migration as both action and concept. According to statistics, the turnover of young workers like Nagayama was very high at the time. However, though migrating from job to job like them,

---

<sup>234</sup> Ibid., 115.

<sup>235</sup> Adachi, “‘*Sakuhin*’ no kaitai to hakai”, 8.

<sup>236</sup> Sasaki Mamoru, “‘*Ryakusho renzoku shasatsuma*’ wa ikani toraretaka”, op.sit., 84.

it is also presumable from his repeated attempts to run away from home and try to leave Japan illegally that, for Nagayama, migration itself was particularly important. In order to trace Nagayama's footsteps, Adachi and his peers physically moved the camera, while simultaneously showing many young migrants—unskilled workers who were working at the same shop, retail store, factory and construction site as Nagayama—onscreen. Those young workers who moved into the city carry out their unstable, everyday labor, repeatedly going back and forth between the store and delivery destination, by bicycle or on foot, carrying products such as newspapers and milk. Furthermore, many students are depicted, going to school or running, and despite the fact that no specific people appear in the film, their images are metaphorically superimposed on Nagayama. The film thus pays special attentions to such migrations, both onscreen and off screen.

As I indicated in Chapter 2, the movement of the young “golden eggs” migrant workers into three major metropolitan areas was a historical event. Due to the freeing up of agricultural land by the occupying army after the war, agricultural land in Japan became privatized and owned by tenant farmers. However when the agricultural communities collapsed, migration to the city was promoted as the next national project. Young people were embraced as an important human resource, responsible for Japan's new economic development, but at the same time were regarded as a cheap, disposable source of labor power. Their numbers grew to approximately 40 million over the course of ten years. Making up approximately 40% of the total population of Japan, this was a tectonic shift, although they remained within the island country of Japan. On the other hand this countrywide project paradoxically created a vast amount of newly de-subjective beings. The modern subject became connected to the possession of land. Labor movements made it possible for workers to organize, having their bases fixed at the production point. Student movements, which were born from a completely different background than labor movements, had their bases in universities. However lower-class laborers like Nagayama migrated endlessly, without specific property or foundation. As they were unable to maintain their affiliations due to their constant migration, it was also impossible for them to organize into existing labor movements, or ally with student movements. However, as the limits of the existing movements were becoming visible,

we could say that, paradoxically, it was this impossibility of organizing that revealed their possibility. Indeed, what was so remarkable was that Adachi and his peers tried to see both the possibility and impossibility of encountering Nagayama through the process of investigating the landscape, and to discover practical and philosophical meanings in these acts of migration.

Meanwhile, the first shot captured by the camera is a movie theater in Itayanagi. The movie theater, signs and posters are single-mindedly documented. Nagayama himself made a comment about his love of cinema, and also left a testimony that he watched a film after committing a crime.<sup>237</sup> However, one should remember that this is not particularly characteristic of Nagayama, rather the fact is that cinema played a significant role as a form of entertainment for the lower proletariat, especially genre films such as action, yakuza and pink films.<sup>238</sup> In fact, the landscape of movie theaters like this serves to indicate that Nagayama as the invisible protagonist, was also a film-goer. Nagayama also made a statement regarding class struggle, presumably influenced by *Battle of Algiers* (1966) by Geo Pontecolbo,<sup>239</sup> a fact makes it possible to speculate that he watched not only popular ‘entertainment’ films but other types of films as well, including art or independent films. Whether he actually watched Adachi or Oshima is unknown, however it is highly likely that he saw pink films by Wakamatsu. In any case, what is important here is not to verify that he actually saw work by Wakamatsu or Adachi, rather to confirm the possibility that an encounter of Adachi and his peers by Nagayama may have taken place, by means of the distribution of film as a reproducible medium distributed to movie theaters across the nation as a ‘base.’ Of course, by ‘base’ we do not mean any specific theaters or any type of fixed space that actually existed in the city, but

---

<sup>237</sup> Nagayama testified about the time he moved to Hakodate after Nagoya where the fourth crime was committed as follows: “Then, that may have been a movie, *All Quiet On the Western Front*. There was an all-night screening.” “Trial Record of testimony by the accused at High Court (Excerpt)” in *Bungei Betsatsu Zohoshinban Nagayama Norio*, 183.

<sup>238</sup> In connection with Nagayama, music critic Hirai Gen discusses young store clerks working at a shop run by his parents in the 1960s who would go out to movie theaters together on their day off in terms of class theory. “Atarashii gankyu e – 30 nen me no Ryakusho Renzoku shasatsuma,” [For a new eye – A.K. A. serial killer after thirty years], *Eiga Geijutsu Bessatsu: Adachi Masao Zero-nen* [Film Art Extra Issue on Adachi Masao Year Zero] 50.2, no 390 (March 2001): 176.

<sup>239</sup> Nagayama proposed that every member of the Red Army Faction should become a solitary terrorist and described as follows: “By the way, jumping to another topic, thinking that Algerian Independent Movement was initiated by action taken by terrorists who were from slums like myself, it wasn’t entirely untrue.” Nagayama Norio, *Muchino Namida: Zoho shinban* [Tears of ignorance: Expanded new edition] (Tokyo: Kawadeshoboshinsha, 1990), 445.

rather, a ‘base without a base’, or invisible bases, which come to the surface only at the end of continuing migration. Though movie theaters across the nation, by mainly screening popular commercial films, had the ideological function of further assimilating the leisure time of the exploited workers, it is because of the landscapes of countless ordinary movie theaters where Nagayama might actually have watched films—and indeed, it is because of this ordinariness of the movie theaters—that Adachi tried to indicate the possibility of an invisible coalition with a countless number of ‘Nagayamas’ beyond the bounds of creator and audience, traversing the design of capitalism or the state. By replacing the notion of migration with the concept of ‘journey’ Adachi will later proceed with investigating its philosophical positioning.

## **8. Landscape as Representation**

As Matsuda indicated, new left terminologies of the 60’s, as manifest in the term ‘situation’ were invisible, abstract political concepts. In contrast, landscape theory was a concrete and practical concept, as it calls upon an invisible power permeating the ordinary quotidian ‘landscape’ and to make the power structure visible. In *A.K.A. Serial Killer Nagayama*, the protagonist, is absent, and all specific events are minimized so that only the homogenized landscape Nagayama may have seen is documented. It is through these landscapes without Nagayama, and devoid of events that the emergence of an unnamable, underclass proletariat is implicated. Thus, the issue of the complex and strained relationship between the visible and the invisible is articulated through the mediation of landscapes, thereby calling film as media into question.

Inasmuch as what constitutes a cinema is having images represent or substitute for some types of objects, the premise is that, regardless of whether it is a fiction or a documentary, and regardless of one’s political or philosophical stance, it documents some objects, which are then screened on film. In *A.K.A. Serial Killer* Adachi problematizes this premise, and asks an even more fundamental question: if we film by simply looking at something that is visible, it does not necessarily mean that we actually saw or filmed that thing, so is it possible not to film something visible, or how is it possible to film something *invisible*? As I mentioned earlier, anti-cinematic approaches were taken in terms of shooting techniques, the analysis

of narratives, and a collective production method, and likewise Adachi posed the fundamental question of ‘unrepresentability’ against cinema as a medium of representation, and against image as form. Though this inquiry is, to a large extent, an aesthetic experiment of vanguard art, it should be emphasized that Adachi further elaborated it in the context of the theory cinema=movement, the theory of insurrection and theory of revolution. Or, to put it differently, it could be pointed out that the aesthetic choice was a political one as well, because the ‘unrepresentability’ at stake here relates to violence and the structures of violence.

Since *A.K.A. Serial Killer* follows the footsteps of Nagayama, it is the premise of the film that four homicides have already taken place. The issue of violence therefore is not to be dismissed, however as indicated in my earlier analysis, instead of documenting the events themselves or their traces, Adachi instead documents mundane landscapes without distinguishing the quotidian from extraordinary, thus the crime scenes are simply treated as a part of the landscape. By documenting the scenes of four crimes—which are all both equally as beautiful and as ordinary as the rest of the landscape, Adachi indicates that the incidents did not occur in some extraordinary spaces, nor is some space that might be seen as typically evocative of crime, but rather as a paradox in which the ordinary, everyday landscape embodies violence. One could further say that what the film expresses here is that the everyday landscape is synonymous with violence. Importantly, however, the concept of violence is ambivalent, as it can mean violence associated with Nagayama on the one hand, and the violence of state power on the other. Adachi conceived both kinds of violence in a relationship of competing forces, and through the representation of ordinary landscapes, he visualized the antagonism between the violence of the state power through military and police violence, and the *gewalt*/violence of the peoples’ insurrection. The landscape is thus defined as this shifting field where these forms of violence collide each other, or as a domain that, though existing everywhere, would always have potential of becoming the forefront of struggle.<sup>240</sup>

---

<sup>240</sup> In the recent reassessment of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, Yabu Shiro discusses the landscape in *A.K.A. Serial Killer* clearly as a target to be destroyed in relation to Jean-Luc Godard’s films from the late 1960’s in terms of theory of violence: “I believe that perhaps [Godard] must have seen something that was not filmed. It is so much about agitation, like, look at this, destroy this and stand up against that.” Sakai Takashi and Yabu Shiro, “68nen no

Such a structure can be demonstrated for example in the depiction of Shinjuku Station square near the end of the film. Though the student troupe played a central role in the demonstration, there were also quite a few young people who were ‘participating’ as bystanders. As they were clearly not organized and were not accustomed to confronting riot police, many of them were held back. Still, many of the riots in the late ‘60s would not have been realized without the presence of those bystanders (*yajiuma*). They were a series of miraculous events where unorganized groups came together to spontaneously form a joint struggle on the street level. Instead of showing the riot in Shinjuku Station itself,<sup>241</sup> Adachi and his peers overlapped images of young people hanging around the station in anticipation prior to the riot, with Nagayama, and tried to discover the potentiality of the riot in the landscapes beyond political strategies or tactics.<sup>242</sup> In addition, by contrasting local vigilante groups who are closing stores and streets with riot police crowded in the streets of Shinjuku, they also indicated the ambivalence of the landscape, where the violence of both sides was in conflict together.

As I quoted in the previous chapter, Nakahira used the term ‘landscape’ to mean the circumstances in which the city and people in the Shinjuku riot were all intermingled, whereas Matsuda tried to redefine third world revolutionary theory and violent revolutionary theory in the context of landscape theory. Adachi on the other hand indicated the potentiality of insurrection or revolution not through violence or events themselves but through the landscape, and that by posing the question of ‘unrepresentability’ he presented a methodology of representing violence or the structure of violence. In the February, 1972 issue of *Art Notes*, Adachi published an essay called *Hyogensha no shutai to kodo*

---

passhion o rire suru” [Relaying the passion of ‘68] in *Bungei Bessatsu Godaru: Aratanaru Zenbo* [Literary Art Extra Issue on Godard: New Whole Picture], ed. Hirasawa Go (Tokyo: Kawadeshoboshinsha, 2002), 146.

<sup>241</sup> On October 21, 1969 when the film was shot, a state of insurrection centering round Shinjuku actually took place, and more than 1,500 people a day were arrested.

<sup>242</sup> For example, Kitano Takeshi, who were working part time at Jazz Bar Village Vanguard around the same period as Nagayama, stated in an interview about Nagayama as follows: “In other words, aside from the Zenkyoto generation, who were thinking seriously, people like myself were jabbing spears at cops or rebelling against the country, but it feels like Nagayama also had an uprising with something. However he was much cooler, like causing a revolt by himself, so I wasn’t thinking that he was a bad guy at all.” “Nagayama Norio wa hitori de hanran o okoshita” [Nagayama Norio caused a one-man uprising] in *Bungei Bessatsu Nagayama Norio*, 76. Kitano testified that Kitano and Nagayama used to work part time at the same Jazz Bar in Shinjuku. Kitano took a daytime shift and Nagayama was in charge of the late shift, so they almost never had conversations. Kitano just had the impression that he was a gloomy guy, and only after the incident did he find out that this person was Nagayama.

(Creator's subject and action) and, looking back at the movement after 1968, he discusses these relations/matters even more explicitly.

Though it started as a campus struggle, the new armed revolutionary front of the masses created some barricades and the <landscape> of the liberated zone. The Zenkyoto movement was able to elevate some of those liberated 'situations' to inner 'situations' of the struggling subject through a solidarity of the fronts that was not simply geographical, but also qualitative. Though an image of prominent subjects struggling against power in battle to tear apart the 'landscape' was glimpsed in a series of events in "Shinjuku" in October 1968, "Todai Yasuda Kodo" in January of '69, "Kamata" in February, "Daibosatsu" in March 1970 to "Airplane Yodo", it has been entirely covered over by the colossal landscape of unshakable and flat Japanese state. Rather than the image of a revolutionary front in Japan in conflict with the nation state as it is, we could indicate that the situations for us is something that has been made as thoroughly invisible as the 'landscape' of the enemy or the state.<sup>243</sup>

While praising leading struggles from the late '60 to early 70's, Adachi's analysis was aimed at the present, which had been entirely overtaken by the landscape of the state. By naming landscape as power, landscape theory made its structure visible. Yet Adachi argues that after going through numerous struggles, the result of even this has been subsumed by the landscape. It is therefore necessary that one must submerge in the landscape of the state and continue an invisible struggle.

As the only breakthrough for subjective development of the 'origin' we keep drifting in search of the fissures of landscape, – everything could emerge only from them -- trying to surface to the moment of confronting landscape through invisible struggle. To challenge the landscape is identical to being invisible in landscape. If one attempts to concretize the invisible front territory again as inner landscape, we will end up reaching the "concretization of dream" that would explode the landscape as state.<sup>244</sup>

Also, the term "concretization of a dream" is taken from words Nakahira used when explaining an urban uprising. While through the trial and error of visibility and invisibility in cinematic representation, Adachi sought the crux of landscape, he went even further to propose the question of visibility and invisibility in the theory and practice of the movement.

---

<sup>243</sup> Adachi Masao, "Hyogensha no shutai to kodo," [The Subject and the Action of the Artist], *Bijutsu Techo* [Art Notes] 24, no.352 (February 1972): 118.

<sup>244</sup> Ibid., 119.

## 9. Deconstruction of Cinema, Negation of *Auteurism*

Whereas cinematic representation was thoroughly questioned and challenged in light of landscape i.e. violence, on the other hand, Adachi considered the issue of representation as only a partial component of cinema, and rejected the theory of image and art based on *auteurism*. Through the concept of landscape, all forms and means that are traditionally considered as given—such as work, the author who creates it, the notions of criticism and audience, film screenings, the release and distribution of work, and so on—are rejected/negated, and, by broadly understanding cinema instead as expression, Adachi attempted to transform it into a totally new form. This radical approach was also taken to restore the potential of what cinema initially possessed. Though rejection of cinematic forms or the elimination of cinematic hierarchy through collective production were referred to in the last section, similar attempts were tested in all aspects relating to existing cinema. In the interview with Nakahira cited earlier, Adachi argued for the deconstruction of cinema. First, the prevailing traits—that terms like 'images' or 'media' had been used uncritically or abused as comprehensive concepts lacking in specificity, and then image-centricism—which serves as a concept to transcend the limit of existing cinema or photography—were astutely criticized. Rather than renewing genre-based definitions, Adachi argued that, in order to genuinely aim for the deconstruction of cinema and image, the created work should not be considered a privileged object, but rather its entirety—even including what that is left unexpressed as a work—must be reassessed.

About “expression” (*hyogen*) in its entirety, 20 or 30% of it become externalized, and when it comes to “externalization” (*hyoshutsu*), the remaining 70-80% does not become externalized. If so, the portion of 70-80% that was discarded then determines the meaning of “externalization”. In other words, what defines cinema or photography pertains to 20-30% at best, and in response to this externalizing, we do not say we hide, but rather, since 70-80% is shared in common, and what we are concerned about is just the remaining 20-30%, it seems to me that the external occupies a small portion of (what we are concerned about).<sup>245</sup>

In response to it, while expressing what Adachi calls the portion of 80% with the concept of inexpressible “words” (*kotoba*) in darkness—which cannot be expressed in language—and touching upon

---

<sup>245</sup> Adachi, “‘Sakuhin’ no kaitai to hakai”, 8.



the title of his own photography book titled, *For a Language to Come*, Nakahira points out that works can be questioned in terms of larger domains, other than ‘expression’ or ‘words,’ suggesting the limits of a theory of the visual that aims exclusively to analyze what is aesthetically and formally represented.<sup>246</sup> Then, in connection to the discussion of landscape theory, Adachi states that landscape, for him, still remains on the side of language, and in order to deconstruct images, he argues that the landscape need be acquired as ‘words’ of 80%.

I myself can still only feel the landscape as language, however when the work of ‘feeling’ can be recognized as a ‘deconstruction of images,’ I believe that for the first time we will obtain the word ‘landscape’ and we will become able to feel landscape by projecting it towards many other words.<sup>247</sup>

Thus, questioning the framework of what constitutes the existing work, Adachi even tried to redefine cinema and cinematic expression through the concept of landscape. In Chapter Two, the issue of the epistemological subject in the landscape, where the subject who is gazing at the landscape himself/herself is actually being looked at by the landscape, as indicated by Matsuda, was referenced. In response to that idea, Adachi aimed to reject the *auterist* subject by overlapping the epistemology of looking and being looked at with the question of the auteur in the work. Adachi’s question was, if the *auteur* who filmed the landscape is actually looked back at by the landscape, who is it that is looked at, and who filmed the landscape. The work that one filmed oneself is limited as a mere part in light of

---

<sup>246</sup> Ibid. In his review of *Kitarubeki kotoba notameni* [For a language to come], immediately after the interview with Nakahira, Adachi discussed ‘words [ことば]-language[言葉]’ as follows: “Nakahira tries to discover his own gaze towards the darkness of the thing-in-itself that is passing him. At the same time he discovers the fact that the words [kotoba] spoken by the thing-in-itself that quietly continues gazing at him from deep inside the darkness beyond his gaze that is wide open to try to look at, is looking back at him. It is these moments altogether that are presented as his image works. Buildings in the city at midnight and at dawn, board signs, sidewalks, running cars, apartment houses [...] [Nakahira] follows, describes and documents the moment in which what only exists as ‘language’ can be revived as ‘words’ that are enduring to breath in the darkness that he encounters.” Adachi Masao, “Yami kara sosei suru <kotoba> e,” [‘Words’ resuscitating from the darkness], *Kozo* [Structure] (January 1971): 130-131. However, Adachi also provides the antithesis of Nakahira’s attempt to define “words” [kotoba] in light of movement/from the perspective of activism. “The fact that Nakahira’s own words—which have been repeatedly argued about—are trying to capture works as his own “words,” and the reality where my pain at the time of crowning a photograph = thing as a slice of reality with the word, “landscape,” has to become “my fire”, my question is, would such a reality be coming as “language”? “Yami kara sosei suru <kotoba> e,” 132.

<sup>247</sup> Adachi Masao, “‘Sakuhin’ no kaitai to hakai: ge” [Deconstruction and destruction of ‘works’ -Second half], Adachi Masao and Nakahira Takuma, *Nihon dokusho shimbun* (Japan Reader’s Newspaper), no.1576, (21<sup>st</sup> December 1970): 8.

expression and the *auteurist* subject in its expression is further negated by the landscape. Hence, he claims that the deconstruction of the image does not simply occur through subjective action by the *auteur*, but rather it is through the recognition that the *auteur* him/herself is subsumed by landscape that this deconstruction happens for the first time.

In addition, Adachi published a text titled *Eigasakka no sakuhin to jissen* (Filmmakers' Work and Practice) discussing the theory of the coming cinema and the theory of cinema movement as mediated by landscape theory in the March 8 and 15, 1971 issues of *Japan Reader's Newspaper*. Referencing *Nihon Kaiho Sensen-Sanrizuka* (The Battle Front for liberation of Japan: Sanrizuka, 1970) directed by Ogawa Shinsuke to discuss the relationship between the Sanrizuka Struggle and the filmmaker, Adachi sums up cinema movements from 1960 onward. *Sanrizuka* is a documentary film about the fight against the construction of the New Narita International Airport, and the second film by Ogawa, after *Nihon Kaiho Sensen-Sanrizuka no Natsu* (The Battle Front for liberation of Japan: Summer in Sanrizuka, 68). The struggle against the construction of the airport, centering around farmers in Narita city in Chiba prefecture was considered one of the most important struggles in the history of the post-war movement in Japan. First discussing Sanrizuka struggle as an occasion for introspection, Adachi first argues that there is an irreconcilable distance between him and the struggle. He then states that, metaphorically, in the comparison to farmers having mud all over them, even though they are discussing a collaboration with the struggle and they actually film the struggle while participating, what they came to recognize is the fact that they are still wearing brand new spotless shoes.

What constitutes our movement has its basis in our joint struggle with Sanrizuka. Then, our introspection towards struggle not only collides enduring time, but it also makes us discover that still mud-free, white shoes are covering our toes. It is these white shoes that define what our departure has reached now, and constitutes the appearance of the situations i.e., the landscape that the decided philosophy itself is encountering? In fact, they continue to be extended to ourselves wearing them, the room where we stand, the territorial space between Shinjuku and Narita to

which we at least extend our hearts, and...to the entire landscape of the world we have been part of.<sup>248</sup>

Adachi further argues that it is through recognizing the current state of the world subsumed entirely by the landscape—and thereby discarding *auteurist* works—that a new cinema, which is different from previous cinematic expression, will begin.

Because cinema—whereby the “experience” based on the author’s phantasmagoria which can be painted heavily in the image=film, is attacked by the landscape—makes its territorial distinction of the work obsolete, and the cinematization of cinema itself just began now.<sup>249</sup>

The discussion concerning the deconstruction of images and the abolition of art, which culminated in the late 60s through the early 70s, was often framed in terms of deconstruction or abolition as a new form of expression, rather than fundamentally questioning expression itself. Meanwhile such image-centric experiments played a historical role to counter the Left—who regarded politics and art as dichotomous— or the New Left who insisted on political ideology. However, due to their antagonism towards political ideology, whereby a critique of capitalism was dismissed, such trends were assimilated into the 1970 Osaka Expo, the infamous cultural festival organized by state and capital. Ironically enough, it was through their extreme gestures against political ideology that the image-centric experimentalism ended up being coaxed into capitalism. Adachi summarizes his thoughts on the situations as follows:

Roughly stated, as for the intention towards the anti-Yoyogi cultural united front, the deconstructionism of images, which could be called media theory=methodology, ended up trying to call “freedom of expression” (=anti-imperialist and anti-Stalinism)—absolutely secondary, not only for cinema but the thought of cinema movement—as actual reality of struggle experience of cinema. [...] It should be capitulated that the “underground” movement, while advocating the liberation of cinema by establishing the self-sustainable system of movement for a theory of expression called the deconstruction of images (the non-thesis of subject and object), abandoned the tangible, primary struggle called the practice of cinematic transformation, and ended up contributing to the conscious industry as seen in the mass production of images (exemplified by World Expo professionals).<sup>250</sup>

---

<sup>248</sup> Adachi Masao, “Eiga sakka no sakuhin to jissen,” [Filmmaker’s works and practice] in *Eiga eno senryaku*, 153.

<sup>249</sup> Ibid., 154-155.

<sup>250</sup> Ibid., 156.

With landscape theory, Adachi thoroughly criticized the trends of image-centricism and art for art's sake. At the same time, in discussing the films made by Ogawa Production, and the distance between Sanrizuka and Tokyo, he likewise criticized the political ideology and empiricism celebrated by independent productions, as well as the trait where the possibilities of the movement have been contained within the works.

Much of the “Independent production” movement should critique (*sokatsu*) its non-partisanship, which made the function of its movement independent (in reality however, it was the sectarian isolation of a “base”) by trivializing the actual practice of struggle exclusively into the transformation of specific work into thought. The movement should become self-critical, aiming for the primary practice of struggle by means of cinema, by recognizing that it is merely the realization of a revisionist, reformist strategy.<sup>251</sup>

In response to the works of Ogawa Production, what Adachi focuses on is not their political stance, but the fact that they pointed out the structures of power and anti-power. In the previous section, in light of the representation of violence I analyzed the way in which the potentiality of the landscape, rather than events themselves, was filmed. In a similar sense, Adachi pointed out that what is important is not that the anti-authoritarian artist subjectively films the righteous Sanrizuka Struggle from the right stance, and that it is properly documented, but the fact that the landscape—including the filmmakers who film the resistance—has been presented.

For example, Ogawa Shinsuke did not succeed in acquiring images (camera) as a weapon for revolutionary struggle by placing the creator, the “camera” eye on the side of the masses (anti-authority) as seen in the *Sanrizuka* series. He rather saw the landscape of the masses and the power.<sup>252</sup>

Then, while pointing out the difficult process of starting with the recognition that he himself is a part of the landscape, Adachi explored the direction for a new theory and practice through the negation of *auterism* and dismantling of the image.

---

<sup>251</sup> Ibid., 156.

<sup>252</sup> Ibid., 157.

The situations where we are actually standing now - <landscape> should be presented truly as a true summation of the fact that (we) are wearing a pair of spotless shoes; it means the struggle against being perceived as apparent dogmatism, as a mistake of straightforward violence (*gewalt*) short-circuited for world revolution, and as self-evident movement-centricism, which can persistently be called the world cinema movement; it also means the practice of dismantling specific 'cinema' in a tangible manner. I believe that the program for a person who attacks cinema by <landscape> should lead the cinema from this standpoint.<sup>253</sup>

Also in the earlier cited *Creator's Subject and Action*, referring to statements by Nakahira and Akasegawa on landscape, Adachi further argues that the landscape exists both “in front of our eyes, and (on) our own inside”<sup>254</sup> emphasizing that the landscape exists both inside and outside of ourselves. In fact, inasmuch as everything is indeed landscape, it no longer even has inside or outside, and it was Akasegawa who actually accepted 'landscape' through his counterfeit thousand yen note, long before the highjacking by the Red Army Faction or Nagayama's attempt to tear apart the idea 'landscape=power.' On the subject of his counterfeit thousand yen note, Akasegawa made the following statement in a round-table discussion on landscape theory:

I created a thousand yen note myself, and then the detective first came. So, to explain it I said out of desperation that this is a landscape painting. I could not explain any further. That was it/the end.<sup>255</sup>

Apparently, Akasegawa treated the image of the thousand yen note he created not as the reproduction of money but as a landscape. Akasegawa did not make any statement about landscape or landscape theory other than at this round-table discussion, and the content of his statement is indeed peculiar. However, Adachi—together with Nakahira, Matsuda and Hara—specially paid attention to this as an important statement.<sup>256</sup> Adachi pointed out that, despite the fact that Akasegawa produced a fake thousand note as a landscape in order to gaze at reality, the police came after him, and through his being

---

<sup>253</sup> Ibid., 158.

<sup>254</sup> Adachi, “Hyogensha no shutai to kodo,” 118.

<sup>255</sup> Akasegawa Genpei, “Toron: Fukei o megutte”[Discussion: about landscape], Akasegawa Genpei, Adachi Masao, Tone Yasunao, Sato Makoto, Nakahira Takuma and Nakahara Yusuke. *Kikan Shashin Eizo* [Photographic image quarterly], no.6 (Autumn 1970): 129.

<sup>256</sup> Nagayama touched upon the thousand-yen bill incident in *Muchi no namida*, and because of this background Akasegawa later designed the cover of a book by Nagayama.

brought to trial for a crime, the landscape, in a sense, returned the gaze back at him. Though landscapes were made visible by landscape theory, the reality where we are being looked at exists prior to our looking at it. Hence, in order to become invisible in an all-pervasively visible landscape, Adachi describes that the first thing to do is to expose your body to landscape, since our recognition of being looked at by the landscape we are looking at, means that we exist as a part of the landscape i.e. the power we confront. In the last chapter I touched on the theory of cinema movement develop by Matsuda. In comparison to Matsuda, Adachi,—who defined *auteur* as activist—elaborated on the concept of landscape from within the *auteur* or the work, deconstructing the authoritarian *auteur* himself from within, thereby seeking a new theory of cinema movement different from either image-centricism or political ideology. The theory of cinema movement as will be discussed later was to be developed further in terms of movement and theory through the production of *Red Army –PFLP: Declaration of World War*.

## 10 Refusal to Screen the Film

I have discussed *A.K.A. Serial Killer* and the landscape theory born from it from various angles, however, as I described earlier, the work itself was not ever screened at the time. Whereas the theoretical discussion was growing—and indeed, that fact made the condition even more complex—it could be said that the choice to not screen the film was made deliberately, as an extension of landscape theory. Adachi made his first statement on *A.K.A. Serial Killer* in the round-table discussion called *Hyogen o haki shiuruka?* (Can expression be discarded?) in the March 1970 issue of *Film Quarterly*. In addition to Adachi, designer Awazu Kiyoshi, TV director Konno Ben, and film director Shinoda Masahiro had a discussion on what expression and art meant, in response to poet and art critic Alain Jouffroy's essay, *Abolition of Art*. On the topic of the assimilation of artistic expression into a society of control, although Adachi created and continued screening his films, his proposal was to stop screening them, precisely because he was always incorporated into the system.

So, I am saying, let's not release the film we worked hard to create. In other words, I believe the fact we made the work was more or less right, however since we go wrong after the stage where we have created the film, why not stop going out of control, and so the problem is, how the difference between before and after making the film, so we have now reached the point where it will be completed if 6 staff members confirm that we created the work with a set of agendas, and we got our answers to the agendas. [...] From our standpoint for example, we worked hard to pursue a single theme—whether the resolution will be found or not—and say, the resolution has been found, and when we realize that no resources other than that are available, then let's not release the film, since it has many things wrong.<sup>257</sup>

Though neither specific works nor details are referenced, as the statement was made immediately after the completion of the film, it suggests the process of how they struggled to reach a decision whether to release the film or not. In addition, due to the differences in background among other participating artists (in comparison to an interview with Nakahira, which was rather intense and highly abstract, for example), there are even more noticeable differences and discrepancies in the discussion. The fact that the concept of landscape is not used also makes it possible for us to read Adachi's intention to reach the decision to not release the film even more clearly. In contrast, the earlier cited *Centering on Landscape* was a roundtable discussion, which was held due to high interest in landscape theory. The statement regarding the non-release of the film was in the context of a direct discussion about Nagayama and landscape theory. While asked about the process of producing the film and developing landscape theory, Adachi argues that even though they claimed that the landscape that Nagayama must have encountered would be filmed, in reality it is only the landscape that they were actually seeing that could be filmed, and therefore, rather than screening the film, all they can do is to mention that they saw the landscape themselves.

...but it could be said that the film we made, even though it included places all over Japan, was just a layering of postcard-like landscapes of the places he had been. And since that is not something meant to be shown to people, it turned out that rather than showing the film, all we could do was to just talk about how we saw the landscape.<sup>258</sup>

---

<sup>257</sup> Adachi Masao, "Hyogen o haki shiuruka?" [Can expression be discarded?], Adachi Masao, Awazu Kiyoshi, Konno Tsutomu and Shinoda Masahiro, *Kikan Firumu* [Film Quarterly], no. 5 (March 1970): 114.

<sup>258</sup> Adachi, "Toron: Fukei o megutte," 120.

In addition, while showing the limit of landscape theory at that very moment, Adachi argues how he reached the decision to not show the film, even proposing that they stop discussing it:

As for the landscape theory that can be derived from that, you could say that the landscape is not what we were able to see or what we saw, but rather a landscape that exposed itself to us. If indeed that is so, then for us, as individuals, that landscape which allowed us to identify ourselves with Nagayama needs to have a much greater structure of loss, not a structure of emancipation. In that sense, what we have here as landscape theory has not yet reached that point, and since we still have not shown the work, I think we should stop speaking about it.<sup>259</sup>

With regard to this refusal to screen the film, Adachi further elaborates on its theoretical positioning in *Imaginary Questions* cited earlier, insisting that, by avoiding screening the film publicly, they avoid the film being assimilated into state power. Adachi argues:

Perhaps, unless the language called image=language that I have acquired, reinforces activity that deviates from the domain of the work or film, it would just end up becoming valuable evidence for the prosecutor's argument. In addition I consider somehow sharing the continuity of his expanding madness by continuously holding my language to the level of the work without interruption. Rather than avoiding responsibility for the language I myself end up having by exhibiting the work, I consider fulfilling my responsibility at the maturity of the excessively heightened truth of decadence to further start my experience, rather than choosing the folly of relegating his uniqueness to typicality.<sup>260</sup>

In fact, even if the film consists only of landscape images, when it is shown in public as a piece of work, what tends to be emphasized —contrary to the filmmakers' intentions—is the typicality of Nagayama as it is depicted in other films or TV programs, or in many of the texts about him, and as a result, it ends up being assimilated into a grand narrative about him. Hence, while refusing both to present the film as a work and to screen it in public, Adachi tries to internalize Nagayama so that his uniqueness as being could be continuously maintained. Since the text was written a year after the production, one could say that it represents what Adachi had already been thinking about as an ongoing matter. Whereas a number of critiques of landscape theory exist, there are few that directly criticize the refusal to screen it. In a later interview Adachi recalls what was happening in those days:

---

<sup>259</sup> Ibid., 120.

<sup>260</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 115-116.



We discussed what to do then, however everyone's mind was already made up. On that spot we decided to stop screening it for then. [...] Voices condemning us for madly doing this 'luxury' arose from all sides. Though the thunderously arising critique also seemed valid, we who had stopped the screenings also felt in our hearts that we were right in some way, so we ignored (the criticism).<sup>261</sup>

Adachi recalls Tamura's statement, which was the most scathing criticism, as follows:

He genuinely made an sharp criticism that perhaps we had created a film that it was not necessary to make, and knowing that it is impossible to present a human being this way, and that the film had been made on an impossible premise, and that was inexcusable. Tamura Tsutomu's criticism was that that was the premise of filmmaking, so on that basis we must show what we show. His point was that not showing or screening the film was a way to avoid confrontation.<sup>262</sup>

Tamura pointed out that to film landscapes that Nagayama may have encountered exclusively is not a goal but just a premise for making the film. But it appears that what he was most critical of was the decision to not screen the film. One could imagine that the decision was unacceptable for Tamura and his peers, who had approached crimes and events like Nagayama's from the point of view of script writing. As I will touch upon in Chapter 4, though they did often collaborate—especially Sasaki was involved with both groups—one can glimpse the differences between Adachi and Sozosha in terms of filmmaking and expression. However in light of history of cinema, Adachi came from the student film study group, and it was not easy for him to have screenings within the existing screening routes, while Sozosha was an offshoot of Shochiku, a major film company. Therefore, Adachi attempted various experiments by screening his works such as *Bowl* and *Closed Vagina* at universities, community centers and galleries. Screenings were organized as events, incorporating happenings, and finally evening preview screenings were held at Art Theatre Shinjuku Bunka. Also, Adachi's own films were shunned from pink movie theaters for commercial reasons, even after his participation in Wakamatsu Production. So although they were commercial genre films—albeit low budget ones—Adachi had found screening opportunities at places such as underground theaters, and special screenings organized by universities or film study groups. Particularly noteworthy as evidence of Adachi's attempts to create new screening spaces was an inaugural

---

<sup>261</sup> Adachi, *Eiga/Kakumei*, 297.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid., 298.

screening for the opening of the Theatre Scorpio of his independent film *Galaxy*, with his peers from the student cinema study group. Indeed, it could be said that it is because of his continuing efforts in the entire process of filmmaking—from production to releasing, to screening, that Adachi may have tried to suggest that releasing and screening the film was not necessarily the ultimate purpose of making the film. This stance is also evident in the round table discussion in *Film Quarterly* mentioned earlier, where, based on the experience of conducting the screening movement for *Closed Vagina* for three years, he states, “When the film was made, rather than the fact that the work is watched, unless I could again get a firm hold of the relationship of being *looked at by* the work, I did not want to release the film.”<sup>263</sup>

However, it is important to note that the decision to not release the film was not made only as a methodological experiment.<sup>264</sup> Adachi wrote an essay called, *Onore ni muke dokuhaku suru kotoba* (Words of 'monologuing' yourself), as a book review of *Tears of Ignorance* by Nagayama for the 3<sup>rd</sup> May 1971 issue of *Japanese Reader's Newspaper*. While making a comparison between “No.108” who was wanted by the police after the second incident, and “No. 941” who was assigned a new number after being arrested as a serial killer, as one with a name, and the other without name respectively, Adachi tries to discover the continuation of “No. 108” in prison, not inside the book of *Tears of Ignorance*, but outside it. By citing Nagayama’s statement quoting Frantz Fanon, Adachi inquired about the 'secret zone' for “No. 108” while suggesting what the 'secret zone' shares in common with *A.K.A. Serial Killer*.

I would say that what is called the 'secret zone' according to the case demonstrated by Fanon is, even after the conversion of “No. 108” into “Nagayama Norio as villain,” the only possible world that “No. 108” could inhabit, as he was able to know “a defensive attitude towards the past and the desire and impossibility of being understood.” “No. 108” has also realized that the world would never be able to unfold in <words> or in books.<sup>265</sup>

---

<sup>263</sup> Adachi, “Hyogen o haki shiuruka?” 115.

<sup>264</sup> This is of course attributed to the economic reason that Sasaki did not need to provide funds and collect production cost himself individually. However, one could imagine that the condition may have been similar, as independent films by Adachi were also self-funded, or funded by other production members. Though the routes for film distribution are much more diverse today, then, unless the film was officially promoted, one could imagine that such efforts as organizing independent screenings, in terms of considering advertising and labor costs, would have further increased the financial losses and difficulties.

<sup>265</sup> Adachi, “Onore nimuke dokuhaku suru kotoba,” [Words for monologizing yourself] in *Eiga eno senryaku*, 117.

As mentioned earlier, Nagayama's incident created an enormous impact throughout Japan, however it was not until the publication of his book, *Tears of Ignorance* in March 1971 that claims made by Nagayama himself became widely known. The book consists of Nagayama's prison diaries that are titled "Note 1" through "Note 10." Since "Note 1" started on July 2, 1969, Nagayama had already started writing by August 1969, when shooting commenced on *A.K.A. Serial Killer*. One year after the filming of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* under the publication of *Tears of Ignorance*, Adachi published this review. Contrary to Matsuda, who took Nagayama's criticism of intellectuals seriously, as one aimed at himself in his book review of *Tears of Ignorance*, Adachi's response was rather negative.<sup>266</sup> Instead of defending Nagayama, he tried to discover the possibility of Nagayama's "secret zone" in the nameless, anonymous Nagayama himself, prior to his proper name, or his transition to a serial killer. In this sense, it could be said that at the time of decision to only film landscapes that Nagayama may have seen, and to accept Nagayama as a

---

<sup>266</sup> Matsuda drawing Nagayama's criticism of intellectuals closer to himself as well, critiqued himself for the fact that he did not realize Nagayama's class transformation at the time of filming, by comparing the filming periods and dates of Nagayama's prison diaries. "At the end of August 1969 we were certainly at the home land of Nagayama Norio, continuing to stand against the landscape of the Tsugaru Plain. However, we did not know that at the very moment a revolution was gradually and rapidly rising in the mind of Nagayama, who could do nothing but live in 'prison' then. Having finished reading the first volume of Nagayama's prison notes, *Muchi no namida* I am feeling extremely ashamed about it."

"Shinsen no chi ni daiya o sagasu ga gotoku," [Like searching for a diamond in the land of profundity], *Shuppan nyusu* [Publication News], (early April 1971): 22. Matsuda also published an essay on terrorism, "Misshitsu no teroru," [Terror in a closed room], First appearance unknown; in *Fukei no Shimetsu*, 233-239 in which Nagayama was defined as a "solitary terrorist in the closed room". Among many other assessments in those days, literary critic Akiyama Shun quickly defined *Muchi no namida* as a literary work rather than the scandalous notes of a criminal in his essay. Akiyama Shun, "Noto no kotoba," [Words from notebooks] in *Akiyama Shun bungei jihyo: gendaibungaku eno kakehashi 1970.6-1973.12* [Literary comments of Akiyama Shun: A bridge to contemporary literature 1970.6-1973.12] (Tokyo: Kawadeshoboshinsha, 1975). In the descriptive notes for *Muchi no namida: Expanded new version* and also in his interview from *Bungei special issue: Nagayama Norio* as follows. "Crime – It is something that has to be thought of also as the pure, live act of a human being." In "Noto o yonde" (After reading the notes) in *Muchi no namida: Expanded new version*, 528. "I was thinking that some sort of murders [committed] by minors without cause, although it is a little bit hard to put it, as I was thinking that killing can be done as if writing poetry, there should be poetry. If one has words that can be precisely explained with theory, one can be different. There is something like a word or a voice that cannot become a form, running in the hand that is extended to kill people. I wanted to know it. I thought it was something in the form of poetry." Akiyama Shun, "Hito o korosu te no naka o nagareru katachi ni naranai kotoba" [Words running inside the hand of killing someone that cannot become form], *Bungei Bessatsu Zohoshinban: Nagayama Norio*, 65. Considering Nagayama's act as a theory of expression rather than simply as a vicious crime, Akiyama tried to read it from *Muchi no namida*. On the other hand, a scholar of German literature Hosomi Kazuyuki, who has been researching the literature of Nagayama discusses *A.K.A. Serial Killer* from Nagayama's perspective as follows: "In this sense, it could be said that later Nagayama, in opposition to a memory where he himself is absent, and that the landscape was telling, tried to fill everything with his own words. It was a delicate period in which the clash between silent landscape and his eloquence begins inside and outside the prison." "Fukei to Kotoba" [Landscape and words], *Jokyo Bessatsu Adachi Masao 'Eiga/Kakumei' o Megutte* [Situations Extra Issue on Adachi Masao: Concerning Cinema/Revolution] 3.4, no. 6 (June 2003): 184.

being, the decision to not release this work was also the inevitable choice in order to defend their own “secret zone”.

**Chapter Three B: On *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War***

Due to the fact that the film *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* was produced as a newsreel film and screened as propaganda, the film was both recognized and critiqued in light of factional politics in Japan. Many of the discussions about this film have focused on the evaluation of the Red Army faction – whether one can be affirmative toward their politics, ideological premise, actions, etc. and therefore the discussions concerning the film’s complex cinematic structure, the manifesto by Adachi, as well as his political stance and tension in relation to the Red Army faction have often been neglected. The same applies to Matsuda’s writings: despite the fact that, while discussing *Red Army/PFLP*, Adachi as auteur, or the Red Army affirmatively, Matsuda was also often critical of their politics, his political stance remained unexamined. It is historically true that Wakamatsu Production, the Red Army faction, and the PFLP (Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine) all joined in its production, and that the screening movement was carried out with the full support of the second incarnation of *Eiga Hiho*. Moreover, since Adachi himself defines the film as propaganda, negating the concept of conventional films, media, or other work, it goes without saying that one should not speak about the work only in terms of theories of film and media, bracketing its political aspects. In this paper, the attempt—rarely made in the past—is to reexamine the film in a multifaceted way: by providing analysis in line with the work and its texts, with an emphasis on its historical and political relationship to the Red Army. Furthermore, this paper will reread the theory of reportage as the theoretical successor to landscape theory, with an emphasis on 'continuity' from it, rather than interpreting it literally as a 'transition,' as proposed mainly by Adachi at the time of the Red Army-PFLP film production.

## **1. Historical Background and Structure of *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War***

*Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* is a newsreel film produced by Wakamatsu Production, co-edited by the Communist League Red Army Faction and the PFLP. Adachi conducted the actual production, shooting, and editing. It was produced to be a text geared toward world revolution, depicting daily life in the Palestinian liberation struggle, as well as the revolutionary struggle in Japan. In

May 1971, Adachi and Wakamatsu were invited to Directors' Week at the Cannes International Film Festival for screenings of their films *Violated Angels* and *Sex Jack*, and went to France with Oshima, who was also invited to Cannes for his films, *Ceremony*, and *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*. After attending the film festival, Adachi and Wakamatsu went to Beirut, Lebanon on May 28. They joined Shigenobu, who had already entered the country as a Red Army faction member, and thereafter began negotiations for producing a story on the journal *AL HADAF* which was a Popular Front for PFLP. In a meeting with Gassan Kanafani, who was in charge of the information center and a scholar of Arab literature, they obtained approval on the condition that the production be made jointly by the filmmaker, the Red Army faction, and the PFLP. On June 11th, film shooting began in Saida, the largest Palestinian refugee camp in Lebanon. They filmed an interview with Kanafani held with the so-called Queen of hijacking Leila Khaled. After moving to Damascus, Syria, they filmed the front base in Daraa, the base in the Golan Heights, and, by way of Amman, Jordan, moved to Jerash to film the largest base of Palestinian guerrillas. However, when the Palestinian troops gathered information that the Jordanian government forces would launch an all-out attack, the three of them were ordered to leave the mountains, and they returned to Beirut on June 25th. Wakamatsu went back to Japan earlier, on June 27th, to prepare for a public screening of the film, while Adachi and Shigenobu continued filming in the Lebanon camps for about two weeks. Adachi returned to Japan via Paris on July 21st. The film was shot with a 16mm Filmo camera, and more than ten thousand feet (a little under 5 hours) was used. Adachi was in charge of most of the filming.<sup>267</sup>

After returning home, Adachi did more filming in Japan, as well as editing. He then organized the "Red Bus Screening Troop" to carry out his practice of the theory of reportage, or the theory of cinema movement, which he had proposed together with Matsuda, and thereby launched a nationwide screening movement that was independent, not relying on the existing film theaters or distribution system. The first screening in Tokyo was scheduled to take place at Art Theatre Shinjuku Bunka on

---

<sup>267</sup> For circumstances and schedule of filming in detail, see the following: Adachi Masao, "<Hodo> to <Sozo> no Kairo," [Circuit between reportage and creation], *Eiga Hiho*, no. 17 (February 1972): 14-21; *Eiga eno senryaku*, 15-36.

September 30, but was forced to be cancelled due to pressure from the parent company, and they changed venues, to *Keio Meigaza* (Keio Grindhouse) in Shinjuku, where the screenings continued for one week. The Red Bus Screening Movement traveled to universities, factories, public halls, etc. in the Kansai, Chugoku, Kyushu, and Shikoku regions. However, due to internal revolt among the screening troops during the tour, and also because of the United Red Army incident that occurred in February 1972, the troops were restructured, and became the second incarnation of the screening troop in April. They toured Kanto, Tokai, Hokuriku, and Tohoku, as well as Hokkaido and Okinawa. In August the same year, the Information Center for World Revolution (IRFIC) was founded, as a base for revolutionary movement centered on "Red Army-PFLP" screenings, and the journal *Sekai Kakumei Sensen* (World Revolution Front) was published. Meanwhile, plans were made to expand the screening movement domestically and internationally, and, shortly after it was completed, a screening of the English version of the film was held at a Palestinian camp. After that, Matsuda and others who were based in Paris sought the possibility of making a French version and bringing the screening movement to Europe. However the project suffered a setback when Matsuda faced deportation from France in September 1974. As a result of these events, Adachi also became responsible as the spokesperson of the Arab Red Army<sup>268</sup> while traveling back and forth between Japan and Arab countries; in August 1974 he left Japan completely to join the Palestinian struggle.

## **2. Analyzing the Structure of *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*—Film/Image Theory**

*Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* structurally consists of landscape shots of Palestinian refugee camps and guerrilla bases in Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria, as well as those of town areas, and interviews with the revolutionary soldiers. Similarly, the shots of Japan include scenes of militant demonstrations, interviews with Red Army faction, and their proselytizing, upon which Japanese

---

<sup>268</sup> The Arab Red Army was formed mainly by the members of Kyodai Paruchizan (Kyoto University Paritizan) and Red Army faction of Communist League, including Shigenobu in 1971. As for the Red Army faction in Japan, upon experiencing organizational decline, the United Red Army (Toitsu sekigun) was formed, but it collapsed as it shifted to the United Red Army (Rengo sekigun). Under these circumstances, while distancing from the domestic group, many people including Adachi who were not affiliated with Red Army coalesced. It was reformulated as Japan Red Army in 1974. It dissolved in 2001.



subtitles, narration and Agitation are superimposed. The narration was voiced mainly by Toura Rokko from *Sozoshu*. The Japanese voice over for PFLP members was added by actress Nakajima Aoi, Matsuda, Iwabuchi and others. The film starts with the narration, "This is a newsreel film for the construction of the World Red Army", followed by images taken from existing news reports on the hijackings by the Red Army faction and the PFLP, upon which *The Internationale* was played at an extremely high volume. The caption, which reads, "The best form of propaganda is armed struggle" in white letters against a black screen is inserted while the contents of their proselytizing and interviews are explained. Images of the hijacking of the Airliner *Yodo* by the Red Army faction, and an airplane hijacked by the PFLP exploding are shown in montage with agitation, clearly indicating that this newsreel film was created as propaganda for the Marxist-Leninist world revolution. However what follows after the news footage—being shown in montage, based on the dialectics of revolution—is, in contrast, entirely different: images of the quotidian landscape of town areas around Beirut. This long-take sequence of landscapes of the city, shot from a car, progresses, occasionally including such mundane features as billboards, seashores, a Ferris wheel, etc. upon which the sounds of aggressive narration and proselytizing by PFLP soldiers are superimposed. Meanwhile, in the sequence of the Shatila refugee camp in Beirut, there is no narration or proselytizing, but instead, a shot of an everyday landscape spreading out under flying airplanes unfolds, while images of landscapes and the sounds of political messages are juxtaposed. Though the film advocates Marxist-Leninist revolutionary slogans in its role as a newsreel film, the focus is not only on images that are relevant to Marxist-Leninist political ideology or struggle; instead, shots of everyday landscapes are repeatedly overlaid, emphasizing that the film's intention is not to straightforwardly aim for one integrated and 'correct' revolution, but to disclose and accept conflicts and contradictions immanent in the reality of their struggle, and thereby, to critique the traditional cinema of revolution by way of its very structure, by the use of this filming methodology.

Next, this section is followed by images shot in Japan, consisting alternately of images from a political rally of the Red Army faction, in montage with the CMs screened on the TV, and those from a news programs reporting on the Sanrizuka struggle. The image of the rally was taken on the occasion of

the formation of *Toitsu Sekigun* (Jointed Red Army), in which the domestic Red Army faction and the *Keihin Ampo Kyoto* (Keihin Security Treaty Joint Struggle) of the Revolutionary Left merged together. It was filmed after Adachi and Wakamatsu returned from Palestine. Meanwhile, the TV images, including a news broadcast by TBS (Tokyo Broadcasting System Television) 's JNN (Japan News Network) news desk, a major broadcasting network, along with commercials for sweets, automobiles, and weather forecasts that were run before and after the news are also used. For the voiceover, the proselytizing for the formation of the United Red Army continues, with sound from the news about Sanrizuka superimposed. In the sense that the film was initially produced for propaganda it should have been more natural to juxtapose the documentation of the aggressive struggle within Japan with that of the struggles in Palestine. However the content of the images used to depict the Red Army faction is extremely restrained, consisting of only images taken at the rally, i.e. the silhouette of militants on the podium and a signboard, which reads, "The Rally to Celebrate the Formation of The Revolutionary Army"—even though this was deliberately executed to obscure identification of those involved. On the other hand, as for the images of Sanrizuka where the most fierce and intense struggle in Japan unfolded at the time, instead of using actual footage filmed by the activists themselves, news images appropriated from the television screen were superimposed onto footage of the Red Army faction at a rally, while footage of commercials and weather forecasts, juxtaposed with aggressive proselytizing by the Red Army faction, with the sound and voice of the news reporters reporting on the situations in Sanrizuka is inserted. In order to portray the Sanrizuka struggle, the use of actual footage taken by Red Army members themselves is avoided, and instead TV news, which is effectively a commodity, referred to as, "suppressed <reportage>" is deliberately employed. In this way, while articulating differences between the Red Army faction and Sanrizuka, rather than their joint struggle, synchronization or mutual identification, the use of this editing method serves to highlight the unreconcilable gap between the Red Army faction/the New Left, characterized by the poverty of their political discourse, and the limited availability of their images like those from feeble rallies on one hand, and Sanrizuka, where an armed uprising by farmers was actually taking place on the other. The methodology of juxtaposing the mundane landscape in Beirut with aggressive political

agitation at the beginning of the film was again used to combine similarly contrasting elements of the everyday landscape and aggressive agitation in an even more complex manner in the Japan sequence, where for instance, the interviews with Palestinian guerrillas with an emphasis on anonymity are juxtaposed with agitations of the Red Army advocating heroism, thereby articulating discrepancies and contradictions between image and sound, and structurally incorporating critical recognition of the Red Army faction and themselves as producers. The more philosophical and theoretical background and issues of this particular cinematic practice will be discussed later.

The next sequence is of refugee camps in Sida, Jelasi and Gaza, consisting of scenes of various mundane landscapes and traces of warfare—soldiers cooking and doing laundry, or reading Vladimir Lenin or Mao Zedong, children playing on the street, sunflowers<sup>269</sup> growing in the surroundings, as well as scenes of men and women of all ages engaged in the exercise of disassembling guns, and numerous guns placed everywhere—while interviews with and proselytizing by soldiers emphasizing their own anonymity are superimposed. With the frequent use of close-ups and panning, depictions of guns are used heavily, however, the emphasis is not on the specificity of the gun as a weapon in extraordinary circumstances, but rather on the image of guns as part of the everyday landscape. As is indicated in the narration in the film, "With guns in their hands, they study guns and are taught by guns. It is guns and bullets that the oppressed people can acquire now for the first time." Focus is given to guns and bullets as 'language' rather than as fetishized physical objects. Also, Adachi later wrote, "We learned and recorded the reality of PFLP's <Armed Struggle> centered on guns as a context for close alignment between the forefront of Palestinian guerilla fighters and the Home Front, without making a distinction."<sup>270</sup> In other words, as the armed struggle itself becomes propaganda, and likewise a hijacking itself is a form of media, through the representation of guns in the front line and in the camps, Adachi depicted their new role—not

---

<sup>269</sup> The depiction of sunflowers may remind us of the landscape in *A.K.A. Serial Killer*.

<sup>270</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 20.

just as a weapon, or as a fetish object, but guns as media.<sup>271</sup> On the other hand, as Adachi pointed out, the soldiers are "working concurrently as guerrilla fighters and as actors for a 'Propaganda film for the Palestine Liberation Struggle'", it should also be pointed out that soldiers were clearly aware of this dual role, and consciously perform and direct the way their own everyday lives are depicted.<sup>272</sup> Also, shots of bullet holes in the camps everywhere are shown repeatedly, and beams of light coming through the bullet holes are employed to depict conditions after the event of war, and to conjure up its violence. As will be described later, in continuously projected traces of war, it can be possible to discover the issue—relevant to landscape theory—of how to represent the unrepresentable—in those traces of war.

Soldiers in search of their enemies at the Syria–Israel border zone are shown only in silhouette to avoid their being identified, and the landscape of the silent but violent border zone is depicted. While shots continue of soldiers searching for enemies, performing exercises and studying in the Jordan–Israel border zone and at the base at Jerashi Mountain. The fighting and training are represented as the everyday life of guerrilla soldiers of all ages. The front zone is a region of mountains, deserts and meadows, which are visually monotonous and ordinary. The camera, however, captures them in a long panning shot, while the PFLP soldiers' messages and agitations, including those by Khaled, Kanafani, founder Georges Habasch, as well as by military volunteers from France, are repeatedly superimposed. An attempt is thus made to articulate a border that cannot be represented with images from the media, and to depict the violence and history that are embodied within the landscape itself. In the next sequence an interview in Arabic with Shigenobu, a Red Army soldier, is shown montaged against landscapes of a street in Jordan and desert mountains, taken from a moving jeep. Hijacking and training scenes are montaged with the image of the Jeep moving forward, and while sounds and voices from multiple messages and interviews are mixed and intertwined, revolutionary slogans are shown rapidly, and similarly to its beginning, the film ends with *The Internationale* played at an extremely loud volume. While these sequences and

---

<sup>271</sup> This is succinctly mentioned by Matsuda. "Either <guns> or <bullets> are not just a subtype/subgroup of weapons. It is a metaphor of communication media in the <third world>." "Sairon 'Sekigun-PFLP • Sekai senso gensengen'," [Revisiting Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War] in *Hakuchumu wo ute*, 235.

<sup>272</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 13; Adachi, *Eiga/Kakumei*, 361.

montages conveying revolutionary messages repeat at the beginning and the end of the film, instead of focusing on this political spectacle, it is important to understand the criticality provided by the cinematic structure itself, and discover a continuity of landscape theory, or the theory of reportage as landscape theory.

### 3. Theory of Reportage—Its Theoretical Analysis as Continuation of Landscape Theory

As was discussed in Chapter Two, the shift from landscape theory to the theory of reportage, or the theory of the media, was pursued in *Red Army/PFLP*. Adachi introduced the concept of reportage for the first time in his article, <Hodo> to <sozo> no kairo: *Sekigun/PFLP: Sekai Senso Sengen no tame no noto* (Circuit of <Reportage> and <Creation>: A note for *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*), in the October 1971 issue of *Eiga Hiho*. A similar article, *Eigaundo no senryakuron* (On a Strategy for Cinema Movement) was published earlier in the October 4th, 1971 issue of Japan Reader's Newspaper, but this second article is considered to be the first text written on Red Army/PFLP. The text consists of short descriptions of the intentions for production proposed to the PFLP; the production of *Red Army/PFLP* and the description of film screenings; and detailed journals of the film shooting in Arab countries. Adachi wrote, "Based on my impression and the diary of this <journey>, I would like to start outlining the thesis for *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*."<sup>273</sup> Style-wise, the text was written not as a theoretical and political manifesto, but as a praxis report relating to cinema movement, in the form of a diary.

In this text, Adachi first defines the journey not as an act of physically moving from one place to another, but as a direction for movement, including the deconstruction of self/self-dismantling or transformation of the subject, and then offers a counterargument against criticism of him by Tsumura Takashi. Adachi then introduces the diary after his arrival in Beirut on May 28th, 1971, followed by the quotation from the statement of intent to produce the newsreel film as a proposal to the PFLP, created on June 5.

---

<sup>273</sup> Adachi, *Eiga heno senryaku*, 15

We must permanently carry out propaganda for all the revolutionary forces fighting for world revolution. We must establish an organizational mechanism for propaganda immediately. Because all revolutionary forces face difficulties, and in that difficult situation we may lose the goal of creating a true world revolutionary front by not seeing the status quo for what it is, and compromising ourselves by it. Now we must begin the movement towards the creation of a world revolutionary front by creating the body of the movement—not to speak about the suppressed <truth> and <history>, but to recognize the <truth> and <history> of the people. Therefore, we must let the people of the whole world know, through the most prominent struggle and strategic theory, and ask them about the specific situation of the struggles of the Japanese Red Army faction and PFLP, who are trying to build a radical world revolutionary front. We must propagandize the declaration of the joint struggle between the Japanese Red Army faction and PFLP with the <newsreel film> as our <language>. *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* must be carried out. We must continue screening this <film>, historically, the most militant film produced jointly by the *Red Army/PFLP* on the basis of the movement.<sup>274</sup>

The production plan is divided into four parts: themes, form of methods, contents, and notes. The quote above, which corresponds to the themes part, suggests that, already at the production stage, Adachi and his peers were aiming to establish the propaganda organizational structure for the revolutionary movement that would extend the theory of reportage—transcending the existing frameworks and categories, such as film as a work of art, newsreel film, political documentary. In addition, although the film was made as propaganda about the joint declaration of the Red Army and PFLP, unlike conventional propaganda, its objective was to create a world revolutionary front through the particular situations of both the Red Army faction and the PFLP, rather than to just introduce the theory and practice of either the Red Army faction or the PFLP, based on independent factionalism. Thus, through the proposal to create the body of the movement to recognize "truth" and "history", the Red Bus Film Screening Troop movement beyond conventional screening movements was to be prepared. Simply put, theories that were to be developed later, such as the theory of reportage, the theory of the Film Screening Troop Movement, and the theory of propaganda, were all presented here in a compact version. Adachi discusses the film's methodologies further based on the following three definitions:

First, we must clarify and learn the strategic theories of the Japanese Red Army and the PFLP, and have a mutual understanding of the current situation.  
 Second, we should carry out a concrete analysis of the specific situations of the Japanese Red Army and the PFLP through the tasks of film production.  
 Third, we should document all the problems around the strategic theories of the Japanese Red

---

<sup>274</sup> Ibid., 18

Army and the PFLP, and the feuds caused by their current status as <truth>, aiming in an accurate and militant direction, and thereby create a genuine propaganda method. Therefore, we must first grasp the strategic theory, second analyze the status quo, and third create a <film> directly reflecting the entire work process of documenting the first two. We must discover its method and form here and now.<sup>275</sup>

Adachi analyzes both Red Army faction and PFLP in a concrete way through the production of the film, documents all the problems—such as discrepancies and contradictions between the strategic theory and the actual situation—and tries to fix them in the film as "truth". Adachi thus aims to disclose those problems and contradictions as a part of their struggle, and to seek a method and form through which the entire process of filmmaking can be constituted as propaganda. Adachi's diary reports that the joint-production was approved, and the PFLP's strategy was introduced as follows.

Propaganda immediately is <information>, and <information>, immediately, is to convey the truth. Moreover, the best form of truth is armed struggle. Therefore, we believe that armed struggle is the best form of propaganda.<sup>276</sup>

The above statement was made by Kanafani, a member of the central political bureau of the PFLP and a scholar of Arabic literature, and his highly specific concept of revolution, propaganda and media marked a significant position for the subsequent production of *Red Army/PFLP*, and the screening movement. With this statement—providing the example that, despite the fact that the U.S. imperialism-propaganda apparatus is historically the most powerful, the U.S. can no longer justify war even domestically, because of the battle in South Vietnam against the Viet Cong's limited but adamant war efforts,—Kanafani continues arguing that this, in fact, proves that armed struggle is the most effective propaganda. While discussing the general rules and principles of the PFLP, Adachi analyzes the reason for the approval for the joint production of his *Red Army/PFLP* as follows, using the term 'reportage'.

For Palestinian guerrillas, arms are the <language of truth>, the armed struggle itself is their <expression>, and therefore, the creation of <information> that is brought along as the result of warfare is considered to be a highly effective form of reportage. The reason they acknowledged <newsreel films> as propagandas is because they only acknowledge political mass movement(kampaniya) as the creation of <information>.<sup>277</sup>

---

<sup>275</sup> Ibid., 18-19.

<sup>276</sup> Ibid., 19-20.

<sup>277</sup> Ibid., 20-21.

Concerning the development of film production, screenings, and the theory of reportage, instead of pursuing abstract answers for either cinema or politics, or art or revolution, Adachi instead subsequently persisted on the specificity of, and equivalence between, armed struggle and propaganda. In his report on film shooting, Adachi discusses the relationship between the filmmaker as author and viewers as readers, continuously providing a counterargument to Tsumura's criticism. Tsumura claimed that, in cinema, the act of reading films—rather than that of creation on the basis of the filmmaker's self-expression—should be considered of primary importance. Tsumura's criticism is that Adachi, despite developing the theory of cinema movement, only speaks from the standpoint of the creator. He then argues that, rather than enclosing cinema in the isolated domain of expression by an author, cinema should be opened up to the city as its exteriority.<sup>278</sup> In contrast, while agreeing on the importance of the audience as readers, Adachi counters that the creator should not be unilaterally criticized by emphasizing the dichotomy between creator and reader, and if the reader is to be considered of primary importance, one should aim to organize spectators as readers, instead of proposing the vague concept of 'opening cinema to the city' to unilaterally criticize an auteur-based cinema.

The cinema as <journey> is a journey of 'anonymizing' in order to become a reader. On the other hand, the <journey> of the anonymous [person]=reader is a journey of <becoming a person> for constructing a strategy, or a journey to <truth>. Situated between them, what is the "truth" that "can be accomplished by <expression>" (called cinema), as its own unique mission?<sup>279</sup>

Adachi argues that in order to become a reader, what is required in cinema is to make authors or individuals become anonymous, unknown, or impersonal. Meanwhile, as for the reader, subjectivization by transforming oneself into a subject for the movement, and organization for the movement should be the goal, in order to read the truth in cinema. Referring to the principles of the PFLP's armed struggle=propaganda, Adachi again argues that the focus at the time of shooting *Red Army/PFLP* was on the "gun as a language"<sup>280</sup> connecting the front line and the refugee camp. Based on that experience, the relationship between the cameraman and the object being filmed, or between seeing and being seen is

<sup>278</sup> Tsumura Takashi, "Prauda wo yomutameno itsutsu no konnan," [Five difficulties in reading <<Pravda>>], *Eiga Hihyo*, no.10 (July 1971): 15-26.

<sup>279</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 23.

<sup>280</sup> Ibid., 26.



placed onto the relationship between the author and the reader of the film. Adachi argues that the cameraman can also be a reader, and the object filmed, as a reader, should in turn react to what has been 'read' by the author, addressing the necessity of reciprocal communication between a creator and a reader, or between seeing subject and being seen object.

I must have the reality of the entire <expression> and <journey>, from reading their <armed struggle>, especially the <language> of guns. They must also read how expression, which I will discover by reading them, comes about, because we must recognize now that the <language> between them and me that is going to be documented and discovered is based on both of our higher agendas as our strategies, "Victory for the Palestinian Liberation Struggle!" and "Build the front line to win the world revolutionary war!", which are our main premises, as strategies of reading.<sup>281</sup>

Lastly, Adachi argues that, through the production and screening movement of *Red Army/PFLP*, onto which the introspection of the creator himself was reflected, 'reportage,' as a new form of communication, in which all theories and practices interact dynamically in order to realize armed struggle=propaganda, must be produced.

However, the only clear thing is that we cannot abandon the creator's position of <reporting> <armed struggle> as an act of converting our reflections into the method shown in "Can drunks in Shinjuku become guerrilla soldiers?" until the <reportage> on a particular feeling as the <journey> called <newsreel film> *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* takes shape. <Armed struggle> is the best propaganda. Unless a form of that <reportage> is <created>, its <language> will not be expressed as a 'language of class.'<sup>282</sup>

While proposing the theory of reportage on the one hand, Adachi poses the provocative and ironic question, "Can drunks in Shinjuku become good guerrilla soldiers?" Again, instead of emphasizing the military, historical and geopolitical differences between Palestine and Japan, dichotomies such as Shinjuku-Japan/Palestine, everyday/non-everyday, avant-garde/rearguard, or front line/home front are canceled out, and the possibility of reciprocal and mutual exchange between them, or even the synonymous relationship of a 'drunk in Shinjuku' and 'guerrillas' is proclaimed as shown in the title's playful expression. This approach of invalidating dichotomous thinking is mentioned even more straightforwardly in Adachi's narration of the film.

---

<sup>281</sup> Ibid., 29-30.

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., 32.

They make no distinction between the forefront line and the home front. The front line base is the place for their rich 'learning' life. The urban area is a place where "weapons" as the common language of the people is discovered and utilized. They make no distinction between urban guerrillas and guerrilla warfare. Guerrilla soldiers learn on the battlefield, and the people and the masses have their place of residence on the battlefield.<sup>283</sup>

Adachi further argues that the landscape in everyday life, rather than the forefront of the non-everyday, is, in fact, synonymous with armed struggle, proposing to extend this context not only to Palestine, a land of revolutionary war, but to Shinjuku-Japan, and the world.

The Landscape, meaning that armed struggle is to be on standby, is now spreading in front of us as a landscape of the world. It is possible to learn from the oppressed Palestinian people that to be on standby means to develop weapons, be armed, and to wait for battle.<sup>284</sup>

Adachi's heavily political writing style, including the theory of reportage, evidently derived from the fact that *Red Army/PFLP* was a newsreel film, which was mainly produced for the purpose of propaganda supporting armed struggle in Palestine and Japan. As was analyzed earlier, in *Red Army/PFLP* various proposals were made to go beyond existing revolutionary theories and theories of media, however, because of the fact that the film was a joint production between the PFLP and the Red Army faction, it is inevitable that these proposals tended to be elucidated in terms of their political relationship. However, Adachi's argument, not on the basis of a binary opposition between urban areas and frontline bases, but on the theory of reportage—in which he recognizes everyday life, including armed struggle is recognized as landscape—and presents it in the form of a newsreel film=reportage, illustrates—albeit by his convoluted use of expressions—a theoretical and practical development, and a continuation of landscape theory.

On the other hand, problematics relevant to the theory of reportage can also be found in the discussions of landscape theory prior to the proposal of the theory of reportage. For instance, in his article *Dezain ni kansareta kyoso no hakuri koso sozo no saisei e* (Peel off the pretense placed on design for the rebirth of creation) in *Design Journal* on September 15th, 1970, in which Adachi discusses the relationship between design and revolution, a journalistic photo of the hijacking of Yodo-go is reprinted

---

<sup>283</sup> From *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*.

<sup>284</sup> Ibid.

with the caption "A 'landscape' of Red Army hijacking".<sup>285</sup> In this way, a photo of a hijacking by the Red Army faction, one of the most crucial struggles—and as a successful one—in the history of the New Left represents a 'landscape', and this expression attests to the fact that landscape theory itself was already embedded in the problematics of the theory of reportage. This continuity, as in the relationship between landscape theory and the theory of reportage is also evinced by the fact that many of the discussions relevant to the production of *Red Army/PFLP* and the screening movement have already been shown in the context of the earlier film theory. Adachi published *Nani wo nasazaru beki ka* (What is not to be done?) as a counter argument to Godard's essay *Nani wo nasubekika?* (What is to be done).<sup>286</sup> As in the Godard piece, problems such as "1. Should we make films of movement?" and "2. Should we make films on the basis of movement?" were asked, based on 39 theses.

The practice of 2 is to practice <cinema> as <movement>, and to learn the following principle and put it into a method. Namely, all the basic mechanisms of production, distribution, and screening of <the film> must be organized politically.<sup>287</sup>

The practice of 2 is an urgent task of all <people working in the film industry>, and rather than judging every practice in which films are used, we must first carry out the <demolition> of the entire mechanism of cinema.<sup>288</sup>

The intentions of making *Red Army/PFLP* and the theory of reportage quoted earlier, were, in fact, part of the process of developing theses like these theoretically and putting them into practice. In addition, it was true that the debate between Adachi and Tsumura that occupied a significant part in *Circuit of <reportage> and <creation>*—crossing the production of *Red Army/PFLP*—was carried over and continued.

The background of this important debate was as follows: First, quoting the statement made by Adachi in his conversation with Nakahira titled '*Sakuhin' no hokai to kaitai* (The collapse and dismantling of 'works') in the December 14th and 21st, 1970 issues of Japan Reader's Newspaper. Tsumura wrote a

<sup>285</sup> Adachi Masao, *Dezain ni kansareta kyoso no hakuri koso sozo no saisei e* [Peel off the pretense placed on design for the rebirth of creation], *Dezain Janaru* [Design Journal], Vol.4.No.9 (15<sup>th</sup> September 1970): 1.

<sup>286</sup> Jean Luc Godard, "What is to be done?" in *Godardu Manifesto* [Godard Manifesto], ed. Fukami Koichiro (Tokyo: Furansu Eigasha and Sozoshu, 1970), 2-5. Originally, published in *Afterimage*, no.1, April 1970.

<sup>287</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 149.

<sup>288</sup> *Ibid.*, 150.

critique of Adachi in *Godaru in wandahrando* (Godard in wonderland), in the March 1971 issue of *Eiga Hihyo*, and Adachi immediately launched a counter-argument against Tsumura in *What is not to be done* in the April 1971 issue of *Eiga Hihyo*. While Tsumura praised the Dziga Vertov Group's experiment attempting to dismantle cinema made in *Lotte in Italy*, based on a comparison to this film, he also critiques Adachi as follows:

When *Lotte in Italy* appeared with the <black screens>, people understood it, and made the connection with the idea of "giving up on [a] movie" unless it was seen as a mere technical novelty. They said that Godard should give up on cinema flatly and do politics instead, and Adachi Masao said that he would not quit cinema, assuming the gesture that he definitely did not have a black screen. But when did Godard, like [Brice] Parain, declare that cinema had to be replaced with a direct mode of action anyway? Indeed, was it not Godard who actually discovered the mission of dismantling the era of the world-image, or the one specific to cinema (TV can also be added), in this world revolution? Isn't it about time that we stop clinging to the old schema of art and politics?<sup>289</sup>

In his analysis of the first half of *What is not to be done*, leading up to the list of theses, while offering a counterargument against Tsumura's critique, Adachi also says that the method of inserting a black screen instead of an image in *Struggle in Italy* is, in fact, an act of Auteurism.

Now, I am saying that <action> must be taken in <cinema> on the same level as <practicing politics>. Did the dismantling of the cinema have to be carried out in that direction? What I am saying is that the "black screen" used in *Struggle in Italy* is part of the Godard's method, in which "the old schema of politics and art" is literally incorporated. How could he not say that <the process of dismantling> that schema merely provided the <work> *Struggle in Italy* with a 'specific task'? It was not that I "assumed a gesture" by making an assertion, but instead I indicated that, when a task specific to <the work>, and a task specific to <the auteur> have been reflectively put into the method with the use of the <black screen>, it becomes only <work>. Why does Tsumura not understand it?<sup>290</sup>

His discussion, referenced earlier, about the relationship between the creator and reader in cinema continues. Tsumura countered the above criticism in his text *Purauda o yomutame no itsutsu no konnan* (Five difficulties of reading *Pravda*) published in the July 1971 issue of *Eiga Hihyo*, while filming of *Red Army/PFLP* was in progress. After returning to Japan, Adachi again countered Tsumura in the October 1971 issue of *Eiga Hihyo* in *Circuits of <reportage> and <creation>*. It is interesting in considering

<sup>289</sup> Tsumura Takashi, "Kagami no kuni no godaru Itaria eno tabi aruiwa <kurogamenn> shiron," [Godard in wonderland: A journey to Italy, or an essay on <black screens>], *Eiga Hihyo*, no.6 (March 1971): 23.

<sup>290</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 143.

Adachi's theoretical development that important texts such as these were written as a response to Tsumura's criticism. Likewise, Matsuda also published texts right around the same time exploring discourse after landscape theory. This series of arguments, which had taken place mainly in *Eiga Hihyo*, thus provided a major influence on the production of Red Army/PFLP and the screening movement, contributing also to the theoretical restructuring of the theory of reportage. Adachi himself, reflecting on the period when he was making the transition from landscape theory to *Red Army/PFLP* and the theory of reportage, writes as follows:

Schematically speaking, landscape theory-based cinema examined ways in which one cuts out the landscape one sees, and the seen-landscape, given the fact that it is being expropriated by power. We tried to acquire a means of maneuvering and breaking through the situation of the existing landscape, or even the enemy's landscape, either subjectively or whatever, and regardless of whether we continue to shoot films, or we think of what to shoot after A.K.A. Serial Killer, would be the extension of that idea itself. We were thinking about that for a long time.<sup>291</sup>

Clearly the statement above, as well as the series of polemics, testifies to the fact that, already when Adachi was leaving for Palestine, the theory of cinema=movement, as opposed to the traditional idea based on a choice between cinema and politics, or between cinema and movement was already established as a background. The theory of reportage was thus to be created to overcome its limitation through the collaboration between the PFLP and the Red Army faction. It is true however, that the equation of cinema and movement inherent in the theory of reportage is often overshadowed, due to a tendency to emphasize aspects of movement through political discourse. As a result, the continuation of landscape theory into the theory of reportage, before and after the production of *Red Army/PFLP* also becomes harder to articulate. The discussion in the following section will attempt to clarify the relationship through closely examining the development of the formation of this argument.

#### **4. Development of Screening Movement——Theory of Cinema=Movement**

Adachi wrote a short article called *Eigaundo no senryakuron* (On the strategy of cinema movement) for the October 4th, 1971 issue of Japan Reader's Newspaper. Unlike his long discussions for

---

<sup>291</sup> Adachi, *Eiga/kakumei*, 364

*Eiga Hiho*, this short text was written as both declaration and advertisement for this book review, informing a variety of backgrounds and discussions quite succinctly.<sup>292</sup> First, the article explains the background of the joint production between the Red Army and the PFLP, and that the screening movement should "include the 'cultural movement', the 'intellectual movement', and the 'popular movement' comprehensively". Adachi then discusses the relationship between the Red Army faction, the PFLP, and himself as producer, specifically defining the positioning of the film *Red Army/PFLP*.

The actual filmmaking is shared among our film production staff at Wakamatsu Production, but we first try to be responsible for the duty: as a theory of strategy for cinema movement to provide structure to the reality of the factional feuds between the filmmakers, who insist on their own auteurist positions; and that created by 'the World Red Army' that is posited based on the joint struggle between Red Army faction and PFLP, and its strategies. In other words, we regard <newsreel film> as the beginning of the manifesto for the construction of the "World Red Army".<sup>293</sup>

Here, both auteurism by representing Adachi et al., and the political strategies of the Red Army faction and PFLP are expressed with the word 'factionalism,' and the mutually conflicting relationship between the three over issues of cinema and politics, art and revolution, and the policies of the movement, are placed as central to the construction of the new theory of cinema movement. Adachi argues that *Red Army/PFLP*, as a newsreel film significantly exceeding the framework of cinema, marks the beginning of a declaration to construct the World Red Army. Furthermore, in discussing the definition of what the newsreel film is, he states that it is synonymous with propaganda and armed struggle.

Therefore, as a theory for a strategy for picking up the truth to be conveyed and the method with which to communicate [that truth], as well as the <language> of its propaganda=armed struggle, from reality, and to return them as <language> back to reality, the <newsreel film> must be presented as an actual state of propaganda. Therefore, we must embody the theory of strategy for the manifesto of the world revolutionary front, such as armed struggle = propaganda, propaganda = <newsreel film>, and <newsreel film>=propaganda=armed struggle.<sup>294</sup>

Adachi proceeds with providing a theoretical definition of newsreel film, referencing a specific episode in which the guerrillas enacted a battle for the sake of the film shoot. Without making a

---

<sup>292</sup> At the bottom, the issue with the text had the advertisement, "<Newsreel film> The first period screening, <Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War> a lecture: Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine soldiers and Red Army soldiers to be held concurrently from September 30 to October 5, open 9:40 every night/Art Theatre Shinjuku Bunka"

<sup>293</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 11.

<sup>294</sup> Ibid., 11-12.

distinction between this quasi-battle and the real battle—following the principle of newsreel film= propaganda = armed struggle—Adachi was aware of the risk, and decided not to shoot the scene. He then poses a question to himself about the problem of how a Palestinian reality—without the boundary between the real and the non-real—should be conveyed as a newsreel film.

When filming this guerrilla soldier as subject, the spirit of documentarism will continue filming them by forcing me to record the entire process of how my position as record taker is collapsing. Or <language> as propaganda will make it possible to hand down the reality of strategy and tactics for guerilla battles called guerilla soldiers' war=armed struggle through <reporting>. I learned from this episode that <newsreel films> can become a <language> not through the auteur's rumination, but through the entire process in which the author, upon confronting that <language>, is collapsing.<sup>295</sup>

Instead of understanding the collapse of auteurism—or its self-dismantling—formally based on the interiority (naimen) of the author or the work, Adachi's emphasis is rather on documenting the process of collapsing and dismantling itself. He then discusses a form of reportage that should be sought.

Then, just like one can claim that there is no disunion/gap between reality and non-reality for guerillas if it is all mediated by their <weapons>, the location of the <language> will become unclear as long as the content of the <report>, and the object being <reported> on, as well as the method of <reportage> for <newsreel films> are not proven by factionalism to build "World Revolutionary Front" and "World Red Army." "The things learned from soldiers must be returned to soldiers"—isn't this the task of true <reportage> that our <newsreel film> can follow with regard to <language>, rather than our speaking about the <episode> itself?<sup>296</sup>

Adachi argues that, in the newsreel film, the content reported, the target to whom the film is shown, and its method, in short, the creator and the reader must be connected as equals for the distinct purpose of building the World Revolution Front and the World Red Army. Therefore, a new machinery of reportage to convey the truth through the act of screening newsreel films, or the screening movement, must be created.

Now our screenings will embody the <newsreel film>. The screening movement must prevent the <truth> of the oppressed people from being relegated to a commodity called suppressed <reportage>. The <newsreel film> *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* is ready to create the machinery of <reportage> as our <language>, which is returned to the actual situation of the movement throughout the screening-movement process.<sup>297</sup>

---

<sup>295</sup> Ibid., 13

<sup>296</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>297</sup> Ibid., 14.

Through the mediation of *Red Army/PFLP*, the theory of reportage functions as a means of dismantling all existing theories of cinema, including Adachi's, and aims for building a completely different and new 'circuit'. Instead of claiming the superiority of factional politics, through the concept of reportage, politics in all domains—including cinema and media—are called into question, and efforts are made to connect their contradictions, conflicts, or possibilities with the theory and practice of reportage. Subsequently, Adachi wrote, *Propaganda no sairyo no keitai ha buso toso de aru* (The best form of propaganda is armed struggle) in the December 27th, 1971 issue of the Japan Reader's Newspaper. Introducing the screening movement for *Red Army/PFLP*, he discusses how cinema movement in the 70's was going to be formed via critique and analysis of the existing screening movement. In fact, since the text was written initially after the Red Army/PFLP screening movement first started, Adachi proceeds with a discussion on the subject (*shutai*) in the screening movement, articulating the relationship between the creator and the reader, on the basis of more concrete experiences and involvement with the audience.

Cinema is starting to try to assume its own role through the screening movement as a circuit of movement based on cinema movement, as well as on the <audience>. Although we began our struggle on that horizon, through the long campaign across the nation/the <revolution bus> tour, repeating familiar screening rallies for *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*, we also had to start rethinking the subject of our own movement [standing] in front of the masses=film <audience>. Many handshakes made secretly, and chance encounters with the <audience> that took place in the middle of countless attacks compelled us to reaffirm the subject of the movement based on the principles summarized in Declaration, i.e., whether we can speak in the words of the people as our own [words]. On one hand, as long as it is shown in front of the <audience>, Declaration is merely a film, however, on the other hand, the question is, whether the screening movement for Declaration in front of the <audience> is nothing more than the cinema movement, which also counts on a <phantom-like> <audience>, is loved and confirmed by them, or it is just the cinema movement "in the service of the masses." The question is how the subject of the movement can assimilate this contradiction.<sup>298</sup>

These words testify to Adachi's assertion that both the concept of screening movement as a cultural project based on auteurist production and consumption of cinema, or one which relied on the political themes documented in the film, must be rejected, and instead the cinema movement of *Red Army/PFLP* must be started from the point where those who screen the film subjectively accept the theory

---

<sup>298</sup> Ibid., 35.



and practice of armed struggle depicted in the film as their own. In order to transcend the recognition that cinema is, after all, only cinema, or the limitation of a fixed relationship between those who screen the film and those to whom the film is shown, what is primarily required of the screening movement is to establish itself as 'subject'. With that in mind, Adachi argues that what is needed in the seventies is the screening troop as a new entity of the screening movement, and its encounters with the audience.

However, in order to confirm that "The best form of propaganda is armed struggle", and continue propagandizing the people's Declaration, to "Create the world revolutionary front through joint military actions", the primary importance of cinema via the screening movement must be ensured by the reality of the front work operation utilizing the <revolution bus>. Instead of showing Declaration, we must keep creating a declaration. We have abandoned the <phantom> <audience> by critiquing our own history, and tried to embody the subject of the movement by creating a front based on encounters with our already assumed <invisible> comrades=former comrades, by instigating tumult and maneuvering secretly.<sup>299</sup>

According to Adachi, the screening troop itself was required to be responsible for *Red Army/PFLP* and the screening movement, in which the world revolutionary front presented therein must actually be theorized and practiced, as well as screening the film as a work. Also, the project should not be carried out by the screening troops alone, but should generate a collaboration with the audience as its active agents. Mediated by the discussion of the 'subjectivizing' of the screening movement, Adachi tried to articulate a new relationship based on mutually reciprocal communication between the author and the audience, instead of the author as creator, or of assuming leadership of movement unilaterally for the audience. Adachi implemented further practical developments based on his own theme of auteur/activist, as well as based on the theory of cinematic activism by Matsuda. In the February 1972 issue of *Art Notes* in a piece called *Hyogensha no shutai to kodo* (The Subject and the Action of the Artist), Adachi notes on more specific content of the screening movement:

However, the <newsreel film> lacked a system of transportation upon which to transmit it as news. As for the propaganda, first of all, we had to start building our own system of transportation, organizing the advertising team to realize the screening movement, founding a publishing bureau, and acquiring <a revolution bus> as a part of our transportation network.<sup>300</sup>

---

<sup>299</sup> Ibid., 35.

<sup>300</sup> Adachi Masao, "Hyogensha no shutai to kodo," 111.

Instead of following existing forms and methods of screenings or screening networks, new means of communication and the construction of the machinery of reportage were proposed, with the goals of organizing the screening troops, procuring the red bus for a nation-wide tour by the screening troops, and establishing a publication center. In reality however, the screenings often had to rely on the existing network of theaters. As will be discussed later in detail, with regard to some issues, including the one above, criticism against Adachi and Wakamatsu grew within the first screening movement, and it was to be dismantled. In response to this circumstance, Adachi developed the discussion on the subject (*shutai*) as an artist (*hyogensha*), arguing that revolutionary thought and action are inseparable, and should after all be integrated. Instead of organizing the movement based on leadership of a fixed subject, Adachi conceptualized their screening-movement journey as a process in which it, as the subject, unfolds through its own transformation, holding various problems that occur throughout. Following this argument, Adachi then touches on the issue of place-space in cinema.

<Filmmakers>, who previously approached a reality in which the heightened situation of the seventies was contested independently at the level of the <auteur> or <work> only within the [domain of] personal struggle, are starting to seek the unique direction for their movement to create not cinema to "be presented to the masses," but <cinema> "to be produced jointly with <the masses>". In a broad sense, they have approached the issue of a "place", in which cinema is comprised of <author,> <work>, and <audience>.<sup>301</sup>

Based on the context of the theory of cinema movement showing a shift from auteurist cinema to cinema of activism, the concept of place-space is proposed, explaining cinema integrating all aspects relevant to production, distribution and screening. Adachi's criticism then points to the fact, though its historical significance to transcend the value and expressions of existing commercial films made by major film companies was significant, due to its being co-opted and exploited by the machinery of the state and capitalism, the auteurism-based cinema movement—organized around the structure of the independent production in the 1960's—had limitations. Furthermore, through the historical investigation of landscape theory, his criticism is also directed against the renegades in the screening movement whose argument

---

<sup>301</sup> Adachi, "Hyogensha no shutai to kodo," 112.

was organized based on the binary oppositions of expression-cinema vs. politics, or screening movement vs. armed struggle. It could be said that landscape theory, through the mediation of the theory of reportage, turned out to be tested in theory and practice at the extremely political, yet quotidian setting of the screening movement of *Red Army/PFLP*. As will be discussed in the following section, the theory of cinema movement was now to move further towards the issues of organizing and specifics of the screening troop and audience.

## 5. Specificity of Cinema

Adachi wrote a long text called <Sozo> to <hodo> no kairo (Circuit of <creation> and <reportage>) published in three parts in the February, March and April, 1972 issues of the *Eiga Hiho*, in which a comprehensive evaluation of the first-period screening movement, including the production of *Red Army/PFLP* and the renegades incident, was carried out, and with reference to a series of United Red Army incidents, which had occurred while writing was still in progress. The text was written as a manifesto for the second-period screening movement.<sup>302</sup> Based on a series of events, including the internal revolt incident and the United Red Army experienced after the start of the screening movement, a review was conducted with regard to past discussions and the theory of reportage, and issues such as cinema in revolutionary movement and politics, and specificity of the cinema movement were also discussed. Because the texts analyzed earlier were intended to be published as a manifesto or agitation immediately after launching the screening movement, the emphasis was often placed on the politics of collaboration between Red Army faction and the PFLP as in critical opposition to the existing cinema and cinema movement. In this text, however, instead of emphasizing politics and its superiority, Adachi discusses the idea of specificity in cinema, through the theory of reportage and media theory, to direct a political critique against the Red Army. Adachi criticizes the first phase of the screening movement for having renounced their screening movement. Then, while verifying the background leading up to the joint

---

<sup>302</sup> Since the text was written in three parts, the text published for the April issue refers to a series of United Red Army incidents occurred in February. E-mail interview with Adachi: on November 2016.

production between Wakamatsu Production, the PFLP, and the Red Army faction, he insistently points out problems of the Red Army faction. He notes:

In the transitional situation between the 1960s struggle of the <preliminary stage of armed insurrection> and the 1970s <armed confrontation stage>, even if the PFLP addresses the manifesto for the absolutely correct revolutionary strategy, "the best form of propaganda is armed struggle," there is still a political judgment that there is nothing in cinema—cultural and intellectual struggle—through which the strategy to be developed by the Communist League Red Army faction can be practiced. The epistemology of world revolution in which the masses and the intellectuals are detached is nothing more than a corruption of revolution, and the logic of the Red Army faction, who demand that we not get involved in their strategic developments, came to the fore in the joint production of Declaration by the three parties. Indeed, it contained a logical structure as an inevitable judgment for revolutionary politics. However, it is the same structure of logic based upon which factionalism as revolutionary politics in response to the partisan politics of establishment power, has filtered out the subject of the movement, with the objective of evolving into the revolution, and produced the existing bureaucracy for revolutionary politics.<sup>303</sup>

When the PFLP was rushing to develop the theory of a pure military strategy, the Red Army faction adhered to the platform-like criteria (tactics), which were militarily effective and necessary. They tried to grasp the development of the subject of Declaration—no longer restricted to the subject of declaration, but the revolutionary subject to be developed for the purpose of organizing the declaration—in the context of the ideological politics justified by the revolutionary situation of 1970's Japan. Using the pretense of the problem of confidential disclosure, they judged that propagandizing that that "the best form of propaganda is armed struggle" would be at odds with armed struggle itself.

Because of their dualistic understanding of cultural movement based on a split between politics and art, they tried to push the movement mobilized for the creation of Declaration back to the horizon of cultural movement. No, they dismissed the essence that <newsreel film> *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* is a pamphlet and a message to our comrades to confirm our factional viewpoints of the world revolution, and instead, attached special importance only to the realistic effectiveness of the propaganda in the relationship to authority.<sup>304</sup>

In reference to the fact that there were major conflicts and discrepancies over politics and culture in the collaboration with the Red Army faction in the process of production, responding to their bureaucratic approach, which viewed the production and screening of *Red Army/PFLP* only within the framework of cultural movement, Adachi argues that the dualism of politics and culture, avant-garde and rear-guard, should be transcended. He continues that, unless their own strategic theory is made popular among the masses, its role as propaganda will stop, and furthermore, it cannot move outside the reach of political conflicts with other domestic factions. Moreover, in comparison to PFLP's more specifically

---

<sup>303</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 40-41.

<sup>304</sup> Ibid., 42.

elaborated theory of military strategy, or Matsuda's theory of anonymous riots, Adachi's scathing criticism was directed at the limitation of the Red Army faction's revolutionary theory, which was organized on the basis of politics with a capital 'P', but showed disregard for insurrection led by armed masses, or spontaneous popular uprising. This is in contrast with the production intention cited earlier, whose premise was on three-party joint production, and the criticism of the Red Army faction was not so specified. This time, however, it became clear that there were exchanges of critiques between Adachi's film group and the Red Army faction at the joint-production level, and political and cultural conflicts between them already existed even at the initial stages of production. These conflicts may have been attributed partially to the separation between the international division of the Red Army faction in Palestine and the main troop in Japan. In the course of reviewing the entire production process and screening movement, towards the new second incarnation of the screening movement, a critique of the Red Army faction, which had not surfaced initially at the time of or immediately after starting the screening movement, was conducted. According to a later statement by Adachi, when the PFLP inquired about the reason for not filming the Tokyo War and the Osaka War as initially proposed by the Red Army faction, Adachi argued that those were just attack on police boxes, not warfare. Looking back on those days, Adachi notes:

Shigenobu was also worried because everything they had held was being denied at the stage of recapturing the logic of the Red Army faction and the contents of their line of policy in light of the reality of the Palestinian battlefield. She was finding out that it was not that their line of policy was denied, but how conceptual the contents of our policy of armed struggle were. It seems that she wrote to Japan several times, but since a proposal returned from Japan said for example, how many guns the PFLP could provide, I later heard that she was so upset by that. Kanafani explained that the PFLP could send hundreds of guns, but that was not the issue. The problem was that it was unclear how we conceived of the course of our revolution. While we were waiting having conversations like that, the PFLP side finally gave us permission to film, but with a condition. The contents of the condition were that if the Red Army faction said they would do the best they could, hopefully it could be a collaboration between the Red Army faction and PFLP, and if we understood, everything would be fine. Actually, we did not care about such a political condition at all. But we were sort of reluctant to be aligned with New Left factions, so the agreement was set to be a "collaboration with all the Japanese Revolutionary factions," and filming began.<sup>305</sup>

---

<sup>305</sup> Adachi, *Eiga/kakumei*, 356-357.

Even though a complex political relationship such as the above existed, it was undeniable that the production, as well as the screening movement, was implemented jointly with the Red Army faction, and hence various misunderstandings and criticisms were prompted. Even Matsuda, one of Adachi's colleagues in *Eiga Hiho*, developed his initial discussion on Red Army/PFLP comparing it to the Dziga Vertov Group's *Jusqu'à la Victoire* (Until Victory/Palestine Will Win), and pointed out the fact that the latter, while documenting the same Palestinian Revolution, had not been completed, even though their filming started earlier. Matsuda ends his text as follows:

However, still, I believe that Adachi Masao and his crew, while trying to "make films politically" as expressed by Godard, may have created a "political film" instead. As of the fall of 1971, the difficulty of filmmakers today lies not only in the misery that the film cannot be completed, but also in the glory that it has been completed.<sup>306</sup>

While strongly supporting *Red Army/PFLP* and the screening movement as a new form of cinema movement, Matsuda at the same time offered a critique that the film may have been drawn to the realm of the politics, rather than the politics of cinema. In response to this criticism, Adachi developed an argument concerning the specificity (*koyusei*) of cinema in contrast to politics, and further provided clear criticism of the Red Army faction. Whereas the previous production intention explained that the objective of the film was to document the relationship between the PFLP and the Red Army faction with respect to their strategy and current issues, Adachi discusses the specificity of the subject as filmmaker and cinema, expanding the relationship between PFLP and the Red Army faction to that, including the filmmaker. Despite various issues that were at play between him and the Red Army faction, Adachi's decision to collaborate with them was based presumably on the prominence of the Red Army faction in the history of Japan's political movements, due to their praiseworthy attempt at armed struggle, with the goal of international solidarity. Through this collaboration in praxis, questions relevant to landscape theory or the theory of reportage were directed at "all revolutionary factions of Japan" from within, rather than from the outside. Hence, rather than unilaterally critiquing the Red Army faction, Adachi finds a strategy for

---

<sup>306</sup> Matsuda, *Hakuchumu o ute*, 233

bringing armed struggle to the masses—common with the PFLP—in the theme of organizing the "ocean of people," and discusses how it can be propagandized through screening movement.

Based on this recognition, we do not intend to establish ourselves as an independent subject, as a third faction that responds to the factionalism of the PFLP and the Red Army faction. We can say, rather, that the production staff of *Declaration* have arrived at the necessity to propagandize not the party politics for revolution, but politics of revolution needed between the Red Army faction and PFLP. It is a common ground for the factionalism of the strategy, "Build the world revolutionary front through joint military action!" shared between the Red Army faction and PFLP that we should 'declare' as realistic indicator from the common ground to the front line, from recognition to praxis. In other words, we at last became able to rise to the level where *Declaration* should not be carried out unless the subjects of the joint production for *Declaration* can formulate under what strategic theory the method of propagandizing the <armed struggle> should be developed as a new policy."<sup>307</sup>

Adachi argues that the role specific to the screening movement is not to literally communicate as mediator what PFLP or the Red Army faction insists, but rather to find out and propagandize commonalities—as a film producer or the body of the cinema movement in collaboration with the two revolutionary organizations—in theory and praxis that are free from factional strategies. Hence, what was at stake for Adachi was to present the universality of the revolutionary movement—whether happening in Palestine or Japan, beyond political, historical and geographical differences—in short, the revolution itself. By proposing a process different from top-down political decisions by political factions, the specific role of the screening movement is pointed out.

It could be posited that the task of propaganda in the situation of "the stage of armed confrontation" is the execution of advertising, and creating (kosaku) a subject of the *Declaration*=the context which embodied the pamphlet rather than the <bulletin> issued and distributed from the center to the lower part of the faction based on <factional> viewpoints not limited to the viewpoint of the political faction.<sup>308</sup>

In addition, Adachi proceeds with his discussion as to how the uniqueness and the specificity of cinema should be explored on the basis of cinema=politics, neither through identification with both organizations, nor political independence from them, but on the basis of the screening troop's subjective undertaking of armed struggle. Tracing the course of the actual screenings in detail, he examines the first-period screening movement launched after the production of Red Army/PFLP, focusing on a rebuttal of

---

<sup>307</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 44.

<sup>308</sup> Ibid., 44-45.

the critique by the renegade group. Concerning what sort of strategy and tactics should be used based on the issues of production and screening, Adachi argues as follows:

The strategy of <the world revolutionary front> as a consequence of propaganda, and the strategy with which propaganda functions determines the strategy of the movement. The tasks specific to cinema proposed in Declaration should be sublated from the error of leaning on a <movement>-centric realism resulting from specifying them exclusively as propaganda, and also from the error of filtering out the propaganda of the strategy caused by aiming for generalizing the <movement> of the screening movement to the level of the subject of developing the tactic of propaganda.<sup>309</sup>

Here, the screening movement is defined twofold: on the one hand, it implies a critique of the politics with a capital 'P', which restricts cinema exclusively to the function of political propaganda, and on the other hand, it favors a screening movement-oriented approach, in which only the screening movement is important, and the media function of propaganda as cinema withdraws into the background. Adachi attempts to define afresh the specificity of the cinema by revolutionary media theory, not just in light of cinema alone, but also cinema as propaganda/propaganda as cinema. Continuing his discussion on the issue of the specificity of cinema, he also argues that all cinema should aim for the purpose of creating a world revolutionary front.

One thing is, cinema, not limited to *Declaration*, should be evaluated in terms of its numerous experiences of the <movement> towards the creation of the <World Revolution Front> now. The fact that cinema constitutes itself by "imitating the way cinema exists," and the fact that "cinema is propaganda" do not mean that the tasks specific to cinema are divided in complete opposition. It is rather that cinema based on these two worldviews is carrying out two kinds of propaganda, and therefore, it is not the task specific to cinema that is paradoxical, but we who must ask ourselves how we are fighting in order to have cinema bear its specific tasks. In fact, it is our side that acknowledges the reality that there are two types of cinema, "capitalistic cinema and revolutionary cinema".<sup>310</sup>

Adachi points out that the problem lies in our recognition that there are two types of cinema, rather than cinema having two different fronts, suggesting instead that what needs to be acquired is the tactic to combine presumably divided cinema into one based on the tasks specific to it.

It is "Revolutionary film" that now propagandizes revolution towards reality, and we are starting to practice cinema to "speak for revolution rather than to speak about the revolution" by asking

---

<sup>309</sup> Ibid., 77.

<sup>310</sup> Ibid., 77.



how the reality of our world determined by capitalist imperialism and social imperialism can be transformed into a "revolutionary" world. As for the meaning of "revolutionary cinema" also, it first of all depends not only on deciding in which of the two propaganda regimes we will position ourselves to fight, but also acquiring the tactic to explicate all cinematic experiences into a strategic practice of propaganda to be revolutionary.<sup>311</sup>

As a theory of cinema of revolution, critiquing capitalist–socialist films in defense of the revolutionary cinema is requisite, however, rather than simply abandoning them, the revolutionary potential on the side of cinema has to be incorporated strategically and tactically. In short, revolutionary cinema must not only serve to propagandize the revolutionary movement but also draw on revolutionary potential from all films. While drawing a clear line between revolutionary cinema vs. Hollywood films, and also differentiating from the theory of revolutionary cinema based on the politics with a capital 'P', Adachi's attempt was to transform all forms of films into revolutionary cinema, i.e. to convert them into a medium for revolutionary propaganda. The role of *Red Army/PFLP* and the screening movement are explained as follows:

The general universality of the *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* lies in the act of propagandizing the theory of the revolutionary strategy for 'Red Army-PFLP' as a specific task of cinema. It also lies in the act of freeing the subject of producing and screening *Declaration* as propaganda, from the narrow-minded pedantic insistence on learning that theory of strategy, and explicating that the specific task of cinema that can be realized in the revolutionary practice of <armed struggle>. It is through these acts that Red Army-PFLP as general universality can become responsible for the propaganda of revolution for the first time.<sup>312</sup>

Also, in the text <*Hihyo Sensen*> *wa shucho suru* (<Critical Front> asserts) written under the name of the editorial committee for the February 1971 issue of *Eiga Hihyo*, which preceded the series *Circuit of <creation> and <reportage>*, the role of *Red Army/PFLP* and its screening is illustrated even more clearly.

The assertion, <The best form of propaganda is armed struggle> proposed in the film, *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* is overwhelmingly correct because it is based on a fair argument in which propaganda for the message of the movement has to be guaranteed as propaganda by making the body of the movement itself into the content of the message.<sup>313</sup>

---

<sup>311</sup> Ibid.

<sup>312</sup> Ibid., 78.

<sup>313</sup> Ibid.

Based on this argument, an analysis is posited for the hijackings by the PFLP, and the question as to what propaganda means in light of the practice of hijacking is asked, rather than through discussions on the basis of binary oppositions (praxis vs. propaganda, politics vs. cinema, or cinema about revolution vs. cinema for revolution).

Hijacking is itself a revolutionary action. At the same time, it also includes the goal of acquisition, which should be propagandized for the benefits of revolutionary action (= armed struggle). There is a viewpoint suggesting that it is acceptable for factions of the revolutionary front that the goal can be a cinema about revolution, or for the subject of movement to create the revolutionary front, that it can be cinema for revolution. The tradeoff is not between 'about' and 'for'. It rather lies in the subject of the movement by the revolutionary front, who should ask themselves what the propaganda must be aimed at, and by whom it can be fulfilled.<sup>314</sup>

The hijackings by the PFLP, which were begun in 1968, marked a new form of guerrilla tactics in which not only did the practice of taking over the enemy's aircraft take place, but also, that very act itself was used as a medium for propaganda, rather than for its initial purpose, a means of transportation. Adachi applied this remarkable tactic to cinema, and by creating a theoretical practice where both cinema for revolution and revolution for cinema could be used for the purpose of propaganda—instead of separating cinema between revolutionary cinema and the other, or choosing either cinema for revolution or revolution for cinema—the potential of cinema as a medium should be drawn out. On the other hand, Adachi also argued how difficult it was to combine the specificity of cinema with praxis in the actual screening movement:

However, the screening movement of *Declaration* that we undertook, torn between the propaganda for revolution that it should speak about, and the revolutionary character of <the world revolutionary front> that it should propagandize, did not have an accurate reflection of reality for the theory of the movement and organization as we recognized them. It posed a reality of the <theory of the movement> in which we must start again by examining the strategic organization for the Declaration screening troop, encouraging our self-critique of not indicating the creation of the subject who propagandizes and that of <world revolutionary front> on the same level.<sup>315</sup>

---

<sup>314</sup> Adachi Masao, "<Hiho Sensen> wa shucho suru," [<Critical Front> asserts itself], *Eiga Hiho*, no.4 (January 1971): 13.

<sup>315</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 78.

Following the experiences and various problems during the first-period, as well as political chaos built by the Red Army faction and United Red Army, a new strategy and tactic for propaganda were to be attempted.

## 6. The First Period of Screening Troop Movement

In this section, the development of the first period of the screening troop movement is outlined, based on statements and discussions made by people involved in the movement. Adachi presented a text discussing his theory of the screening troop movement called *Chukan sokatsu notame no noto* (Notes for interim self-evaluation) in October 1971, a time when an internal revolt took place.<sup>316</sup> In the section called *Joeiundo wa ikani okonawarerubekika?* (How should the screening movement be conducted?) Adachi reported on the status of the screening movement using a chart. The text includes discussions as an extension of Adachi and Matsuda's previous theory of screening movement, and based on Adachi's concept of expression=activist (*kodosha*), however, the roles and function of the screening troops, their relationship to, and differences from cinema and revolutionary movement are even more clearly defined.

The direction of → means the process of creation and responsiveness, and we consider that what is mentioned on the same level (things that should be indicated in the chart), cannot be said to be entirely on an equal level. Therefore, as for the positioning of the screening troop movement in the chart, I would like to propose the necessity of constructing a <theory of movement> and a <theory of strategy>, by confirming the process of creation and the process of movement as specificities of the screening troop strategies and their evolution (removal of frameworks).<sup>317</sup>

Adachi then laid out four issues with regard to the specificity of the screening troop, such as the political relationship between the Red Army faction and PFLP, screening troop strategies, and the problem of the screening troop member as subject, and claimed that the screening troop movement would not be justified without carrying out the overall evaluation of these issues. After that, while countering in detail criticism from the first period screening troop, he specifies the policies as an overall evaluation of the production and screening movement, to prepare for the second incarnation of the screening movement.

---

<sup>316</sup> Since these notes were to be reprinted partially in "<Sozo> to <Hodo> no kairo", it was announced to the general public a few months later. Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 58.

<sup>317</sup> Ibid.

*Declaration* is intended to propagandize the strategy of creating <world revolutionary front>. In addition, the subject of the propaganda shall be established by carrying out the process of creating <world revolutionary front>, and the strategy for propaganda must acquire reality to include all duties to develop strategies for <world revolutionary front> through the screening movement. We consider that it is by having the reality of the screening troop <----> red rescue party, that the circuit of the people's military<---->the people's language <armed struggle> <----> screening troop=troop for propaganda efforts<---->the people will make the construction of strategies to create <world revolutionary front> possible, and also the subject of movement for the screening troop will become responsible for propaganda strategies for the first time.<sup>318</sup>

As was discussed earlier, the question that Adachi proposed was, how would it be possible for the screening troops to accept the strategy of cinema as propaganda, or propaganda as cinema, through the film production and the screening movement. However, the actual first-period screening movement was going to be dismantled due to the revolt of the screening troop members against Adachi. The background of this incident, in short, is as follows: the screening troop, with Adachi at its center, consisted of members of Wakamatsu Production, those from the Red Army faction, and laymen who had responded to a call by the screening troop.<sup>319</sup> The first incident was that the initial screening in Tokyo scheduled to be held at Art Theatre Shinjuku Bunka was cancelled due to pressure from the theater's parent company. Members of the screening troop proposed occupying the theater, but the screening location was changed to the Keio Grindhouse, also located in Shinjuku, and known for screening Wakamatsu films. Meanwhile, under these circumstances, they needed to find additional autonomous screening venues, and the nationwide screenings began. However, due to the fact that the screening was forced to be canceled by the existing commercial theater—albeit being known as a base for independent ATG or underground films—selected by Adachi and Wakamatsu, and also the fact that, despite this course of events, the production of the film that later became *Ecstasy of the Angels* continued with ATG, as a consequence, Adachi and other members of the screening troop were severely beleaguered. Furthermore, the propaganda for armed

---

<sup>318</sup> Ibid., 76.

<sup>319</sup> "There were myself, Saito and someone named Kawakami from Wakamatsu Production. Also, people based on open recruitment, people who participated in struggle at Aoyama Design technical school, black helmets from Yokohama National University, and a young man who was arrested at Daibosatsu, or Kansai Gakuin University Zenkyoto." Arai Haruhiko, "Akabasu wa eiga to kakumei no aida o hashitta," [Red Bus ran between cinema and revolution] in *Underground Film Archives*, 68.

struggle in cinema that they aimed for prompted contradictions between theory and practice through actual screening movement, and criticism caused by this led to the internal revolt.<sup>320</sup>

While there were participants from the film side, including Arai Haruhiko, Saito Hiroshi and others from Wakamatsu Production, they neither traveled to Palestine with Adachi, nor necessarily shared the film's production process or theorization. There was also the issue of collaborating with Red Army faction, who had almost no understanding of cinema movement, or art and politics, at the actual site of the screening movement. Forming screenings with such members and collaborators brought enormous difficulties even from the outset. Meanwhile, as for the statements about the screening troop at that time, besides the ones written by Adachi, there are materials such as booklets by the screening troop and university papers. However, because they are practically unavailable now, one can only learn about them from fragments of statements Adachi quoted in his counterargument. However, some of the people involved later made comments about it; some of them will be summarized here. First, in a book of interviews published in 1982, Wakamatsu reflected on the screening troop as follows:

Then we launched the nation-wide 'Long March.' I still remember that it was raining heavily. I, who had never sung *The Internationale* before, sang the song together with Iwabuchi in front of the Central Apartment where my office was, to see everyone off. I had them take 300,000 yen, saying that they should take care of the rest with money earned from the screening, and send all the money left over back to me. But they were gone, and never sent back even a penny. After a while, someone we had been asking to come to Japan from Palestine was going to come, so from Kyushu I told Adachi to return. Then, after having many discussions I said, let's do it together, but soon after he came back to Kyushu, he was critiqued and thrown out by everyone. Then we realized that we didn't know where the bus had gone. The renegades at that time were people like Arai Haruhiko and someone called 'Small' Adachi, Arai's girlfriend and so on. Adachi was thrown out, along with a few Red Army members. I then asked what was happening now in Fukuoka. I said, "Ok, Iwabuchi, in any event, you and I should go," and so we decided to take a flight with Jumbo the next day, and fly to Kyushu, with Japanese swords packed in our bag. So, I said, first, since Arai was the ringleader, we should forget about the rest of the losers, and I would chop off one of Arai's arms, you should attack the other guy.<sup>321</sup>

Wakamatsu's statement, based on his own view—in contrast to Adachi's—conveys that, regardless of the context related to the political movement, Wakamatsu's role as the producer of *Red*

---

<sup>320</sup> I would like to research and compile statements those days about the screening movement by members of the first period screening troop, and Red Army faction at another occasion/in the future.

<sup>321</sup> Wakamatsu Koji, Uchida Eiichi (interviewee), *Wakamatsu Koji: Orewa teo yogosu* [Wakamatsu Koji: I dirty my hands]. (Tokyo: Dagereo Shuppan, 1982), 135-136

*Army/PFLP*, including the handling of production costs and the screening movement, was of crucial importance. Wakamatsu, who came from a Yakuza group and became a pink-movie director, previously had no connections with either the New Left movement or the Red Army faction, however, his involvement in politics significantly increased through his meeting Adachi and Matsuda. Upon receiving Adachi's proposal, Wakamatsu agreed to go to Palestine after the Cannes Film Festival and shoot a documentary film – partly due to the fact that Palestinian guerrillas he met at the base in Jerashi Mountain were all massacred immediately after the filming, although later he entrusted *Red Army/PFLP* as the screening movement entirely to Adachi—out of his feeling that the film might be sold to TV companies.

Many people, even activists in Japan, kept saying, Vietnam, Vietnam, and their attention was all devoted to Vietnam. I thought that, if I go to Palestine now, film the activities of Palestinian guerrillas and come back, it may become something to propose as an issue. There was also the calculated thought that I might be able to sell it to make money.<sup>322</sup>

Although he was crucially important as producer for the production and the screening movement of *Red Army/PFLP*, Wakamatsu, on the other hand, created increasing conflicts and contradictions. In an interview in 2001, reflecting on the development of the screening troop, Arai commented on the relationship between Wakamatsu Production, who financed the cinema movement with their box-office sales of pink movies and ATG films, and Adachi, who leaned on them as follows:

So, before leaving, we decided to carry out a screening at Shinjuku Bunka, but nothing could be done with the efforts of Kuzui alone, and the screening was crushed by Sanwa Kogyo. Though they did not get on the bus, members of the Red Army faction were also involved, so together with them, I had Kuzui write a self-criticism and so on (laughs). I guess Adachi and Wakamatsu also felt troubled by it, but I must say, from the standpoint of my own logic, it didn't look good to the Red Army faction. They didn't understand cinema movement and so on, so the screening at Shinjuku Bunka was arranged based on a somewhat laid-back relationship among movie-related peers, and it was suddenly cancelled. You couldn't get away just by saying that.<sup>323</sup>

Arai's scathing criticism was also directed at/based on the fact that the cancellation of the screening was a top-down decision, made based on the relationship between Kuzui, the manager of Art Theater Shinjuku Bunka, the main venue for screening ATG films exemplifying auteurist art films, and

---

<sup>322</sup> Wakamatsu, *Ore ha te wo yogosu*, 122.

<sup>323</sup> Arai, "Akabasu wa eiga to kakumei no aida o hashitta," 68.

Wakamatsu and Adachi. Thus, Adachi's contradiction—whose theory of revolutionary films was developed on the basis of Wakamatsu Production—was pointed out.

That could also be a problem for Wakamatsu Production, and they were enthusiastically discussing "cinema for revolution or revolution for cinema." The same holds true with Adachi-san himself, and they deal with the problems in a twofold manner. While making revolutionary films, he was also making pink or ATG movies for a living. However, people like us, those who have nothing to do with selflessly devoting yourself to Wakamatsu Production out of the love of movies, strongly felt that way. Looking back, after all, I think that the red bus was just running somewhere between cinema and revolution. I mean, between "cinema as revolution" and "revolution as cinema," because there were problems with positioning against authorities or factions when screenings were held at different universities. They thought that, position-wise, we were a propaganda group for the Red Army faction, so they didn't let us in. Then, as a way of maneuvering, we said, "We are Wakamatsu Production. We just screen the movie." For everything there was this problem of switching positions, taking on a two-fold role. It was sometimes convenient, but the role itself became unclear.<sup>324</sup>

Though initially being a factional activist, Arai was also affiliated with his university's cinema study group. He was therefore asked to join Wakamatsu Production as a script writer by Adachi through the editorial division of *Film Art*. As one of the young staff members of Wakamatsu Production, as well as a member of the screening troop, he often bore the brunt of day to day of the issues on the ground, however his background of approaching cinema from politics allowed him to maintain distance from both of them, and it could be from this unique position that Arai's relentless criticism was directed at Adachi, who was making a shift from cinema to politics, the domain from which Arai was separated, on the one hand, as well as at Wakamatsu, who supported Adachi and the movement not from for the sake of politics, but out of sympathy, allowing one to read *Red Army/PFLP* and its screening movement from angles that were different from Adachi's.

Also, Wako Haruo, who used to work on staff at Theater Scorpio, and later became the assistant director for Wakamatsu Production, and assumed responsibility for the second-phase screening movement after Arai's involvement in the first-phase, looks back critically at the screening movement for *Red Army/PFLP* in light of an even deeper political relationship than Arai's with the Red Army faction.

---

<sup>324</sup> Ibid., 69.

Initially, with *Red Army/PFLP* what we were aiming for was 'cinema of movement' as an antithesis to 'cinema of politics' by Godard. In retrospect, it seems that we actually transformed ourselves into 'cinema of politics' evidently at the time the second-phase screening troop was launched. Even though we called ourselves the screening troop for *Red Army/PFLP*, in reality, we had become a part of the supporters in Japan for the 'Arab Red Army', and that fact was also a reminder to try to maintain our own uniqueness in response to various domestic factions related to the Communist League Red Army faction after the United Red Army.<sup>325</sup>

While aiming for its own political autonomy on one hand, the second-phase screening troop positioned itself as a part of Arab Red Army, taking a stance to distinguish itself from the domestic Red Army factions that were eventually led into the United Red Army incident. It could in fact be due to this two-fold stance that the second-phase screening troop was able to protect itself from vulgar political criticism. On the other hand, Adachi himself also recognized political limitations and problematics in the actual screening movement, and was looking back as follows in his conversation with Sato Makoto in the December 1973 issue of *Geijutsu kurabu* (Art Club).

In actuality, it may have only been seen as a film for tourism. We call it Red Propaganda Task Force (Sekishoku Senden Kosakutai), but there is a situation specific to Japan in which propaganda and task inevitably have to be divided. It is still impossible to believe that the film itself could communicate between them, either as language or as world-view. Therefore, the direction of the community driving the red bus creates news, based on what originally existed as a text or a pamphlet.<sup>326</sup>

Rather than simply screening political and social films or carrying out the screening movement for the audience to consume, the tactics with which the screening troop, the Red Army faction, and Red Aid were jointly organized—both the screening movement and the operation of the political movement were carried out simultaneously; the film is screened as a text for learning revolution; and finally, a new form of work and movement are to be constructed through joint screening with the audience. Therefore it was inevitable that not only political issues but also various problems and contradictions arose at specific places or through the process of developing the movement. Adachi knowingly generalizes this situation as the "phenomenon of an embryonic period for the construction of the revolutionary subject which the

---

<sup>325</sup> Wako Haruo, "Ware ga zendankai: Sekigun-PFLP • Sekaisenso sengen to Palestine senjo deno sonogo," [My preliminary stage: *Red Army-PFLP: Declaration of World War* and afterwards at the Palestine battlefield] in *Underground Film Archives*, 112.

<sup>326</sup> Adachi, "Tabi eno senryaku," [Strategy for Journey], Adachi and Sato Makoto in *Eiga eno senryaku*, 220.



movement—which had started politically and organizationally from a completely new horizon—had to undergo eventually."<sup>327</sup> Instead of unilaterally criticizing the first-period screening troop, he insists on continuing the movement, in which problems that arose, or may arise in practice will be construed as a part of the screening movement and screening troop movement, and that they should be undertaken regardless of their outcome. Adachi once defined the role of Critical Front as "making of a program of our assertion that, rather than cinema as creative movement concerning where to seek an auteur, works and spectators, what should be organized in cinema is to bring creativity into the movement. In other words, cinema is a circuit of communicating at a fundamental level through the practice of <criticism> by drawing the meaning of the creative movement fundamentally closer to the principle of revolution."<sup>328</sup> Similarly, in the new screening troop, rather than bringing either one of auteur, works or spectators to the movement, in all aspects encompassing cinema, including these three categories, a new form of creativity and its establishment as the subject for the movement was sought. Indeed, that was what Adachi called the screening troop movement, and this endeavor was passed along to the second incarnation.

## 7. Party and the Subject——Return to landscape

In the August 1972 issue of *Eiga Hihyo*, Adachi wrote a thesis called *Waga sensen no saikochiku no tameni--<Fukeiron> kara <Undoron> eno teni no noto* (For the reconstruction of our front line—Notes on the transition from <landscape theory> to the <theory of reportage>) to look back at the previous development of the theory of cinema movement, particularly during the second incarnation of the screening movement, including issues raised by Critical Front. This long theoretical argument was virtually the last text—except for a few short reviews—written prior to Adachi's departure to Palestine. It also turned out to be the last text written on the film *Red Army/PFLP*, as well as Adachi's last piece published in *Eiga Hihyo*. This text is particularly important because Adachi returned to landscape theory as the point of origin to discuss the production of *Red Army/PFLP*, and analyze the current situation of

---

<sup>327</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>328</sup> Adachi, "<Hihyo Sensen> wa futatabi shuchosuru," 12.

the screening movement, as well as related future issues. Adachi first argues that, while the screening movement began in search of communication with the people and the masses, it only resulted in discovering reality as mere landscape, where all across Japan, even neighborhoods associated with lower class workers were surrounded by citizens and migrants devoid of subjectivity. Based on this analysis, Adachi critiques the notion of intersubjectivity, developed by the Zenkyoto group, as follows:

Even though a landscape with migrants guarantees the development of <intersubjectivity>, that cannot be a guarantee that the subject of struggle for 'subjectivity' and 'creativity' of the Japanese masses is allowed to survive. Rather, it guarantees the <crisis> that makes the 'subjectivity' and 'creativity' the landscape of migrants.<sup>329</sup>

Continuing the earlier discussion of the screening movement, Adachi argues that the notion of the subject at play here is neither the revolutionary subject in politics with a capital 'P', nor is it intersubjectivity as criticism of the former; it is, rather, the subject that assumes responsibility for the struggle, and also recognizes him/herself as being subject to change. To force one's way through such a landscape, the course of events undergone by Critical Front is reviewed, and discussed, including the Suzuki Seijun Joint Struggle incident, the production of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, the publication of *Eiga Hiho*, and the production of *Red Army-PFLP* and the screening movement for it. Through this process, Adachi offers a counterargument to Matsuda's criticism regarding Adachi's concept of 'the <party-based>' (<To> teki naru mono). Future plans and objectives for Critical Front were also sketched out. Here, the clarification of Adachi's concept of party, mentioned briefly in an earlier section, provides an effective perspective for examining the ensuing arguments. Adachi's full use of the concept of 'party' started with the production of *Red Army/PFLP*. His discussion of the factionalism of the filmmakers, the Red Army, and PFLP first appeared in his text called *Eiga undo no senryakuron* (Theory of strategy for cinema movement) in October, 1971. Also, in his article "The best form of propaganda is armed struggle" published in December 1971, his critique was directed at the way in which political party-based themes (seito teki shudai) should be addressed. The discussion of the party-based viewpoint proposed in *Shucho: <Hiho Sensen> wa futatabi shucho suru* (Assertion: <Critical Front> asserts itself again) in February

---

<sup>329</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 81.

1972, was fully developed in his text "Circuit of <creation> and <reportage>" during the period from February to April 1972, where the concept of the 'party-based', or the party-based viewpoint—as opposed to existing political parties/factions or partisanship/factionalism—is to be defined.

In the <assertion> in this journal, and also in this report, I have continued to make manifestos not for *Declaration*, but for the practice explained in *Declaration*. However, this does mean that we have established the <party-based> viewpoints to develop the subject for which *Declaration* propagandizes <Pick up the weapon!> and <Armed struggle now!>, either with the deployment of the political faction structure, or under the system of political bureaucracy. Indeed, we also know that, other than the creation of the <World Revolution Front> by joint military action, the <party> itself is unnecessary. What is called the <party-based> viewpoint for the <World Revolution Front> first of all, is nothing other than the recognition of being on standby for <joint military action>, through the continuation of <armed struggle>. It is by arming oneself and standing ready, and by preparing oneself for battle, that the creation and maintenance of one's own weapons should be sublated into the creation of a <party-based> viewpoint for the first time. It is with the goal of embodying that process of sublation that propaganda becomes equal to <armed struggle> for the first time.<sup>330</sup>

Adachi argues that not for political reasons, but rather exclusively with the intent of hands-on armed struggle for revolution, a collective body called <party> is required, and *Red Army/PFLP* and the screening movement are to be situated as its propaganda. Although the introduction of the notion 'party' in Adachi's theoretical argument may seem somewhat unexpected, it could be due to the fact that the reinterpretation of 'party' was necessitated by his engagement in the actual struggle with Marx-Leninist factions, such as the Red Army and PFLP. While Adachi stresses the necessity of the party, his notion of party challenges the existing notion of party as an organization with hierarchical structures; by incorporating his discussion of landscape theory—including ideas such as the recognition of 'being on standby', or 'a state of being prepared for battle', and using the term, the 'party-based' instead of 'party', Adachi's objective was to define 'party' purely in terms of its functional role. To put it differently, rather than either affirming or denying the party altogether, based on the context provided by landscape theory where there is no distinction between the everyday and non-everyday circumstance, or avant-garde and rear-guard, Adachi tried to restore the authentic meaning of party as a collective body for revolution. In an important sense, also, it is not the party that take leadership of armed struggle; but because of his

---

<sup>330</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 61.

stance that the party is necessary for armed struggle and its propaganda, it could be said that Adachi had to clarify the role of the party, or adopt it exclusively.

However strong criticism was voiced against Adachi for trying to redefine this already historically obsolete concept. A text entitled *Ima naze <tabi> ni derunoka* (Why go on the journey now) in the June 1972 issue of *Eiga Hihyo* includes an interview with Oshima by Adachi and Matsuda. While making a comparison between a documentary film shot abroad by Oshima, and the production of *Red Army/PFLP* and the issues revolving around the screening movement, Adachi presented a discussion as to how the artist's viewpoint can possibly intersect with the party-based viewpoint. Though Adachi discusses the necessity of the 'party-based', he was brutally criticized by both Matsuda and Oshima. Due to lack of space, and due to the fact that the discussion is a digression from the interview with Oshima, the discussion ended up being published just as a summary by Matsuda.

Both Oshima and Matsuda, who couldn't help but perceive both sorrow and humor at the same time in the word, <party>, offered critical comments about the revelation of <party> in Adachi Masao. Matsuda Masao's comment —. What existed at Jerash Mountain was not so much a <party>, but was it rather the reality of a single <front>? Also, rather than saying that the screening movement was an approach to issues at the party-based level, on the contrary, would it be more accurate to say that it was a process in which what was presented initially as a party-based issue was being dismantled? We object to the Adachi's dichotomizing of individual level and party-based level.<sup>331</sup>

As someone who discovered the <party> in the process of disengaging from, rather than engaging in something, would Adachi Masao be able to properly consolidate this dispersal? The discussion must continue even after this interview. In the meantime, a comprehensive list of problems will be raised by Adachi in the next issue. That should be a new starting point.<sup>332</sup>

In response to this, Adachi counters that Matsuda is just criticizing the party outright without discussing how the party should be established, and is only pointing out a difference in position from Adachi's 'party-based' positionality. What Adachi refers to as the 'party-based' is a new concept, an approach to organization for the purpose of overcoming issues of the currently existing parties/factions.

---

<sup>331</sup> Matsuda Masao. Oshima Nagisa interviewed by Adachi and Matsuda, "Naze ima <tabi> ni deru noka," [Why start a journey now], *Eiga Hihyo*, no.21 (June 1972): 20-21.

<sup>332</sup> Matsuda Masao, "Naze ima <tabi> ni deru noka," 21.

I meant to assert that, exactly because it is impossible to find something <party-based> in what the existing <parties/factions> are responsible for, that 'something' should be created in the process of pursuing how to establish it.<sup>333</sup>

This thesis, "For the reconstruction of our front line" was originally written as a response to Matsuda's criticism of the party. The notion of the party was re-proposed through comprehensive evaluations of issues related to Critical Front and the past screening movement. The debate developed in this text did not continue afterwards, however it did create significant conflicts among the coteries of *Eiga Hiho*, especially between Adachi and Matsuda. Meanwhile, Sato Makoto, Artistic Director of *Gekidan Kuro Tendo* (the Black Tent Theater), who like Adachi, was also discussing a new concept of 'party', praised Adachi's theory of cinema movement, but made objections against his argument about 'party'.

On one hand, we approve of the relentlessly <factional> principle-based approach that remains consistent throughout this "newsreel film, *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*, as well as the violence of the work <language> as its consequences, and we deeply hope that the creation of <the movement> will be established to realistically manage the effectiveness of its propaganda function. At the same time, based on what we can imagine, we should not ignore the crucial incongruity lying between the <factional> viewpoint, which is the basis of this work, and the '<party>-based viewpoint' that Adachi tried to specify in the process of his <movement>, and that should be established as having been mentioned in his so-called 'evaluation'.<sup>334</sup>

While affirming the proposition of cinema as propaganda=the armed struggle, Sato points out that the actual political factions such as the Red Army faction or PFLP, and Adachi's argument of party-based viewpoint are significantly different, and therefore they should not be confused.

From what I have read from 'the overall evaluation', the 'realistic process' for "The establishment of a <party>-based viewpoint" that Adachi has envisioned involves a dangerous moment where [this process] may side-slip down to a slogan-like empty word, due to the hasty thought process from 'the creation of the subject for propaganda' to 'the creation of the world revolutionary front'. Even though we respect Adachi's pride as <an activist> who always tries to respond directly to the actual <situations>, and we also understand his sense of urgency, which can be even called 'tactical', we cannot easily accept something like a <party>-oriented basis (*toteki kiban*), upon which the Red Army, PFLP and Wakamatsu Production are connected as subjects of joint production for *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*. Moreover, it seems to me that the poverty of the policy of <the screening movement> embodying this <party-based> strategy

---

<sup>333</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 87.

<sup>334</sup> Sato Makoto, "Wakamatsu pro ni okeru sakuhin no <ba> wa nanika <ge>," [What is the <place> for work by Wakamatsu Productions], *Nihon Dokusho Shimibun*, no. 1639 (20<sup>th</sup> March 1972): 8.

theory as 'a part of the cinema movement' indeed must be thoroughly criticized, with all of my zealous camaraderie.<sup>335</sup>

Sato's strong disagreement with Adachi was due to his insistence on directly connecting the three groups (Wakamatsu Productions, the Red Army faction and PFLP who jointly produced *Red Army/PFLP*) at a foundational level, through his notion of 'party-based'. Sato encountered the Red Bus Screening Troop in various places at a time when he was carrying out his own Black Tent Theater performance movement. Expressing understanding of Adachi's screening in terms of his practice and theoretical proposition, Sato, as a similar organizer of a performance movement, albeit in a different genre, tried to critique Adachi's argument about 'party' in terms of his approach to organization. Returning to the discussion of Matsuda, he had a closer relationship with the Red Army faction than Adachi, and, due to having had experiences with the Communist party in his youth, and having developed an Anarchism-based theory of violent revolution, as well as a theory of insurrection thereafter, he completely rejected the notion of the party, and instead considered the Red Army faction highly as an organization, as well as their tactical and military actions. After a series of incidents—from the internal purging within the United Red Army leading up to the shoot-out with the police—Matsuda wrote a text entitled *Heishi no Katekizumu* (A Catechism for soldiers) in the journal, *Bessatsu Keizai Hyoron* (Economic Criticism Extra Issue) in 1972.

What we need here is not a loquacious yet vulgarly flamboyant strategic talk in which we find faults with policy differences about the significance of the revolution. In other words, we need, rather, a sincere approach to the problem of how our own existence and life, which always remain only in the realm of silence, can be situated in this clamor, and organized.<sup>336</sup>

Matsuda argues that, following the difficult situation of the revolutionary movement especially after the United Red Army incident, what is at stake is not the political transition from the Red Army faction to the Integrated Red Army and to the United Red Army, but only the discussion—as one's own existential issue—of what the necessities are for revolutionary soldiers at this moment. A thoroughly tactical analysis was then carried out, quoting the organizational principles of the early Red Army faction,

---

<sup>335</sup> Ibid.

<sup>336</sup> Matsuda, *Fukanosei no media*, 130.

the Red Guards' Three Main Rules of Discipline, and the Black Panthers' Ten-Point Program. In contrast, through praxis of "research, operation, learning and living activities" <sup>337</sup> based on the production of *Red Army/PFLP* and the Red Bus, Adachi—rather than isolating the issues of the Red Army faction leading up to the United Red Army incident and critiquing it from outside—strove to undertake a series of issues and limitations entirely as a part of revolutionary movement. In short, his objective was not to separate the notion of 'party-based' identity from the physically existing factions, but rather to connect them in reality. However, the collaboration with the actual Red Army faction, especially after the United Red Army incident, was not easy, and in fact, Adachi himself, as well as the screening movement, came under sharp criticism. Yet, while placing himself in the midst of criticism, at the same time Adachi sought a new concept of the party and organization theory, and thereby attempted to maintain distance from the actual factional politics that Matsuda and Sato were criticizing. It is in this multilayered context that Adachi brought landscape theory to light again, and continued critically analyzing the status of struggle in Japan.

It was also the beginning of the face-to-face, confrontational struggle against the reality in Japan of how the content of the strategic debate between the Red Army faction and PFLP was used to formulate a thesis in such a dire situation as the struggle in Japan, and why it had been made into the landscape.<sup>338</sup>

Adachi argues that, as opposed to the Palestinian liberation struggle which was built on the basis of the quotidian environment, with no distinction between the vanguard and the rearguard, what the Japanese Red Army called the theory of preliminary armed insurrection, in which insurrection by the vanguard can be followed naturally by the rearguard or the masses, had limitations militaristically, sharply criticizing the fact that even the Red Army faction was only capable of presenting such a lacking, problematic strategy as this.

What spreads out in front of us is the heavy landscape of our reality, in which this 'preliminary armed insurrection' is the only form of the movement we are capable of organizing.<sup>339</sup>

---

<sup>337</sup> Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 88.

<sup>338</sup> Ibid., 88.

<sup>339</sup> Ibid., 94.

The use of the expression "grave landscape" not only displays Adachi's recognition of landscape as the apparatus of power, but also points out the difficult situation in which all that embodies the movement—including the Red Army faction, the movement body including Adachi himself—have been subsumed as part of it internally. The joint operation between PFLP and the Japanese revolutionary fighters at the Lydda Airport is then cited as an instance of a practical opportunity to break through such a landscape. Adachi concludes his text by referencing ensuing difficulties such as the assassination of Kanafani, and successive oppressions against the screening troop and Wakamatsu Productions in Japan.

This is the state of (subjective) landscape where we are currently standing. Do we often break through this landscape?<sup>340</sup>

In the history of the Japan's postwar movement, the Red Army faction is well known for their development of the most aggressive armed struggle. Adachi perceives it even not in its exteriority, but something that is already subsumed into the landscape=power, which, as his objective, must be conquered. Indeed, the crux of landscape theory lies in the perception and recognition of landscape as apparatus of power—where there is neither exteriority nor interiority—and it was under the assumption of this definition that a new theory of the movement should be developed. Contrary to what the title of his text indicates, it is possible to discern the continuity from landscape theory to the theory of reportage, or to the theory of movement.

---

<sup>340</sup> Ibid., 99.