



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 Two: Matsuda Masao's Landscape Theory**

The aim of this chapter is to analyze various texts by Matsuda Masao, the film critic and central ideologue of landscape theory, and theoretical responses to them made by film director Adachi Masao and photographer Nakahira Takuma. First I explore the historical background of how the concept of landscape, or landscape theory developed into an intense debate, and then I examine the process of its decline. The theory of reportage—the theoretical successor to landscape theory—is then described. Finally I discuss the underlying concept for both theories, the notion of cinema=movement, and its implications in a global context.

In 1969, Matsuda published the essay *Fukei toshiteno sei* (Sex as landscape)—which can be called the manifesto for landscape theory—in the December issue of cultural magazine *Asahi Janaru* (Asahi Journal), in which the concept of landscape was initially introduced, whereas his landscape theory was formulated during the production of the film, *A.K.A. Serial Killer* (1969). As will be discussed later, *A.K.A. Serial Killer* is a documentary film consisting exclusively of shots of the landscape that 19-year-old Nagayama Norio—the perpetrator of a series of fatal shootings that took place in Tokyo, Kyoto, Hakodate, and Nagoya between October 1968 and April 1969—may have encountered while wandering through various regions of Japan, from the time of his birth until his arrest. The film was produced collectively by Matsuda, director Adachi, script writer Sasaki Mamoru, producer Iwabuchi Susumu, and cinematographer Nonomura Masayuki and Yamazaki Yutaka. Filming began upon the arrest of Nagayama in July 1969, and was completed by the end of that year. The incident had a nation-wide impact—it was a time in which Japan was undergoing rapid economic growth, and Nagayama was a young migrant worker, embraced as a so-called golden egg (hard-to-come-by young talent), who, had come from the poor Tohoku region to the city upon graduating from junior high school.

This chapter focuses on this text by Matsuda, explaining Matsuda and others' theoretical foundations as represented in *A.K.A. Serial Killer*. In this essay Matsuda defined ordinary quotidian landscapes as 'power.' As the major currents of social movement stemming from 1968 were losing their

momentum, Matsuda employed the concept of 'landscape' to explore theories of power and the State, with an eye toward the 1970s as well as new horizons of revolutionary theory.

## 1. The Origin of Landscape Theory

Matsuda's essay *Sex as landscape*, about Wakamatsu Koji and his work, was written (while the shooting and editing of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* was in progress) for a special feature on *Sei kaiho* (Sexual liberation), published in *Asahi Journal* on December 28, 1969. The concept of the 'locked room' in Wakamatsu's films was the center of his argument. Matsuda himself has repeatedly referred to this essay as his first text on landscape theory, and it has also been cited as such by many others. It is therefore clear that this essay marks the beginning of landscape theory.<sup>95</sup> In the essay, Matsuda discusses landscape as follows:

Meanwhile, together with Adachi Masao and other peers, following the entire path of serial killer Nagayama Norio, we walked all over the eastern half of Japan, starting from Abashiri, to Sapporo, Hakodate, Tsugaru Plain, Tokyo, Nagoya, Kyoto, Osaka to Kobe, and even further to Hong Kong, and, calling it a documentary film, we single-mindedly kept filming the landscape of each region that Nagayama may have also seen with his own eyes; the fact that we are now creating a strange work that can only be called an actual landscape film is solely because the landscape itself has been first and foremost perceived as a power that we are at war with. Perhaps Nagayama shot bullets most likely to tear apart the landscape. State power would recklessly sever the landscape to clear the path, for instance, for the Tomei Highway. While we are enjoying a pleasant drive on that highway, it is at that very moment that the landscape haunts us and power can seize us. So, whether it is 'situation' or a situations without mercy, we venture to say that it doesn't matter to us. Have we not transcended even the landscape?<sup>96</sup>

At the beginning of this essay on the works of Wakamatsu, Matsuda first discusses *Go, Go Second Time Virgin* (1969) directed by Wakamatsu and scripted by Adachi, a unique love drama about a young couple set on the rooftop of an apartment, referencing the concept of the 'locked room' for

---

<sup>95</sup> Specifically, I referred to the following texts, in which Matsuda himself compiled details of the debate and its development. Matsuda Masao, "Shishi no ichigeki," [A lion's blow], *Kohyo* (November 1970): 20-29 and "Fukeiron no kitten," [The origin of landscape theory], *Dezain* [Design], no.141, (January 1971): 11-14.

<sup>96</sup> Matsuda Masao, "Fukei toshiten sei," [Sex as landscape] in *Bara to Mumeisha* [A Rose and the Nameless] (Tokyo: Hageshoten, 1970), 123-124. *Bara to Mumeisha* is Matsuda's second book of film criticism. This essay is included with the revised title, "Misshitsu/fukei/kenryoku -Wakamatsu eiga to 'sei' to 'kaiho'," [Locked room/landscape/power: Wakamatsu film and 'sex' and 'liberation']. Though the essay attests the origin of landscape theory, it was not included in *Fukei no shimetsu* [The Extinction of landscape] (Tokyo: Tabatashoten, 1971), his third compilation of essays on landscape. However, it is included as an opening essay in *Zohoban: Fukei no shimetsu* (Newly expanded edition: The Extinction of Landscape) (Tokyo: Koshisha, 2013) republished in 2013.

analysis. By comparing it with *The Embryo Hunts in Secret* (1966), another Wakamatsu-Adachi production and *New Jack and Betty* (1969) directed by Okishima Isao from Wakamatsu Production, both of which are dramas set in the closed indoor spaces of a single house and a single room, Matsuda points out that the locked room in this film is an artificial space constituted by being locked at midnight. Referencing the specificities of this locked room, which is actually open to the infinite sky, and linked to the brilliantly-colored urban landscape, he pulled the concept of 'landscape' from the final sequence, in which the couple throw themselves over the edge and off of the rooftop.

It is only out into the landscape that a young boy can step. There is nothing that the young boy and the girl can do but lightly jump over the wired fence, throw themselves into the landscape and die.<sup>97</sup>

Matsuda argues that Wakamatsu and Adachi, by pushing the inquiry of the locked room to an extreme, indicated that not only the characters' quasi-liberation, but also their extremely personal 'sex' in the indoor space, has been contained by the external 'landscape'. Discovering the concern shared between this concept of landscape and *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, Matsuda suggests that, in both this film and Wakamatsu's films, the quotidian landscape is indeed a manifestation of power, and thus clearly situates landscape theory as a theory of power.

It is important to note that Matsuda's argument marks the beginning of landscape theory, but also presents a critical stance against the political thought of the 1960's, especially against that of Yoshimoto Takaaki, a leading intellectual and poet of post-war Japan, who had introduced 'situation' (*jokyo* or 情況) as a concept representing the new political conditions and movements of the time. As a critical response to 'situations' (*jokyo* or 状況) proposed by Jean-Paul Sartre in *Being and Nothingness* in 1943, Yoshimoto discussed Japanese modernity and the state based on the Emperor system and the family system, as well as the relation between the masses and intellectuals.<sup>98</sup> The discussion of 'situation,'

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid, 123.

<sup>98</sup> In response to Sartre's concept of 'situations' (状況), Yoshimoto reinterpreted it specifically in the context of Japan by replacing the Japanese character '状' (*jojo*) signifying 'state,' 'condition' or 'appearance' with the character '情' implying state or quality grown or occurring natively, as in Japanese words such as *kanjo* (sentiment) or *ninjo* (human sympathy), and proposed the concept of 'situation' (情況). Rather than literally introducing Sartre's political

which had initially been proposed in the early 1960's, was developed in his essay titled "What is situation?" (*Jokyo towa nanika*), published in the general opinion magazine, *Nihon* (Japan) from February to July of 1966. The book compiling Yoshimoto's lectures from 1961 to 1967 was called *Jokyo eno Hatsugen* (Statements for Situation)

Originally, in the real world, 'situation' is designed so that actual reality cannot be touched. Under such circumstances what matters is to determine in advance what level of recognition is to be employed with respect to the assumed actual reality. If a situation is one which I surely and directly experienced, it does not immediately mean it is true, and in that case, the problem is within what kind of overall reality the experience should be placed. On the other hand, if what I can touch is related to world recognition, in which it is only something quite insignificant in advance, what matters is not how I gained knowledge through seemingly truthful literature, but how my judgment and ideals were given the sense of having interacted with the world.<sup>99</sup>

Yoshimoto created a new revolutionary theory that made clear distinctions from the Communist Party, the existing vanguard Left, at a time when the struggle against the 1960 U.S.-Japan Peace Treaty was escalating, and his theory continued to have influence afterwards. As Japan was heading toward a new decade, 1970s, Matsuda called strongly for a shift away from the concept of the 'situation', symbolic of Yoshimoto's thought, toward that of 'landscape.' This background indicates that landscape theory, at its origin, was presented not only as a theory of film and art, but also as a political and philosophical theory.

## 2. Philosophical and Art Historical Background

The relationship between new art movements and thought in 20<sup>th</sup> century Japan has its origin in the 1920s, when Japan underwent enormous social and cultural transformations under the accelerating modernization starting in the Meiji period. Marked by the emergence of the first avant-garde movements on one hand, and the introduction of Socialism on the other, the situation provoked various discussions based on the dichotomies between politics and culture, or revolution and art. However, first with the rise

---

concept of situations within the context of European philosophical arguments into Japanese, Yoshimoto attempted to take on the historical and philosophical challenges it had proposed, while shedding light on incongruities caused by Japan's rapid modernization and formation of the state. "If a task for Sartre is to radicalize (existentialize) existing radical language (classical Marxism), the task at least for me, inevitably is to find linguistic thought (autonomy) that can either ascend or descend the structure of strained warps and divergence created between radical language and indigenous language." Yoshimoto Takaaki, *Jiritsu no shisoteki kyoten* [Intellectual Basis for Autonomy], (Tokyo: Tokumashoten, 1966), 87.

<sup>99</sup> Yoshimoto, *Jiritsu no shisoteki kyoten*, 100.

of socialism, most of them ended up being contained by the party's ideology; and later they were suspended as the rise of militarism dismantled the avant-garde party itself. It was after the Second World War, from 1945 onward, that the discussion of the theory and practice of post-war art came to the fore, with such literati as Hanada Kiyoteru and Takiguchi Shuzo aiming to liquidate the agendas that had remained unresolved before and during war time. However, it was not until the loss of authority of the Communist Party, the existing avant-garde left, that the art movements started to become culturally and politically autonomous in the literal sense of the term—domestically through the shift from armed struggle to a peaceful line in *Rokuzenkyo* (the Sixth National Party Congress) in 1955, and globally through the critique of Stalinism in 1956 and the Soviet Union's military intervention in the Hungarian Revolution in 1956.

Among these new currents, literary scholars Takei Akio and Yoshimoto launched their hard line critique, denouncing the previous generations in *Bungakusha no senso sekinin* (Literati's war responsibility) in 1957. The Leftist culturati and intellectuals who had been dismissed as inviolable also became targets of criticism, and the myth of the existing Left as leader—in both the anti-militarism struggle in the pre-war period and anti-U.S. occupation policy struggle with the new Japanese government in the postwar period—was gradually dismantled. In film, directors such as Matsumoto Toshio and Noda Shinkichi proposed a theory aiming to make films independent from politics, and integrate the avant-garde and documentary, which developed into a heated discussion with film directors affiliated with Communist Party. Meanwhile, directors such as Oshima Nagisa and Yoshida Kiju systematically criticized every aspect of the existing Japanese cinema, aggressively confronting the previous generation, including Leftist filmmakers. Meanwhile, in politics, in 1958 a student organization broke off from the Communist Party and began *Bund* (the Japan Revolutionary Communist League). One of their main targets was the struggle against the peace treaty, which aimed to disrupt the revision of the U.S. Japan Security Treaty. In its aggressive opposition to the Communist Party, the new group developed its own theory and practice, coming to be known as the New Left. To part with Communist Party, which had been synonymous with politics and revolutionary movement in post-war Japan, was in itself a revolutionary

event. The independent thought advocated by Yoshimoto thus played a significant role for a new current of movement and thought aimed at fighting against the Security Treaty without aligning with the Communist Party. On the other hand, the labor movements that had been thriving in the fifties, many of which were led by the Communist or Socialist Parties, were unable to play a central role during the *Anpo*, struggle against the U.S. Japan Security Treaty in the sixties, and the New Left movements thereafter were developed mainly by students.

Matsuda joined the Communist Party as a high school student.<sup>100</sup> In 1957 he became an editor, and, through communicating with Hanada and Yoshimoto, as an opposition force within the party he called for *Rokugatsu kodo iinkai* (the June Action Committee) to join the *Anpo* struggle. Thereafter he immediately left the party. In 1962 he participated in the launch of *Jiritsugakko* (the Autonomy School), which was centered around influential poet/philosopher Tanigawa Gan, who, together with Yoshimoto had played a significant role in the philosophical development of the New Left movement. In 1964, Matsuda formed the *Musefu kyosanto* (Anarchist Communist Party) with anarchist Yamaguchi Kenji. In 1965 they formed *Tokyo kodo sensen* (the Tokyo Action Front), and in '67 founded *Reboruto-sha* (Revolt Publishing House), which published the journal *Sekai kakumei undo joho* (World Revolutionary Movement Information), advocating violent revolutionary theory based on direct action and Third Worldism as 'tactical rather than strategic thought.'<sup>101</sup> He looks back on the process of setting forth the new thought, which was distinct from both the vanguardism of the New Left and the Autonomist stance of Yoshimoto as follows:

In retrospect, the seed of the tragedy was already germinated when Yoshimoto Takaaki emphatically declared at the court of lawsuit against Marquis De Sade's *L'Hisorie de Juliette; ou Les Prosperites du Viceon* on January 24 of 1962 'When considering anarchist society or society without the state as utopia, its essential concept I think is not human freedom but its independence.' All days during the sixties, Yoshimoto Taaaki tackled the unprecedentedly difficult journey to establish the essence in itself. And those who aimed for independence sent cheers. Everything changed and nothing changed. In the early 60s, I was compelled to wander

---

<sup>100</sup> Matsuda Masao, "'Sagyo Nisshi' shisho," [Personal selections from Work Diaries] in *Samazaama na Sengo (dai san shu)* [Various Postwars (Third Volume)], ed. Sunouchi Kenji and Matsumoto Masatsugu (Tokyo: Nihonkeizaishinbunsha, 1995), 189-222.

<sup>101</sup> Matsuda Masao, "Jijo," [Preface by author], in *Teroru no Kairo*[Circuit of Terror], (Tokyo: Sanichishobo, 1969): 1.



between vanguardism and independent thought. Suspicious of the available choices, content neither with 'autonomy' nor 'vanguard,' I was struggling to pursue a single word of my own that would completely capture this time period.<sup>102</sup>

Derived not from strategic thoughts of the Leftist intellectuals represented by Yoshimoto, but from a new philosophical trend with practical strategies at its origin, the *Zenkyoto* movement began in '65 as a struggle against tuition increases, as well as the struggle for autonomous management of student buildings. The movement gained its momentum as blocks with barricades went up at various universities and high schools, as well as the intensification of street struggles in May '68. Though many members of the New Left sects were also involved, *Zenkyoto* was radically different from those that were based on self-governing associations at universities, and its struggle committee within each university had directly created a network of communication, beyond the boundaries of departments or universities, forming a new anarchism-based movement. The conflict with the existing Left in '68 was not entirely new—in the Leftist Movement in Japan, the roles of the existing Left and the labor movements led by it had already disappeared in the fifties—in comparison to other countries. Furthermore, *Zenkyoto* was novel as a neo-New Left movement, because it had aligned with the New Left, which had begun during the *Anpo* in 1960—although their stance was entirely different. It is thus characteristic of Japan that building coalitions between students and workers was no easy task.

However, the *Zenkyoto* Movement, which grew into a nationwide movement, was successfully suppressed by the police force, and beginning in mid 1969, it gradually lost its momentum. On the other hand, owing to the opening of the Osaka World Expo in 1970, popular interests shifted from political movements to the formation of a highly advanced consumer society. Also because of the so-called *Nihonreto kaizo keikaku* (A Plan for remodeling the Japanese Archipelago), a nationwide development that began in 1972, the entire landscape of Japan was drastically remade. Furthermore, the time of art movements, which had resumed in the fifties, came to a close as a number of well-known avant-garde writers and cultural figures were mobilized for the Osaka Expo and its media campaign. In the midst of this period of regression in politics and movements, landscape theory—which forecast the shift of state

---

<sup>102</sup> Matsuda, "Waga rokujunendai no hikari to yami," [Light and darkness of my 60's] in *Teroru no kairo*, 24.

system—was presented as a new critical concept in the seventies. Rather than capital-P-political spaces, symbolized by State, Police, Military and University, landscape theory served as a theoretical framework to perceive structures of power within the seemingly non-threatening, everyday landscape. It also made clear the limits of existing political movements, which aimed for physical confrontations as well as occupation of political space, and was presented as a new theory to perceive and analyze—and ultimately to subvert—the status quo, in which even everyday landscapes were subsumed by power. On the other hand, although ideas of the leftist opposition factions epitomized by Yoshimoto gradually lost their radical edge in the shifting domain of the movement, they still had an enormous influence on the New Left, and on cultural and literary figures. Matsuda therefore proposed landscape theory to call for a shift from 'situation' to 'landscape', introducing the more specific concept of landscape=power, rather than situation, a notion that was ambiguous and vague. Along with this proposal, by critiquing Yoshimoto's autonomy thought itself, which had enormous impact from the late fifties to the sixties, Matsuda attempted to demonstrate the need for a new philosophical horizon

### **3. Film Historical Background**

If one looks back at the history of Japanese cinema, one must recognize an important factor, the development of film as movement, which was closely linked to the formation of landscape theory and *A.K.A. Serial Killer* as its background. Suzuki Seijun, a film director working for the Nikkatsu, which was one of the top five Japanese film production companies and had the longest history, was suddenly laid off in 1968. Suzuki had continuously engaged in experimental film production, and was widely acclaimed as an auteur even though he was a "program picture" director. However, because of the production of *Koroshi no Rakuin* (Branded to Kill, 1967), Nikkatsu relieved Suzuki of his post, then refused to rent out

his film prints for a Suzuki Seijun retrospective of scheduled by the Cine-Club Study Group, and cut off distribution of all of Suzuki's works.<sup>103</sup>

In response to this, a group called *Suzuki Seijun Mondai Kyoto Kaigi* (Joint struggle committee for Suzuki Seijun problem) was formed, with the goals of having his firing reversed and reinstating circulation of his films. Support came from numerous individuals and groups, ranging from filmmakers affiliated with major film companies, independent production companies such as Oshima's *Sozosha* and Wakamatsu's Wakamatsu Production and groups of documentary films such as Ogawa Production, as well as critics, editors, university film groups, and cine-clubs from all regions. So much support for the group arose that it became a political movement in the film industry, which showed some resemblance to the Zenkyoto Movement.<sup>104</sup> In fact, the Seijun Joint Struggle provided an occasion for Matsuda—who, when asked, would occasionally write film criticism—to become seriously engaged in film criticism.<sup>105</sup> Matsuda joined the struggle as chairperson; so did Adachi as representative of Wakamatsu Productions, and Sasaki likewise as representative of *Sozosha*. Thus various people in different positions who later developed landscape theory were involved in this movement.

The current of this new film movement segued into the publication of the second incarnation of the film journal *Eiga Hihyo* (Film Criticism). Matsuda, Adachi and Sasaki, along with music critics Aikura Hisato and Hiraoka Masaaki formed *Hihyo Sensen* (Critical Front) in 1969, in order to develop it in theory and practice. In order to develop film criticism and critiques as political movement they started the journal in October 1970. The journal stopped publication with the September 1973 issue, however the

---

<sup>103</sup> Hori Kyusaku, a CEO and President of Nikkatsu corporation, who laid off Suzuki made the following statement: "Suzuki Seijun is a director who makes incomprehensible films. Therefore, his films are not good films, and it is a shame for Nikkatsu to screen them." "Suzuki kantoku no saiban ni kansuru houkoku" [Report regarding Director Suzuki's trial], *Suzuki Seijun mondai kyoto kaigi hokoku* [Suzuki Seijun Joint Struggle League Report], no. 1 (1<sup>st</sup> August 1968): 9.

<sup>104</sup> This can be argued in parallel with the struggle for the reversal of the firing of Henri Langlois of Cinematique Francaise in France, and the anti-Cannes Film Festival action. As a similar incident, which occurred in the context of underground cinema and hippie movement in Japan, the protest against the Film Art Festival organized by Sogetsu Art Center in 1969 can be listed.

<sup>105</sup> Matsuda Masao, "Moshimo anotoki" [What if, then] in *Tamura Tsutomu: Hito to shinario* [Tamura Tsutomu: Man and Scenario], ed. Shinario sakka kyokai shuppan iinkai [Japan writers guild publications committee] (Tokyo: Shinario Sakka Kyokai, 2001): 336-338.

manifesto by Critical Front published in the first issue attests that film production, screening and criticism, that is to say, theory and practice were considered equally important:

We strongly feel that the so-called 'crisis of cinema' has been the most acutely exposed in the domain of criticism. In the midst of the so-called quantitative decline in films, despite the fact that genuine works of filmmakers and the silent support of the audience are instead bringing about an unprecedented quantitative excitement in cinema, the status of criticism, as seen in some film magazines, is currently reaching an alarming circumstance rife with gossipy drivel in the name of 'art' or 'critical review.' If, at this moment, tackling the task of creating criticism as a movement to mediate accurately between creative movements which are competing against one another as swirling currents, and a popular movement, in which a series of searches are amorphously continued is neglected, it is as clear as day that one will regret it for many years to come, and ultimately will allow for the coming of a genuine crisis of cinema. We, with an awareness of being activists herein express that we begin the battle aiming to establish new critical front.<sup>106</sup>

*A.K.A. Serial Killer* became the first film that was presented as a critical practice of the *Hihyo Sensen* mentioned above, as part of the process to prepare for publication of the first *Eiga Hihyo*. Inviting Nonomura and Yamazaki, members of the Film Studies Group of Nihon University Art Department, as cinematographer, and Iwauchi of Wakamatsu Productions for production, Adachi evidently organized the film crew as the extension of the previous cinema movement, and it is out of this movement that landscape theory was born and developed.

#### 4. Theorization of Landscape——"City as Landscape"

After the completion of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, Matsuda continued to publish texts based on the experience of making the film, accelerating the theorization of landscape theory. Adachi, the director who

---

<sup>106</sup> Introduction for the first publication, Second term *Eiga Hihyo* [Film criticism] in October 1970. The editorial group published the magazine urgently, since it was to be the medium by which to discuss critically this new phase of film as movement from the late 60s through the early 70s. The magazine eschewed film stills, publishing only uncompromising criticism and interviews. Numerous revolutionary films from around the world were introduced, and had significant influence politically as well as cinematically until the end of publication in September 1973. As a critical movement young critics and filmmakers were proactively used, and a number of new writers made their debut. Though the editorial system was completely revamped, the reason for being of the second term is that it was intended to continue the theory and practice of *Eiga Hihyo*, which was published in the late fifties. Also, *Eiga Hihyo* was a film magazine published by producer and film director Kumagaya Mitsuyuki (Kasu Sanpei), providing support for Shochiku Nouvelle Vague such as Oshima and Yoshida, as well as new wave in documentary films, including Matsumoto and Hani. Also, what is referred to as 'Art' and 'Criticism' in the main text is Film Arts and Film Criticism respectively, which had been published since the pre-war period. As a historical film magazine there was one called *Kinema Jumbo*, however by the second half of the sixties, film magazines, such as *Kikan Firumu* [Film Quarterly], *Shinema* [Cinema], and *Me* [Eye], which critiqued the existing media and made clear their new political and aesthetic positions were published in succession.

co-produced *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, the script writer Sasaki, and—as a response from outside of those involved with the film production—photographer Nakahira each made their own statements on landscape or landscape theory from their distinct position, launching its theoretical construction, centering around Matsuda. Though *A.K.A. Serial Killer* was screened immediately after its completion, it was not until 1976 that the film was first shown publicly. Because of this delay, during the first half of the year, the theoretical developments were literally focused on writing. Meanwhile, in June, though in a slightly different context than *A.K.A.*, Oshima's *Tokyo senso sengo hiwa* (The Man Who Left His Will on Film, 1970), scripted by Sasaki and Hara Masataka (Masato) was screened, and the discussion on landscape started to take place more extensively. In this section, I would like to review the development of Matsuda's landscape theory, which gained momentum in the early 1970s. By summarizing the theoretical interventions of Adachi and Nakahira, the entire picture of landscape theory at the period will be examined.

*A.K.A. Serial Killer* starts 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" and the final reel ends with, "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." This film is quite extraordinary as it shows only the landscapes that Nagayama may have encountered from the time of his birth until his arrest when he was drifting across Japan. Though the fact that fragments of landscape projected on the screen are showing the footsteps Nagayama had left from his birth until his arrest, it becomes evident through Adachi's narration that the seemingly ubiquitous landscapes are simply projected onscreen as a series of shots or sequences, without articulating the superiority of any one shot over another.

After completing *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, Matsuda published his essay *Fukei toshiteno toshi* (City as landscape) for the journal *Gendai no me* (Contemporary Eye) in April 1970. Since this essay was published in the special issue on urban structure, and the essay, *Sex as landscape* mentioned earlier that was published in the special issue on sex focused on the discourse of the locked room in the films of

Wakamatsu, this can be considered the first essay whose discussion was dominantly about landscape.<sup>107</sup> Analyzing the collapse of the dichotomy between Tokyo and the countryside, or the center and periphery, the regimentation of the entire Japanese Archipelago as a gigantic city, and the homogenization of the landscape, Matsuda pointed out almost all the important definitions for landscape theory, referencing terms such as state power, underclass proletariat, invisible homeland, commune, and guerrilla-revolution.

The essay starts with a strange encounter with a quasi-traditional festival that Matsuda and his peers experienced in Abashiri City, followed by the introduction of a documentary film about Nagayama. Based on the experience of tracing the footsteps of Nagayama for four months, the homogenization of landscape, which was in progress nation-wide, is analyzed. Matsuda further criticizes the statements by cultural figures and journalists, including dramatist Terayama Shuji,<sup>108</sup> who attributed the incident caused by Nagayama to geographical and social factors, including Hokkaido Abashiri City, his place of birth, or the "desolate northern countryside" of Itayanagi of Tsugaru Province in Aomori Prefecture, where Nagayama's entire family had moved when he was five, and discusses the collapse of the dichotomy between Tokyo=city and the countryside, or center and periphery, due to loss of the homeland.

In other words, the uniqueness of local regions had drastically eroded, and what we saw in its place was a homogenized landscape that could be called a copy of the center. The colonial city of Abashiri, the indigenous town of Itayanagi, and furthermore, even the central city of Tokyo looked pretty much the same.<sup>109</sup>

In an episode in which he followed the trajectory of Nagayama and was unable to discover 'homeland', Matsuda referred to a statement that Tanigawa had made in his poem, "Do not go to Tokyo" (Tokyo e yukuna). He points out a theoretical limitation of Tanigawa, who, while critiquing the concentration of power in Tokyo, was himself based in the local region of Kyushu not as intellectual but

---

<sup>107</sup> This essay is the opening text of the first edition of *Fukei no shimetsu*.

<sup>108</sup> See Terayama Shuji, *Boku ga senso ni iku toki* [When I go to the war] (Tokyo: Yomiuri Shinbun-sha, 1969); *Kofuku-ron* [On happiness] (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo 1969) among others. On the other hand, Nagayama's criticism of Terayama is compiled in *Han-Terayama Shuji-ron* [On Anti-Shuji Terayama] (Tokyo: JCA Shuppan, 1977).

<sup>109</sup> Matsuda, "Fukei toshiteno toshi", 10.

as 'kosakusha' (operator), and worked with coalminers heading towards the new era of the seventies.<sup>110</sup>

The end of roles played by important thinkers in the sixties, i.e. Yoshimoto in "Sex as Landscape", as well as Tanigawa in "City as Landscape" was thus indicated in order to articulate the position of landscape theory.

In this way it turned out that we were unable to discover the 'homeland' that may have nurtured Nagayama either in Okhotsk or the plain fields of the Tohoku region. Indeed, we did nothing more than seeing a little 'Tokyo'. Even a shanty town called *Irifuku-jutaku* (housing) located at the corner of Itayanagi-cho where Nagayama lived during his grade school years could be situated anywhere in Tokyo. We must therefore confirm that the scheme of Tokyo vs. hometown, which was the basis of what Gan Tanigawa used to advocate, "Do not go to Tokyo, create your hometown" no longer carried any currency at the dead end of the sixties.<sup>111</sup>

In fact, Matsuda presents a paradox that Nagayama's migration to Tokyo was a journey to the origin from the local countryside, which was itself an imitation of Tokyo, thereby concluding that the existing 'homeland' is in the invisible domain. On the other hand considering Nagayama and his urge to aim for an invisible homeland, Matsuda insists that countless numbers of 'lumpen proletariat' were forming a new class in this process of drifting. Matsuda continued to develop his analysis of the underclass proletariat in his many other writings as well. However it was in fact Tanigawa who first found in the unorganized wandering underclass proletariat something positive, in struggles such as the 60's Anti-security treaty struggle or Miike struggle.<sup>112</sup> Inheriting Tanigawa's theory and action principles, Matsuda discovered creative value in the underclass proletariat. Critiquing the establishment of the base, or self-

---

<sup>110</sup> Tanigawa Gan, "Tokyo e yukuna," [Don't go to Tokyo] in *Tanigawa Gan Shishu* [Collected Poems of Tanigawa Gan] (Tokyo: Kokubunsha, 1960), 79-81.

<sup>111</sup> Matsuda, "Fuhei toshiten toshi", 12.

<sup>112</sup> "It is no doubt a fact that only among those people who are alienated in the form of discrimination such as farmers and fishermen in remote areas, the drifting proletariat, special outcast group (*tokushuburakumin*), lepers and ethnic Koreans... that is exemplary of Japan. It is upon them that the thought of the dominant class has been projected most aggressively, and therefore with a certain condition, they are closer to individuals exemplary of modern Europe than anybody else, and also have potential to transcend the "individual." However, one will be faced with an agenda of what kind of course one should take to attain the potential, and what guarantees the productivity of the thought. What lies in disregarding these and considering, by confusing the historical order with the logical order by first emancipation from production relations and then after that... is this bottomless bourgeois secularization towards concepts such as production or relation." Tanigawa Gan, "Nihon no nijukozo," [Dual structure of Japan] in *Sento eno Shotai* [Invitation to combat] (Tokyo: Gendaishichosha, 1961), 225. For other theories, see the following. Tanigawa Gan, *Kosakusha Sengen* [Operator's Manifesto] (Tokyo: Chuokoronsha, 1959); Tanigawa Gan, *Kage no ekkyo o megutte* [Concerning shadowy transgressions] (Tokyo: Gendaishichosha, 1963) .

identification in the movement that Tanigawa had advocated, Matsuda, concerning the creation of a new concept of class, succeeded Tanigawa's concept theoretically, further developing it.

Probably for the first time, we are encountering the transitional period in which our underclass proletariat is going to be formed as a class. Occupying the city as wandering being, they slowly began to emerge as the gravediggers of capitalism.<sup>113</sup>

By finding the independence and subjectivity of a new individual in the underclass proletariat, and by organizing them, Tanigawa attempted to move beyond the Communist Party and existing labor movements. In contrast, Matsuda, like Tanigawa, viewed the proletariat as a new emerging class, however instead of finding their 'revolutionariness' as a fixed subject, he tried to discover it within the mobility of 'drifting,' their de-centered subject in its unfolding, as well as in their prematurely organized form itself. Matsuda thus attempted to overcome the limits of the labor movement in Japan, and in order to end it, attempted to construct a new class concept that didn't have its basis in the labor movement. Furthermore, as one entered the seventies, concepts, which were proposed by Yoshimoto and Tanigawa around the *Anpo* Struggle in 1960 and had enormous influences on contemporary thought and movements, such as subjectivity or the independence of an individual, were even contained by the landscape. He pointed out the limit of Tanigawa's revolutionary theory, while at the same time criticizing the theory of subjectivity proposed by Terayama and others, who regarded Nagayama's as a geographically unique narrative.

Furthermore, in discussing the wanderings of Nagayama, which Matsuda himself had traced in spatio-temporal thread, he developed an analysis of the homogenization of the landscape in the Japanese archipelago, and emphasized that, in order to express it, it cannot be "substituted with words such as 'nature,' or 'climate'" but the term "landscape" had to be employed. It is for this reason that extraordinary method of tracing the landscape Nagayama may have encountered was employed in the film.

It may be that space unique to us, who traveled through our unique time, even though it happens to be the same place or the same itinerary, as a matter of fact, should have been different from the trajectory of Norio Nagayama. If a single function could be extracted from both our and

---

<sup>113</sup> Matsuda, "Fukei toshiteno toshi", 21.



Nagayama's time and space, it would be indeed the landscape. Like a painted picture, or a large mural at a public bath, it is the flat landscape itself without pretension.<sup>114</sup>

Rather than celebrating what was particular and unique about Nagayama as an individual, and either sympathizing with or criticizing it, what Matsuda attempted to discover—by following his footsteps and confronting the homogenized landscape he saw—was the universality of Nagayama. He went on to quote Regis Debray, who called the city a "comfortable purgatory," against which he counterposed the 'mountain'. He then argued that, since there was no 'mountain' in the transitional period of Japan, where the entire island itself was transforming into a gigantic city, the 'mountain' must be created in the midst of the city. The point made by Masada indicates that even within the context of the loss of geographic dichotomy, the potential of landscape theory can still be proposed as a guerrilla theory and theory of revolution in Japan. And lastly, pointing out that the current situation was a transitional period, during which all of Japan was undergoing a massive transformation, Matsuda argues that a rigorous analysis of power was necessary in order to respond to the systemic shift of the State. Also, with the renewed recognition of power not only as State, but also as a combined assemblage including capitalism, the analysis had to be taken into account as an opportunity to subvert it.

When we consider that Japanese capitalism, which had moved its way up to third place in GNP for the twenty years following the war, dropped an accumulated total of 3 to 5 billion in capital on this island, there is no doubt that ten times more investment in the next twenty years will increasingly facilitate this enormous urbanization. We must therefore possess an ear to detect this aggressive campaign, not as a take-off signal for Japanese imperialism, but as its funeral bell.<sup>115</sup>

It has been pointed out that the advent of Japan's consumer society, which can be called a global experiment of highly advanced capitalism, took place on a large scale when in 1972, Tanaka Kakuei, the prime minister of Japan at the time, put forward a special plan for remodeling the Japanese Archipelago.

<sup>116</sup> However, after re-living the journey of Nagayama's drifting for nineteen years only in four months at

---

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 16.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 21.

<sup>116</sup> For a sociological perspective see also: Sakai Takashi, *Jiyuron: Genzaisei no keifugaku* [On Liberty: Genealogy of Actuality] (Tokyo: Seidosha, 2000). In the context of architecture, see Miyauchi Ko, *Enkon no Yutopia* [Utopia of Grudges] (Tokyo: Inoueshoin, 1971) and *Fukei o Ute* [Shoot the landscape] (Tokyo: Sagami Shobo, 1976). For a

an incredible speed in the latter half of 1969, witnessing the landscape that was being rewritten from day to day, Matsuda and his peers quickly foresaw a big change to the system. Rather than an extension of revolutionary theories of the past, the creation of an entirely new conception was sought, and as a result, it was named 'landscape'. Though landscape theory was discussed mainly with an emphasis on power, and as a result Matsuda himself presented his revision of it as state theory, his initial attempt was to interpret power exclusively as an attribute of the state, but to define it rather broadly, including capitalism.

## 5. Development of Landscape Theory

In his subsequent texts Matsuda went on to develop important theoretical issues he had raised in *City as Landscape*. In the May 3, 1970 issue of Asahi Journal, *Naraku no tabino tojo de* (On the journey to the abyss), citing ontological revolutionary theory by thinker and novelist Haniya Yutaka and French literary scholar Shibusawa Tatsuhiko, Matsuda developed a discussion about cultural revolution and the possibility of creating revolution beyond the dichotomy between city and rural, primitive and modern, through his analysis of the free jazz performance of the Yamashita Yosuke Trio, who had also participated in films by Wakamatsu and others. Also, in *Waga retto, waga fukei* (My archipelago, my landscape) published in the June, 1970 issue of the art magazine *Bijutsu Techo* (Art Notes), the reference extended to third world revolutionary theory, by way of the differences between the Japan-made world map and the overseas world map, in connection with *A.K.A Serial Killer*. Furthermore in the June issue of *Gendai no Me* (Contemporary eye) in the same year, Matsuda also published the text *Kagaminokuni no toshi* (City in wonderland), a short essay on the city, which he contributed to accompany the photographic works of Yanagimoto Naomi, a young editor of the magazine *Provoke*. In this essay he again developed the shift from 'situations' to 'landscape' by discussing the manifestation of the impersonal and non-subjective landscape after 1968. In contrast to 'situation' and other previous philosophical and political concepts as abstract, he emphasized the fact that landscape was thoroughly visible.

---

viewpoint from labor theory, see Hamamura Ko, "*Haikyo to yutopia: Miyauchi Ko to Varuta Benyamin*" [Ruin and Utopia: Miyauchi Ko and Walter Benjamin] in *Yoseba*, No. 15, (May 2002): 172-193.

And the soldiers were gone and only the landscape remained. When one stops talking with imitation words, not just situation, but even merciless situations disappears, and there emerges the landscape. This is the world that is thoroughly visible. Whether it is closed or open, it is the landscape. No matter what kind of thought is projected, the sky in the Seventies remains blue, and night remains dark.<sup>117</sup>

It is informative that the theorization of landscape theory was developed through the mediation of both film and photography, and landscape is discussed in some of his film reviews as well. Though not in chronological order, Matsuda discussed the New American Cinema, wrote a review on *Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid* (1969) for the January 1970 issue of *Kinema Junpo* (Cinema Bulletin), as well as *Dochu eigaron josetsu* (Preface to Discourse on Road Movies) among others.<sup>118</sup> Matsuda discovered 'landscape' in different films and stated that the 'protagonist' of *Easy Rider* (1969)—directed by Peter Fonda, a milestone of the road movie genre—was indeed the landscape itself. In *Dochu eiga josetsu* he discussed it as follows: "Though it is strictly my own personal view, the protagonist of *Easy Rider* is neither human beings nor music, but the road itself. Rather than nature and climate of the U.S., the landscape is the protagonist." In this film, scenes of the two protagonists riding their motorcycles are continuously followed, and ordinary scenes of American towns and the vast expanse of nature along the highway continue infinitely. However, 'landscape' for Matsuda is not the appearance of American towns or an image of vast land that even Japanese people are familiar with. Instead, what Matsuda means by landscape is the way the filmed landscape, that is, "the deserts common in cowboy films or the cityscapes of Las Vegas that are often seen in sleek romance films and so on become transformed in an instant, and begin to breathe ominously, like a creature with gigantic iron hands." This is exactly why Matsuda claims

---

<sup>117</sup> Matsuda Masao, "Kagami no kuni no shuto," [Capital in wonderland], *Gendai no me* [Contemporary eye] (June 1970): 12-13.

<sup>118</sup> "Joji roi hiru kantoku 'Asuni mukatte ute'," [*Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Hill*, directed by George Roy Hill] and "Dochu eiga josetsu," [Preface to on road movies] in *Hakuchumu o Ute* [Shoot the Daydream] (Tokyo: Tabata Shoten), 8-11. Before this sentence, Matsuda states the following: "Though it is strictly my own personal view, the protagonist of *Easy Rider* is neither human beings nor music, but the road itself. Rather than the nature and climate of the U.S., the landscape is the protagonist. Two motorcycles continue running endlessly, and we are made to watch continuously ordinary landscapes of the vast American Continent, that look as if they were postcards. And it is at this moment where the desert common in cowboy films, or the townscape of Las Vegas, that are often seen in sleek romance films and so on, instantly becomes transformed, and begins to breathe ominously, like a creature with gigantic iron hands."

that the landscape is the main protagonist. Thus, making the common landscape visible, this film was successfully able to shed light on its structure of power.

After all, both the killers and those killed are humans. The landscape remains after the humans are gone. Indeed, is it not a road movie that suggests that the casual landscape itself is actually none other than a space of madness? What a decadent picture this is with no need of humans! <sup>119</sup>

In the essay *Eizo, fukei, gengo* (Image, landscape, language) published in the June, 1970 issue of *Kikan Firumu* (Film Quarterly), Matsuda set forth a critique of discourses on situation mediated by theories of photography, and discussed the relationship between image, language and landscape, analyzing the permeation of power in everyday life. With this analysis of everyday life, he pushed forward a theoretical development of the 'landscape=power' theory. In his discussion of the photography book, *Ikari o hibino kateni* (With agony as daily bread) <sup>120</sup>, photographer Kurihara Tatsuo based on a single photograph taken during the struggle at Tokyo University, Matsuda describes the structure of power that spread like a network in every domain of everyday life as follows:

Meanwhile, especially with no need to look closely, on the steel manhole cover stretching across the foreground of the most impressive snapshot, we see the inscription, "imperial college sewer". Yoshimi Takeuchi stated something like, that the Japanese Emperor system has permeated every tree and blade of grass, indeed at Tokyo 'Imperial' University 'imperial' dwells everywhere, from the very manhole cover to the bathroom doorknob. <sup>121</sup>

As the above is an excerpt from the text by Matsuda himself, published in the April 20, 1969 issue of *Asahi Journal*, it predates landscape theory (as that beginning with *A.K.A. Serial Killer*); this portion was not printed due to a lack of space, so it first appeared when it was printed in *Film Quarterly* in June, 1970. Drawing from the discussion of the literary figure Takeuchi Yoshimi about minute forms of power that dwell in the ordinary landscape of Tokyo University was prophetically argued. <sup>122</sup> When

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid. 12.

<sup>120</sup> Kurihara Tatsuo, *Ikari o hibino kateni* [With agony as daily bread] (Tokyo: Tojusha, 1969).

<sup>121</sup> Matsuda, "Eizo, fukei, gengo," [Image, landscape, language] in *Fukei no shimetsu*, 102.

<sup>122</sup> "Like 'a torso embodying all of Greece', the Emperor system dwells in every tree and every blade of grass. Emperor system exists as our tactile sensation. Art cannot be exempted from it. Not only a torso, but all of art has been absorbed by the Emperor system. It is Japanese art that is struggling to escape from the Emperor system within the Emperor system." Takenuchi Yoshimi, "Kenryoku to geijutsu" [Power and art], *Chuokoron* (April 1955): 127, compiled in *Gendai nihon bungaku taikei 78* [Compilation of contemporary Japanese literatures 78], (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1973), 343.

photographs of struggle are discussed, usually interest tends to be focused on the struggle or its accompanying events, however Matsuda deliberately paid attention to aspects of the ordinary, everyday landscape of the university, which are not directly related. Takeuchi points out that since Japan is entirely under the control of the Emperor system, in this sense, art cannot be exceptional, therefore indicating that art in Japan is struggling to escape from the Emperor system, within the Emperor system. If this formula applies here, one could say that in Japan, under the control of the power of the landscape, even the struggles which counter it, e.g., the struggle at Tokyo University in this photograph, are no exception, struggling to escape from the landscape while within the landscape. Furthermore, in the same text, Takeuchi expresses that the Emperor system is an apparatus in which all of Japan is subsumed.<sup>123</sup> By calling landscape power, Matsuda aimed to make visible this invisible structure of power that extends to the visible landscape. In this sense one could say that Matsuda's landscape is the result of reinterpreting Takeuchi's conception of apparatus as analysis of power.

In an essay *Fukashi no murano iriguchi de* (At the entrance of the invisible village), which was published in the July 1970 issue of the journal *Kozo* (Structure), while discussing a TV documentary about the family of a charcoal burner in a depopulated village, as well as referencing the footsteps of Nagayama, Matsuda sharply pointed out that the inversion of the relationship between rural and city was taking place on television, in its role as new media. Critiquing intellectuals, who tend to pose concepts such as 'life' *seikatsu* (life) or *seikatsusha* (living people) against 'thoughts' or 'politics,' or understand the notion of indigenous in the geographical transition from Tokyo to the rural area—as being one

---

<sup>123</sup> "The emperor system is not a single value system, but a complex system; rather than a system, it is a kind of apparatus that cancels out different values. If the Emperor system were a single value system, another value system could be brought in and posed against it. However, if that was the case, without a need to indicate its premodernity again after the war, it would have long since ceased to exist." Takeuchi Yoshimi, "Kenryoku to geijutsu," 339. For a recent philosophical discussion of the concept of apparatus, philosopher Giorgio Agamben and writers' collectives such as Tiqqun and the Invisible Committee —based on the concept proposed by Michel Foucault—have tried to newly theorize it. A theoretical comparison between landscape and apparatus is for another occasion. Meanwhile, as a presentation including a comparison between landscape theory and apparatus theory revolving around *A.K.A. Serial Killer* and *Red Army/PFLP Declaration of World War*, see Hirasawa Go and Kohso Sabu, "Landscape/Media-an Investigation into the Revolutionary Horizon, Reloaded" (Courtisane Festival in Ghent: Belgium, 2014).

dimensional, Matsuda relocates this inversion within a commune theory to seek an invisible home beyond the dichotomy of rural and city.

We must eliminate the pointless dichotomy between center and countryside, and further explore the process of forming the underclass proletariat in order to become genuine villagers on our island. What we need is not static, academic analysis or intellectual enlightenment, but rather, together with those who are dynamically wandering like Nagayama Norio, but to embark on a journey to the third village or to our invisible home. An entrance to the village exists within landscape expanding inside our window.<sup>124</sup>

Matsuda also addresses the homogenization of the landscape based on his experience of filming *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, and discovers its latency in ordinary landscape, and precisely because of its ubiquity. He sought the possibility of an alliance with Nagayama and others mediated by the landscape, emphasizing the necessity of the strong mind to carry out the wandering that Nagayama and others had to go through, as a 'spiritual wandering'. Reflecting the then current analysis of landscape=power, since landscape is considered a text of power, Matsuda strove to develop it inversely through rigorous reinterpretation of landscape itself.

I visited an apartment the size of three *tatami* mats in Nakano, Tokyo where Nagayama had last lived, and as I looked out the small window, I recall being struck with somewhat extraordinary trepidation. For there was the ordinary landscape. There were rooftops of rows of houses upon which TV antennas stood, and as it was a residential area, small but green trees were glimpsed. It was, for us, a quite familiar, homogenized cityscape. Just like one outside of my and your window, Nagayama Norio was also seeing this ordinary landscape. And, perhaps for our entire archipelago as well, it is the same homogenized and familiar landscape.<sup>125</sup>

By deliberately using 'landscape', which conjures up the quotidian, yet, as discussed in Chapter One, embodies the historical contradictions of modern Japan after the Meiji Restoration, an attempt was made to subvert the nationalistic connotations of the term. Landscape theory was extremely political and revolutionary, yet, precisely because it pertains to the landscape itself, it spread extensively. However, on the other hand, because of the term 'landscape', it was fraught with ambivalence, which invited fallacies or confusion in its interpretation.

---

<sup>124</sup> Matsuda, "Fukashi no murano iriguchide" [At the entrance to invisible village] in *Fukei no shimetsu*, 127.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, 119-120.

## 6. Landscape in *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*

Theorization on landscape theory made progress through Matsuda's text written on the occasion of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, however it was the filming of *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* by Oshima that it showed some additional and new developments. Originally called *Tokyo Fukei Senso* (Tokyo Landscape War) and subtitled, *Eiga de isho o nokoshite shinda otoko no monogatari* (A Story of a man who left his will on film and died), this film is considered as one of the most experimental films in Oshima's filmography. What is referred to *Tokyo senso* (Tokyo War) came from a slogan addressed by *Kyosanshugisha domei sekigunha* (Communist League Red Army Faction). The Red Army Faction upheld a theory of the preliminary stage of armed revolt in which the Red Army Faction itself would take the initiative to lead the insurrection in the preliminary stage of revolution, and lead the entire revolutionary movement. In September, 1969 advocating the Tokyo War and the Osaka War, they attacked police booths and police stations.

Though the slogan of the Red Army Faction was appropriated, the film itself as 'a postwar secret story' of the Tokyo War kept its political ideology at a distance, involving difficult philosophical inquiries. The film was written by Sasaki of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* and Hara. Hara, one of the most anticipated filmmakers at the time, won the grand prize at the Sogetsu Film Art Festival— which was popular as a publicly sponsored exhibition of experimental films—with the film *Okashisa ni irodorareta kanashimi no barado* (Sad ballad colored by humor). The process went such that Oshima first proposed the subject matter as "a man, who left his will on film and died", and Hara put together the first draft, then he and Sasaki co-wrote the script. The idea of leaving a will on film was inspired by the film *Tenchiisuijakusetsu* (Theory of Heavenly Breakdown, 1968) by *Gurupu Pojipoji* (Group Posiposi), which was a high school film study group at Tokyo Metropolitan Takehaya High School. The film actors were all members of the group.<sup>126</sup> Hence, landscape as subject matter was not exclusively attributed to Sasaki, who joined the

---

<sup>126</sup> Dissatisfied with *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*, Group Pojipoji made *Tenchiisuijakusetsu Dainisho* [Theory of Heavenly Breakdown Chapter Two] in 1970 as their response to it. They funded it with the reward they received for their appearance in the film. Goto Kazuo, who played the protagonist, later joined the editorial group in the second incarnation of *Eiga Hihyo*. See Goto Kazuo, "Goto Kazuo intabyu," [Interview with Goto Kazuo] and Hara

production of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*. However since *A.K.A. Serial Killer* was not publicly screened, *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* was generally recognized as the representative work of landscape film. In addition, since Oshima's films created a buzz every time he made a film, the debate on landscape or landscape theory began to proliferate.

Matsuda presented an essay called *Dokonidemoaru fukei o megutte* (Concerning ordinary landscape) retitled as *Yutopia no hango* (Anti-utopia) compiled in *Fukei no shimetsu* (Extinction of the Landscape) for the catalogue of *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* published in June, 1970, as well as *Fukei ga jokyo wo nottotta* (Landscape took over situation) in the 6<sup>th</sup> July 1970 issue of *Shukan Dokushojin* (Readers' Weekly).<sup>127</sup> Here Matsuda first presented *fukei eiga* (landscape film) as a genre and developed his discussion of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* based on an analysis of scenes of the landscape in the 'play within a play' in *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*. Also, comparing the approaches to landscape in both films, he critiqued himself, realizing that landscape, which had been discussed as the antithesis of 'situation', albeit being effective as criticism, was too caught up in an idea based on situation theory; in other words, what had been discussed was 'theory' of landscape rather than the landscape itself. He then concluded that the gaze with which underclass proletariats like Nagayama were imbued with should be directed internally, to bring about universality in landscape theory. Matsuda thus discovered potentiality in the "ordinary landscape" or the landscape in itself, rather than the landscape which is grasped as displacement from situation, or in the context of movements and politics. Furthermore, in comparison with the quasi-utopia that is being produced by a society of technology and control, Matsuda defines the ordinary landscape as anti-utopia. Matsuda argues that what inevitably results from confronting power is the landscape, thus redefining landscape theory as revolutionary theory.

---

Masato, "Tokyo senso kara Tokyo fukei senso e," [From the "Tokyo war" to the "Tokyo landscape war"], *The Man Who Left His Will On Film*, DVD booklet (Tokyo: Kinokuniya Shoten, 2010), 17-25 and 26-38.

<sup>127</sup> Matsuda Masao, "Fukei ga jokyo o nottotta," [Landscape took over situation], *Shukan Dokushojin* [Reader's Weekly] (6<sup>th</sup> July 1970): 8. The title was changed to "'Fukei' to 'Jokyo'," ('Landscape' and 'situation') at the time of reprinting.



The construction of our philosophical strategy of eternal revolution is entirely dependent upon how we can gaze at quite commonplace, casual, sentimental, dingy things lying around: "ordinary landscape".<sup>128</sup>

Hence, what was at stake was "how one captures the 'ordinary landscape,' and also how one can possibly recapture the self that has been seized by the landscape." While in Matsuda's argument on the locked room in *Sex as landscape* 'sex as interiority' was posed against the 'landscape as exteriority,' here, an even more complex relationship is presented. Instead of a simple dichotomy between external power and the internal self, he recognized the structure of landscape, where inside and outside are tightly intertwined, or they become indistinguishable, and thus concluded that to define landscape in this way would become a new revolutionary moment. It is from this context that Matsuda further introduced the problematic of the subject in the landscape, who not only sees the landscape, but is seen by it, thereby developing the analysis of landscape theory from an epistemological perspective as well.

I would like to add that what is at stake is whether one will be able to become aware of one's being in itself as it is being seen by 'that fellow' in the landscape. It may be that the so-called ordinary circumstance of the landscape, is in fact, not that we see, but that we are seen.<sup>129</sup>

With the introduction of the new landscape film *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* six months after *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, a multilayered definition was brought to the concept of landscape. As described earlier, Matsuda already discussed guerilla theory and revolutionary theory in his second essay *City as landscape*, however it is in this essay that landscape theory has clearly been redefined as a theory of revolution. In fact, while it was presented in the discussion of the actual film, its development was initially not confined to the domain of film theory. However as Matsuda called it "the principal thought from the seventies,"<sup>130</sup> the debate intensified. In the course of such heated discussion as this, Together with Matsuda, Adachi and others involved in the production of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, photographer Nakahira played a significant role from the early stage of its theoretical development.

---

<sup>128</sup> Matsuda, "Yutopia no hango," [Anti-utopia] in *Fukei no shimetsu*, 136.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., 137.

<sup>130</sup> Matsuda, "'Fukei' to 'jokyo'," ['Landscape' and 'situation'] in *Fukei no shimetsu*, 140.

## 7. Nakahira Takuma

One of the most significant contributors to landscape theory was photographer Nakahira, who had been known for co-founding the photography journal *Provoked*. It was because of his participation that the discussion of landscape theory extended to areas such as photography, fine arts, design, and architecture, among others. While Matsuda published his essays mainly in film journals, journals of political thought, book review newspapers and news magazines, Nakahira's participation made the art theoretical discussion of landscape theory possible. In addition, it is important to note that Nakahira immediately responded to Matsuda's *Sex as landscape*, in the February 1970 Issue of *Dezain* (Design), a journal of criticism for design, art and photography. In 1969 Nakahira started a column called *Dojidaiteki towa nanika?* (What Is Contemporaneous?) in *Design*. In February 1970, he then published a series of his own photographs titled "Landscape", which documented images including subway platforms, underground malls, passengers on trains, underpasses, buildings under construction, street corners to the beach etc., interspersed with short texts in which he discussed landscape.<sup>131</sup>

To me, the fact is that a man, woman, town or sea – everything exists only as 'landscape'. Unmistakably it is my misfortune. As Matsuda Masao rightly pointed out, a single gunshot or flash of a glittering knife would be enough to tear apart the 'landscape' that is uniformly plastered over by this power. However that will only become possible through our own transformation. It is for the sake of the transformation to come that I now continue to gaze at everything as 'landscape' that stands against me. And I will wait—next comes the fire!<sup>132</sup>

I continue screaming further. Girls, buildings, rails, industrial complex, walls, cars, flowers, fish... etc. However they are fading further and further away, and these names, by losing places over which to hang, begin to float in midair. Again, what remains behind is featureless landscape. At that moment, certainly I myself will also be a tiny constituent in the landscape. But I, who have never witnessed it myself, cannot say it for sure.<sup>133</sup>

Drawing Matsuda's theory of landscape=power closely to his own practice as photographer, Nakahira discusses how he perceives and recognizes, and, how, through the viewfinder, he shoots the landscape that confronts him. Around the same period he also published related works titled, *fukei* (Landscape) and *chika* (underground) in pictorial magazines such as *Asahi Gurafu* (Asahi Graph). In the

---

<sup>131</sup> Based on the relationship between Nakahira and Adachi, and since it seems likely that Nakahira attended the preview of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, presumably this text must have been written after the screening of the film.

<sup>132</sup> Nakahira Takuma, "Fukei 1" [Landscape 1] in *Design* (February 1970): 92.

<sup>133</sup> Nakahira Takuma, "Fukei 2" in *Design* (April 1970): 80.

July 1970 issue of the design magazine, *Gurafikeshon* (Graphication), he wrote a full-fledged theoretical response to landscape theory *Mitsuzukeru hate ni higa..* (Fire at the limits of my perpetual gazing). In it, Nakahira agreed with Matsuda, who defined landscape=power through the discussion of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, and suggested that Nagayama fired his gun to tear it all apart. Nakahira also argued that the landscape simply appears to be glossy and solid, like plastic, concluding that it is not the landscape that is a part of the city; indeed, the city is none other than a landscape. He also argued that all the recent violence and chaos that had been fomented in the city, as had been pointed out, was nothing unusual, and that the city remained undamaged as a transparent 'landscape'. Nakahira explains the ways in which he confronted this unyielding 'landscape':

And at night the city wipes out all the impurities and acquires almost perfect beauty. At that moment it transforms itself into an invulnerable castle, which is impeccable and seamless. But, because of that, fire must be set to this hostile 'landscape' by my own hand. My entirely personal fire. The ultimate form of passion is fire.<sup>134</sup>

When commissioned to write about urban revolt, Nakahira clearly deemed landscape an object to be set on fire and destroyed. He then continued that the revolt would come to pass when the landscape becomes cracked, the fissures deepen, and it "gets turned inside out completely, like taking off a glove." He further develops his analysis about the relationship between landscape and revolt: for instance, the barricade struggle at the university means "personally possessing university in public domain as landscape that encloses itself, or as an institution through blockade." Or, he proposes that "first begin by regarding the environment or world that encloses themselves as 'landscape' as an opponent; tear it open and destroy it." Nakahira claims that by continuously gazing at the landscape, one must transform oneself into fire and set it ablaze, thus suggesting the possibility of a leap from landscape to personal revolt, and to uprising. For Nakahira, urban revolt as "endless, personal advance to 'landscape'" necessitated not only the theoretical and aesthetic analysis of the landscape, but practical and violent intervention.

In his essay, "*Dojidai de arutowa nanika?*" (What is Contemporaneous?), which was published in *Dezain* (Design) four times during the period between May and August 1969, Nakahira relentlessly

---

<sup>134</sup> Nakahira Takuama, "*Mitsuzukeru hateni higa*," in *Gurafikeshon* [Graphication] (June 1970): 10-11.

criticized the spectacle of the movement that had been consumed in the media based on his experience of documenting university barricades and street struggles around 1968. Referencing the battle at the Yasuda Hall, Tokyo University in January 1969, which was the culmination of the university struggles in the sixties, Nakahira argued that the media—including himself—were taking photos from a safe place, i.e. behind the riot police, and however objective those photos may be, they were complicit with state power. It was from this standpoint that Nakahira aggressively questioned the relationship between politics and movement, reinterpreting his own forms of expression ontologically, and negating conventional photography and art.

Thus, based on Matsuda's landscape theory, Nakahira recaptured the concept of landscape as a discourse on expression, and went on to write essays and make statements on various occasions. Whereas Nakahira had previously turned his camera to the daily landscape, evidently a more theoretical approach was taken to landscape. Groups of photos made as 'landscape' and published in the same period in the aforementioned *Design* or *Provoke*, or those that were compiled in his own photography book *Kitarubeki kotoba no tameni* (For a language to come) show no relevance to the spectacle of events that was happening: uninhabited underground paths, street corners at night, stores and factories, were shot and printed with a practical methodology, later described as *are, bure* (rough and blurred), literally, presented materially. However, the ordinary landscape, which is beautiful as well as something to be set on fire and destroyed, is in fact a landscape that paradoxically anticipates the events to come, it is a landscape before the event. In other words, one could read in his photos both the traces of his struggle against landscape, and a crack inscribed in the landscape. In his review of Nakahira's *For a language to come*, critic Taki Koji, a member of *Provoke*, wrote of Nakahira's relation to the landscape as follows:

In other words, it is impossible to grasp the event logically when one is faced with the impulse to lend one's body to the world, remain 'inside' it, recall the landscape, and become part of the landscape oneself.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> Taki Koji, *Kotoba no nai shiko* [Thinking without words] (Tokyo: Tabatashoten, 1972), 93. Taki did not get directly involved in discussions of landscape theory, however his philosophical inquiries on gaze centering on photography shared the similar contemporary issues with landscape theory. For a compilation of his publications

It is through this confrontation with the landscape that Nakahira's photography and *A.K.A. Serial Killer* were closely and inevitably connected both in theory and practice. More importantly, Nakahira's landscape theory, while being formulated against the background of theories on image and visual art, was a more personal and autonomous discourse, established through his own viewfinder, and it helped organize Matsuda's complicated conceptualization and ambivalence, as well as his political discussions, which at times were too polemical, and thus clarified the direction of the argument as a theory of revolt-insurrection, or of revolution.

## **8. Landscape Theory according to Adachi Masao and Sasaki Mamoru**

From the middle of 1970 Adachi and Sasaki as well, along with Matsuda and Nakahira, started to discuss landscape theory. Since *A.K.A. Serial Killer* was produced but was not screened publicly, they were initially reluctant to talk about it. However, as interest in landscape theory grew due to the birth of *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* and Nakahira's occasional, though not too frequent participation, they began to be asked for their statements.

Adachi made the first statement on landscape in the round table discussion *Fukei o megutte* (Concerning landscape) published in *Kikan Shashin Eizo* (Photographic Image Quarterly) in November, 1970. In response to the ongoing discussion on landscape theory, this round-table discussion was conducted with artist Akasegawa Genpei, musician Tone Yasunao, stage director Sato Makoto, as well as art critic Nakahara Yusuke as moderator, in addition to Adachi and Nakahira. First the development of landscape and landscape theory was introduced by Nakahara, and next Adachi touched upon how he arrived at the concept of landscape, and came to choose a methodology to film the landscape exclusively through the filming of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*. Adachi first organized Matsuda's theory based on their shared understanding of landscape through the production of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, and then pointed out the two types of contexts for landscape: one was based on the discussion of a shift from situation theory to

---

from the early eighties, see Taki Koji, *Me no Inyu Shikaku no Genshogaku* [Metaphor of the Eyes Phenomenology of Visions] (Tokyo: Seidosha, 1992).

landscape theory, a major development, and the other based on the content that Matsuda tried to demonstrate with the word, 'landscape.' Based on both contexts in comparison to the situation theory, Adachi discusses landscape in terms such as 'concrete' or 'everyday', as in the following:

In fact, if situations is a conceptual problem of ours, then by calling it landscape, we can make all that is tackled within the concept more concrete and realistic; and in the sense that we tackle it in the process of making it more realistic, it is at least clear that landscape, not situations is more concrete and identifiably quotidian.<sup>136</sup>

Due to the fact that this discussion was organized by a photography magazine, naturally, the discussion was centered around photography and images, however, since artists and writers active in different domains were assembled, the content rather pertained to how each made their responses to the issue of landscape. In this sense what they described was not exactly about Matsuda or Nakahira's landscape theory itself, but landscape theory within the broader context of art and politics. In addition, given Adachi's statement that he had not read Matsuda's landscape theory, one could say that providing a theoretical overview was not their initial intent either. Therefore, though not all the relevant points were on the table, in as much as it indicated a broader interest in landscape theory at the time, this round-table discussion was extremely important. Also, in the January 1, 1970 issue of *Nihon Dokusho Shinbun* (Japan Reader's Newspaper), Adachi published the text <*Renzokushasatsuma*> *eno kakuu no shitsumon* (Imaginary Questions to <a serial killer>), in which the Nagayama incident and the shape of its trial were mentioned while Nagayama's trial was about to begin. Discussing what is ordinary and extraordinary, Adachi argues the inevitability of his methodology of filming only the landscape in *A.K.A. Serial Killer*.

In other words, the voluntary speed of committing four murders in Tokyo, Kyoto, Hakodate and Nagoya in two months, and the succession of discontinuous crimes, which were looked upon with wonder by criminology, suits the label of killer, however that is not where the problem lies. What matters, rather, is what became of him during the six-month period leading up to the fifth incident, in which he failed at his attempted crime; the period in which he buried a pistol, which was his only 'accomplice,' rented a room and worked as a bartender. And the question is, after

---

<sup>136</sup> Adachi Masao, "Toron-Fukei o megutte," [Discussion: Concerning landscape theory], *Kikan Shashin Eizo* [Photographic Image Quarterly], no.6 (October 1970): 118-134. This round-table discussion was conducted for the photography magazine. Participants included Nakahara Yusuke (art critic), Akasegawa Genpei (artist), Adachi Genpei (filmmaker), Tone Yasunao (musician/composer), Sato Makoto (theater director), and Nakahira Takuma (photographer), who were known for their radical practice and theory in the 60's and 70's. A partial translation of this talk was included in *From Postwar To Postmodern Art in Japan 1945-1989 Primary Documents*, 233-238. This is a version of a translation slightly revised by me.

transforming the unreality of a 'dream' into the everyday that the serial killer made explicit at the time of his wanderings, and the transformation of reality into the non-everyday as a return by the transformation of evil (*ma*) into the everyday—[which was] realized through committing murder in his wandering—on the same level, what happened when he led a life which, for him, in general was unrealistic, the best he could, as everyday in general, which was nothing but non-everyday.<sup>137</sup>

Meanwhile, Sasaki made his first reference to landscape theory in the round-table talk titled, *Oshima shimpoijumu* (Oshima symposium) compiled in *Sekai no eiga sakka 6 Oshima Nagisa* (Filmmakers of the world 6 Oshima Nagisa), which was one of the filmmakers' series, published by *Kinema Junpo*, with Oshima himself as editor. Though its publication date is September, 1970, it was actually sold in July.<sup>138</sup> The round-table talk was conducted by journalist Kawarabata Nei, actor Sato Kei, poet Sekine Hiroshi, film director Jissoji Akio, and film critic Sato Tadao as moderator, all of whom were closely connected to Oshima films. Each of them spoke about Oshima's debut film, *Ai to Kibo no Machi* (A Town of Love and Hope, 1959), and as works from the late 60s were referenced, Sasaki located Oshima's films - from *Kaettekita Yoparai* (Three Resurrected Drunkards, 1968), to *Shinjuku Dorobo Nikki* (Diary of a Shinjuku Thief, 1969), *Shonen* (Boy, 1969) and to *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* in the context of landscape theory, from cartographic perspective, and discussed what power in landscape means, referencing film as a medium in which the landscape must inevitably be shot.

As our time is increasingly becoming one in which we confront the so-called state power, state power is appearing in forms such as the helmet and shield and a fighting uniform, however at the same time, there is something like a landscape that we have been making up on our own.<sup>139</sup>

And while touching upon power in everyday life, stating, "Casually go to the station, casually walk on the street, casually drive a car—all of these become points of contact between us and state power..."<sup>140</sup> and furthermore, in *Boy*, despite the fact that a boy is the protagonist of the film, Sasaki continues his analysis of the landscape that is shown in the background. Though Sasaki's reference to

---

<sup>137</sup> Adachi Masao, "Renzoku shasatuma eno kakuu no shitsumon," [Imaginary questions to a 'serial killer'] in *Nihon Dokusho Shimbun* [Japan Reader's Newspaper], no.1578 (1st January 1971): 11.

<sup>138</sup> See "Henshusha kara" [From the editor] in *Sekai no Eigasakka 6 Oshima Nagisa* [Filmmakers of the world 6 Oshima Nagisa], (Tokyo: Kinemajumposha, 1970), 214.

<sup>139</sup> Sasaki Mamoru, "Oshima shimpoijumu," [Discussion: Oshima symposium], Kawarabata Nei, Sasaki, Sato Kei, Jissoji Akio, Sekine Hiroshi and Sato Tadao in *Sekai no Eigasakka 6 Oshima Nagisa*, 130.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, 130-131. Also, Sasaki argues that *Diary of a Shinjuku Thief* made a pioneering contribution in the genealogy of landscape theory-based films such as this. Sasaki Mamoru, "Scenario and film as joint production," Tamura Tsutomu and Sasaki, *Kinema Junpo*, no. 547 (1st April 1971): 111.

landscape is very limited, based on the fact that he was involved in the production of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, and Sozoshu, the details of his statement are valuable, as they are his analysis connecting both. While the conception of landscape theory was centered around Matsuda, who, as a critic, had more opportunities to talk than others, it must be emphasized that landscape theory itself was born as a result of collective discussions around *A.K.A. Serial Killer*.

## 9. Landscape and Uprising

In November 1970 Nakahira and Matsuda held a talk for the magazine *Kikan KEN* (Quarterly magazine KEN). Though subsequently a serialized column called *Fukei* (Landscape), consisting of Matsuda's essay and Nakahira's photographs ran from January through June 1971 in *Eiga Hihyo*, this is, in fact, the only text that was published as a talk between them. Though Nakahira's photograph was used for the cover of Matsuda's collected essays on landscape *The Extinction of landscape*, and Matsuda's portrait was also taken by Nakahira, the initial plan for the book had been to combine Nakahira's photographs with Matsuda's texts. It was not realized, however, and as a result, Matsuda published *The Extinction of landscape*, while Nakahira published his photography book *For a language to come*. Although this talk contains arguments that overlap with what has already been discussed here, as it is in a form of conversation, the content is extremely clear. In addition, especially since its philosophical background has been mentioned, it provides many useful insights for understanding the development of landscape theory.

First, discussing themes of this special issue with 'madness' and 'resentment' as important leads, they criticize cultural trends that strive to discover concepts of the pre-modern, such as indigenism, externally through geographical and historical movements. They continue that what needs to be analyzed is not a dichotomy between pre-modern and modern, but the homogenized state of modernity itself, by superimposing spatio-temporal movement in the external world upon a trajectory that is unique to one's interiority, and thereby making a connection to landscape theory. Providing the example of the riot at Shinjuku, they/and juxtaposing uprising and insurrection with revolution, they discussed how the tradition



of popular uprisings that had existed in the middle of Edo Period known as *Hitsuke* (arson) or *Uchikowashi* (destructive urban riot), could be reinterpreted, and transcended. They conclude that it is through the revolt and uprising that the landscape can be made visible.

Remember there was a struggle in the 'Kanda *Quartier Latin*?' Apart from the question of how effective that was tactically, I think the way the street, the air and the people of Shinjuku were harmoniously integrated at a time when the anti-riot law was being used against the Shinjuku Riot, [that] was really the landscape. By making a blow or something, landscape clearly comes to surface. After all, 'struggle in a liberated zone', or 'fire' brings landscape into existence...<sup>141</sup>

The struggle in the *Kanda Quartier Latin* was a street action, in which students occupied the university-dense Ochanomizu area in June 1968. It was named after the demonstration in the Quartier Latin in Paris. The Shinjuku Riot took place on International Anti-War Day, when students and workers occupied Shinjuku Station and surrounding areas, and it was the first time after the war that the anti-riot law had been applied. Both are remembered as historical events of street uprising and street occupation. Nakahira discovers 'landscape' in the streets and people that come to be seen through these events and practices. On the other hand, Matsuda traces the origins of landscape theory to the time of filming *A.K.A. Serial Killer*. Describing the pleasure he experienced while taking a bus trip on the Tomei Highway, he attributed the sense not only to the speed of the car, but to the beautiful scenery, with undulating mountains, valleys and plains. However, he claims that at the same time, his questioning of the very structure that generates this scenery provided an occasion to think about landscape.

A gigantic state power draws a single line with one quick stroke on the map of Japan; it starts to develop roads, and that is how it has shaped the scenery (*keshiki*) as it is now. In fact, by 'harmonizing' natural beauty with artificial beauty, what provided the 'great progress' in the highway administration is the state power (...) Not nature or climate, but indeed an array of sceneries for sightseeing, like picture postcards, which can only be called landscape that I determined myself to think about thoroughly.<sup>142</sup>

Furthermore, Matsuda puts past debates over and the development of landscape theory into perspective. While comparing landscape theory with situation theory using the allegory of Japanese chess

---

<sup>141</sup> Matuda Masao, "Soto no hebi ni" [A double-headed snake], Nakahira Takuma and Matsuda Masao, *KEN*, no.2 (October 1970): 151.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 151-152.

(*shogi*), he argues that landscape theory insists on the continuation of a new struggle in the seventies; however, what was at stake was a radical rethinking of politics and thought itself.

I was only saying no more and no less than, let us fight it out, or think through the seventies from the point to which we have stepped, diagonally and backwards.<sup>143</sup>

As Nakahira comments in the talk that he was surprised that Matsuda, whom he perceived as a revolutionary, had developed a remarkable landscape theory—Matsuda had in fact taken on leadership roles in struggles such as the anti-U.S. Security struggle in 1960, direct and militant actions, as well as violent revolution in theory and practice. Interestingly, however there was some criticism that Matsuda's proposal of landscape theory was politically regressive. For instance, in the above noted talk for

*Photographic Image Quarterly*, Tone indicated the following regarding the word landscape:

Landscape used to be pejorative until recently. [...] Matsuda reversed its meaning and gave the word a positive nuance. But whether it is an 'event piece' or 'pop art,' in the sense that, by putting what is trivial up front, it calls into question its prior experience beyond the consciousness of representation, it may be the same. However, when landscape is addressed, we must say, after all, that it is a time of decadence. Because when Matsuda Masao mentions such a thing as landscape, it obviously means a retreat in the battle.<sup>144</sup>

Such criticism, it can be said, was certainly inevitable, from a politics-centric perspective, or in the context of 'politics' with a capital 'P'. In response Matsuda himself critically and openly examined his own stance at the time, with a focus on theorizing and writing, as well as landscape theory as his task.

If we set the agenda for how to go beyond [forms of protests such as] '*hitsuke*' and '*uchikowashi*', it has become inevitable that we must consider it in an 'indirect' domain, where terms such as 'modern' or 'primitive' are overused. Since in the sixties - not in the fifties - I was on the side of making Molotov cocktails the first time, I think that chatting endlessly about problems in the domain of directionality 'indirectly' is weak. However, it will be of no help if we try this way or that to find what comes ahead of Molotov cocktails as extended patterns of our physical action [...] However, not the domain of directionality, but even in the realm where 'indirect' concepts fly wildly, I have encountered the intractable problem of landscape or landscape theory.<sup>145</sup>

Whereas many of the influential Marxist revolutionary theories from that time no longer hold sway, landscape theory still has potential today is precisely because it kept a critical distance from politics with a capital 'P', as well as from the vanguardism of the time, thereby foreseeing the transition into a new

---

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., 155.

<sup>144</sup> Tone Yasunao, "Toron-Fukei o megutte," 122-123.

<sup>145</sup> Matsuda, "Soto no hebi ni," Nakahira and Matsuda, 157.

system. It also analyzed the subsumption of all aspects of everyday life, including our own existence within that, through a concept of landscape as a multifaceted entity, and from that standpoint it addressed the key question of how one can fight against something that of which one is intrinsically a part. Meanwhile, in the midst of that time, after the peak of *Zenkyoto* and when radical calls for armed struggle and revolutionary war started to be all talk and no real action, Matsuda's choice was to focus on the concept of landscape. It meant that a pursuit of revolution and insurrection during such a transitional period required a creativity and radicalism that differed completely from that of the theories and practices of the past. In the sense that it critiqued and questioned the existing revolutionary concepts, landscape theory was the "primary thought of the seventies," or the post-'68 theory of revolution. At the same time, however, landscape theory, which fully succeeded the potential of what the initial revolution of the '68 embodied, was not a post-'68 thought, but rather can be identified as a thought of 1968.

## **10. Landscape as Revolutionary Theory**

With the defeat of the street struggles and university struggles of 1967–'69 by the thorough crackdown of the state police, some of the radical sects and anarchists decided to shift their direction to armed struggle and underground activities, moving from man-to-man tactical street warfare to urban guerilla warfare. Though the Red Army faction declared the Tokyo war and the Osaka war, they were enormously impacted by mass arrests during the military training at *Daibosatsu Toge* (mountain pass)—which aimed to occupy the Prime Minister's residence in November, 1969. In addition, the movement itself tapered off after finishing International Anti-war Day in October and the Struggle against Prime Minister Sato's visit to the U.S. in November. Discussing the shift of the State system, landscape theory aimed to criticize the politics-oriented revolutionary theory on one hand, while in practice and tactics, it began to act in concert with the military line of the Red Army faction, foreseeing changes to come in movement.

In the December 1970 issue of *Contemporary Eye*, Matsuda published an essay, *Meiro no oku no komyune* (Commune deep inside the maze) in an attempt to develop landscape theory as a theory of

revolution. Debates and counterarguments over landscape theory were offered in the first half of the essay, and by way of his experience of the unequal distribution of food between sect and non-sect groups within the barricades, Matsuda focused his attention on everyday living spaces as a site in which to stage revolution, to demonstrate the need for a new theory of the commune. While he had already addressed this need in *City as Landscape*, *At the entrance of the invisible village* and other texts, in this essay Matsuda argued for the reconstruction of communal experiences based on struggle as everyday practice.

Matsuda then published a text, the third one about Oshima's *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*, titled, *Naze Fukei Senso ka* (Why landscape war?) for the press release for a screening at Cannes International Film Festival Critics Week in May 1970. The text was later reprinted in the No. 7, 1970 issue of the magazine *Eiga Hihyo*, as well as included in Matsuda's book *The Extinction of landscape*. Since the text was written for an overseas audience, and the passing of time after the production of the film was taken into consideration, it serves to clarify the explanation of the everyday as the site of struggle. Matsuda first introduces the status of political movement in Japan centering around the Red Army faction, and then discuss how the landscape occupied a crucial role in this film. He concludes that in the post '68 situations, that is, what is referred to *senjo* (post-war) in *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*, what is at stake is the continuation of the daily struggle of urban guerilla warfare, rather than frenzied street demonstration, and that landscape theory serves as a theoretical support for its tactics.

Metaphorically speaking, 'landscape,' like water in the ocean, exists everywhere in the living spaces of the populace, and comes to be seen as an ordinary place. In some conditions it is a harsh space that grabs one of them by its deadly jaws. However, it has reached such an extreme that the tremendous ruling power beyond the landscape cannot be revealed unless today's Japanese students, before anything else, discover themselves living through the survival in this landscape. (...) In this sense one might say that progressive Japanese youth are gradually shifting away from an extraordinary phase of combat with the goal of utopia as a space of nowhere, toward resisting the ubiquitous space of the landscape, and toward how they can overcome it.<sup>146</sup>

In viewing landscape theory as a theory of revolution, it could be pointed out that—as I discussed earlier—the structural analysis of landscape, which was remarkably prophetic, was borne out of a theoretical and tactical necessity to thoroughly understand landscape as an 'enemy,' and how one must

---

<sup>146</sup> Matsuda, "Naze fukei senso ka?" [Why Landscape War?] in *Eiga Hihyo* [Film Criticism], no. X, (July 1971): 40-41; *Fukei no Shimetsu* [The Extinction of Landscape], (Tokyo: Tabatashoten, 1971), 240-244.

fight against it in everyday life. It is also in this context that it becomes clear why Matsuda, around the time of, or in parallel to, landscape theory, actively discussed figures and topics such as Che Guevara, Franz Fanon, Louis Auguste Blanqui, Lev Davidovich Trotsky, Osugi Sakae, Haniya Yutaka, Tsumura Takashi, the Paris Commune, and the International Volunteer Army. Essays on them were included in *The Extinction of landscape*, however, since they were written as theory of revolution or the third world revolutionary theory, landscape theory itself was not exactly the main topic of discussion. It should be said, however, that they are not only political theories, but they all share issues that are closely related to landscape theory. Conversely, in as much as landscape theory is indeed intrinsically connected to those revolutionary theories, they are mutually supportive, and this attests to the fact that the analysis of landscape theory as film theory, image theory or theory of state=power alone constitutes only a partial examination of this rather complex concept. It is thus based on this connection that Matsuda decided to include both landscape theory and revolutionary theory in *The Extinction of landscape*.

In this brief moment of life and death, people of the third world organized themselves as their own military, and also, again affirm themselves as people. In the space in which guerillas are generated, uniforms themselves are enemies. After incorporating a course to abolish their own uniforms beforehand, they transform themselves into soldiers. In other words, the military, together with the state, always exists as a dying target there.<sup>147</sup>

It is however because of his weakness that he was able to have this moment of becoming the first practitioner of the philosophy of the International Volunteer Army, which was ridiculed by those who had claimed to be strong. He was a pioneer. Or, what occurred to him may have been frenzies that only lasted for three days. However, would it be the case that "at the most appropriate moment" he was able to convert himself from a person into a soldier, and after three days, was he then demobilized and returned to a person? I will stake the possibility of revolution that he will become a soldier again at a new, 'appropriate moment' to come.<sup>148</sup>

The former text, *Gerira kukan to wa nani ka?* (What is guerilla space?) was published immediately after *City as landscape*. Discussing the revolutionary theory of Che Guevara, Matsuda asked what guerilla soldiers are in the third world: By grasping the connections between party and guerilla, as well as people and military, not as a one-way line, but rather as a reciprocal mechanism of transformation, he illuminated the problem of institutional power which dwells in the uniform itself as part of everyday

---

<sup>147</sup> Matsuda, "Gerira kukan to wa nani ka?" [What is Guerilla Space?"] in *Fukei no shimetsu*, 35.

<sup>148</sup> Matsuda, "Soshikiron o megutte," [Concerning the organization theory] in *Fukei no shimetsu*, 56.

life in the military. Further criticizing the doctrine centering around the official military, which Blanqui would call "troops of oppressed slaves", he exhorted the historical rehabilitation of the militia (*minpei*) as "liberated people's troops" when the military was rather called the vanguard in the course of making the transition to armed struggle line in movement in Japan. Meanwhile, latter text, *Soshikiron o megutte* (Concerning organization theory) was published in the same year as *What is guerilla space?*. Here, the context is rather specific to Japan, and Matsuda starts countering the criticism made about a young man, who, after participating in the Viet Nam War as a member of the International Volunteer Army of Japan, became a drug addict. Mediated by Haniya's revolutionary theory, Matsuda compares Partisan Quintet with the Red Army Faction to discuss tactical possibilities and limitations in the sixties, and propose a new organizational theory towards the seventies.

When one calls 'people equals soldiers', the vanguard exists as an equal sign $\Leftrightarrow$  as a circuit to guarantee the transition. In any circumstances, the vanguard should never substantiate itself, but stand still quietly as a mere sign, no more or no less.<sup>149</sup>

Here, Matsuda insisted on discussing organization theory not in terms of politics, but in terms of tactics, and he thoroughly negating the vanguard revolutionary subject. He strove to discover the possibility of revolution not in the established military forces fighting in extraordinary conditions, but rather in people, who, with their own weaknesses, commit themselves to even a moment as a soldier by crossing back and forth between everyday and non-everyday life. Subsequently in *Commune in the depth of a maze* Matsuda states, "the widely known opposition between the intellectual and popular masses in the sixties should be reinterpreted as intellectual  $\Leftrightarrow$  popular masses." Rather than assuming these oppositions between masses and soldiers, or intellectuals and masses are dichotomies, or prioritizing one over the other, or unilaterally reducing one into the other, a new organization theory was sought in the incessantly de-subjectivizing process of becoming. His claim was that there is no 'correct' revolution by a 'correct' political subject, but that there was the continuous struggle of remaining in the everyday landscape rather than the extraordinary vanguard spectacle. Furthermore, instead of emphasizing the dichotomy between the everyday life of the masses and the extraordinariness of politics and revolution,

---

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 57.

and embracing the former in the relationship to the latter, he insisted on trying to connect them, proposing that they were on equal footing.

Meanwhile, similar points more in terms of practice are referenced in *Dare kara korosu bekika?* (Who should be killed first?) published in February 1971 in the art magazine *Bijutsutecho*. In this text Matsuda discusses *Seizoku* (*Sex Jack*, 1970) directed by Wakamatsu and scripted by Adachi, which was in fact inspired by actual events of armed struggle, including the hijacking of the Japan Airlines 'Yodo' airplane by the Japanese Red Army Faction. Interestingly however, the film is not the story of a radical group itself, but of solitary terrorism, committed by the protagonist, a young man who was sheltering the radicals.

It is only those who can endure time, in this sense of the term, who can kill people for the first time. The reverse, of course is true, and conceivably, even terrorists can let their will deteriorate and die of old age. What is interesting about Wakamatsu's new film, *Sex Jack*, is that the film was able to depict this dialectic of time in terrorism to some extent. A hit and kill, or killing of a police officer in the street, or the assault on a Stalinist bureaucrat, and finally to the assassination of the prime minister; or the case of the failure of a group of four students, who are immediately arrested after coming out from having kept in hiding for a few years or a few days. They all start with the sharing of that 'time' that they have in common, that is "far more absurd, boring and difficult."<sup>150</sup>

In the discussion of this film Matsuda references Russian writer Boris Savinkov, who wrote about the task of the terrorist, remarking on the time that is spent in boredom, doing something other than holding a bomb and stepping out to the street. That, he argues, is what the film successfully depicted. It is further important to note that the film absolutely negates a narrative in which the young man is enduring this boring time for the sublime purpose of terrorism: the accounts of killing a security guard or bombing the Communist Party Headquarters or assassinating the Prime Minister are told through an article in the newspaper that the young man buys for the students who are hiding. There is no mention of why terrorism was determined at all, and the young man comes back into the room indifferently. Therefore, what is depicted most in the film is the downtime that the students spend in a small, dirty apartment, trying to recruit the young man to join the terrorist group in the name of solidarity with the workers. Rather than a

---

<sup>150</sup> Matsuda, "*Darekara korosu bekika?*" [Who should be killed first?] in *Fukei no shimetsu*, 200.

transition from ordinary, everyday life into an extraordinary life, the apocalyptic landscape of neither the ordinary nor the extraordinary continues endlessly.

In addition, it is important to note that the issue of representing time in this way—that is to say, the problematic of a revolution of time rather than a revolution of space— is a task unique to landscape theory. As I repeatedly mention, landscape exists as a complex, assemblage of all elements; it is all-encompassing, subsuming both the vanguard and rear guard, students and workers, all classes, collapsing the dichotomy between the ordinary and the extraordinary. Indeed, the crux of landscape theory lies in the radical theorization of both survival within this dark, forlorn landscape, and tactical analysis of it, as an opportunity to subvert its omnipresence.

## 11. Changes within Landscape Theory

In the course of debates surrounding landscape theory, another main factor that made its understanding difficult was underlying theoretical differences between those who were involved. Also, as I mentioned earlier, despite the fact that screenings of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* were suspended, the discourse concerning the film developed independently nonetheless. The circumstances became further complicated, since *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*—which was screened publicly—ended up being the film considered as representative of landscape theory, however due to difficulty of the film, it was hardly understood. In addition, as too much emphasis was placed on the shift from 'situation' to 'landscape,' there was a great deal of sheer rejection of the film. Hence, it became extremely difficult to further the discussion through theoretical debates. Matsuda himself recalls the developments as follows:

First as I mentioned earlier, in June, 1970, when some of my approaches to landscape theory began to get published, and, with the efforts of Nakahira Takuma were in the process of being reframed as a common theme from the domain of film into a broader discussion among various art genres, the completion of Oshima Nagisa's *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* became, in a sense, an unfortunate incident for landscape theory, which was just in the process of formation. Because, contrary to all the misunderstanding, the idea for the film to be shot as a man's will that ended up consisting of tons of landscape shots was, in fact, the contribution of Hara Masataka, another joint script writer, who was unrelated to either myself or Adachi Masao, or even his collaborator for the script of this film, Sasaki Mamoru. To exaggerate a bit, I cannot resist the feeling that the discussion about landscape theory, transcending borders and generations, has



become universal in its contemporaneity. However, as is already made clear by Hara Masataka, who has criticized my landscape theory, the possibility of debate between Hara and us lies in the fact that we must use the same term, albeit in different contexts; we could also say that this involves the difficulties of this shared task.<sup>151</sup>

Of course, 'landscape as man's will', or the 'post-Tokyo War as illusion' in *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* as subjects themselves represent problematics that are distinctively characteristic of landscape theory, and one could say that the theoretical targets of both Matsuda and Hara almost seem to overlap. However, Hara was highly critical of Matsuda's landscape theory; employing the notion of intersubjectivity proposed by Maurice Merleau-Ponty, he developed his own theory in an attempt to locate the concept of landscape rather ontologically. His seminal essay, *Sekai nai sonzai no fukeiron teki tenbo* (Landscape theory-oriented perspective on being-in-the world) was then published in *Eiga Hihyo* in October 1970.

Thus, since Matsuda has entrusted the 'gaze' to the lower class proletariat, the notion of landscape as construct has entirely been lost, and landscape has instead become synonymous with a painting of Mt. Fuji at a bathhouse. Then, he has climbed up to the height of situations theory, a privileged domain from which only he can look out, and has become overwhelmed by ecstasy and anxiety. What Matsuda refers to as landscape is, in an attempt to shift from a theory of situation to landscape theory, none other than an expression [of the point] where his own sensitivity towards time, situations and restlessness are reified into the landscape.<sup>152</sup>

Here, Hara criticizes Matsuda for his glorification of the proletariat in his essay on Nagayama. The fact that Matsuda included the critique of landscape theory in the inaugural issue of a film journal that he was involved in demonstrates his fairness toward the debate between the two. As was discussed earlier, one could say that this criticism does not seem applicable to Matsuda's argument, as he was attempting to hammer out a concept for a new class through this wandering lower-class proletariat. Referencing generational differences, Hara's argument tends to be rather schematic in articulating the opposition between the old and new generations. On the other hand, it seems undeniable that his

---

<sup>151</sup> Matsuda, "Fupei no shimetsu no tameni," in *Fupei no shimetsu*, 281-282

<sup>152</sup> Hara Masataka, *Sekai-nai-sonzai no fukeironteki chobo* [Landscape theory-oriented view of being-in-the-world], *Eiga Hihyo*, no.1, (October 1970): 42-57. The title of this essay was revised to "Fukeironteki chobo," [[Landscape theory-oriented view] when compiled in *Mitai eiga no koto dakeo* [Only about films I want to watch] (Tokyo: Yubunsha, 1977), Hara's first book of collected essays.

misreading is due to Matsuda's rather emphatic critique of 'situation.' After his critique of Matsuda, Hara goes on to scathingly criticize Oshima 's *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*.

Look at Nagayama Norio. He succeeded in shifting the classical origin by accepting his own fictitiousness to its extreme within landscape. Rather than tearing the landscape apart, Nagayama Norio completed it. There is nothing in his origin in which landscape is understood as a hostile power. For him, landscape serves to complete the fictitiousness of his murderous intent. It is in this sense that 'landscape exists everywhere ubiquitously', and his 'gaze,' which strives to accept the fictitious substance to its extreme, at the same time becomes landscape, with its own individual beauty. The landscape depicted in the will left on film in *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* is the landscape that opens up as the fiction of protagonist Motoki Shoichi's fetishism is completed. However he does not understand it. As a result, he shifts the origin based on the cause and effect that, because of such and such reason he filmed this landscape. In any event, wouldn't it be true that the shift of origin in the classical sense and the shift of the origin in the art are initially on a different level?<sup>153</sup>

As a practical response to Oshima and Matsuda, Hara created his own landscape film, *Hatsukunishirasumeramikoto* (First Emperor, 1973). On the other hand, unlike script writer Hara or Sasaki, Oshima never proactively discussed landscape or landscape theory, but rather tried to keep his distance from it. Oshima explains his intentions in the production of this film as follows:

The Red Army screamed, the Osaka War last September, and then the Tokyo War in November. However this was an illusion. Each sect was shouting that they would risk their deaths in the fight, but finally not a single person died, while of course I was also roaming around the vicinity of Haneda Airport holding a camera. *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* is the answer to the question 'how can men die?'. At the same time, it was a requiem, dedicated with thought and emotion, to the peaceful Japan twenty-five years after the Second World War—in which, rather than dying willingly, many young men were just killed—and to the dead who were in their adolescence after war.<sup>154</sup>

Referencing his own *Seishun Zankoku Monogatari* (*Cruel Story of Youth*, 1960), which is closely linked with the Anpo Struggle of 1960, Oshima locates this film ten years after *Cruel Story of Youth*—in other words, after the *Anpo* struggle. The film is a response to the question of how one can bury the 1970s, which paradoxically also answers the question of how one can live in the 70's. Whereas Oshima shared with Matsuda and others the problematic of seeking new thought towards the 70's, it can be said that his attempt was to place the film within the broader contexts of the history of the movement, and post-war

---

<sup>153</sup> Hara, *Mitai eiga no koto dakeo*, 99-100.

<sup>154</sup> Oshima Nagisa, "Shisha eno chinkonka," [Requiem for the dead] in *Kaitai to Funshutsu* [Deconstruction and Eruption] (Tokyo: Haga Shoten, 1970), 187.

modern history. In his review of Matsuda's book *The Extinction of Landscape*, reflecting on the production of *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, Oshima discusses the circumstance surrounding landscape theory as a response to criticism of this book from a reader.

In this sense, it was astonishing and also justifying that essays included in *The Extinction of Landscape* kept being written based on the experience of the film that he himself produced. Although there were many people who received Matsuda Masao's <landscape theory> as simply a 'general theory', it was indeed a theory written with his flesh and blood. And yet it is too egotistical that so-called the <landscape film>, Matsuda's recent point of foundation, is not shown in public. I of course have not seen it, either.<sup>155</sup>

Oshima points out that Matsuda's relationship to cinema significantly had shifted as a result of filming *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, and because of this, landscape theory tended to be understood not in the context of film, but rather as a general theory. However Oshima notes, in actuality, landscape theory was deeply rooted in Matsuda's thought and practice in cinema. On the other hand Oshima was critical about the fact that the film remained unreleased to the public. Tamura Tsutomu likewise had an extremely negative response to the film's content, as well as the decision to withhold screenings.<sup>156</sup> Evidently, *A.K.A. Serial Killer*—though Adachi, who was a co-scriptwriter for Sozosha along with Oshima and Sasaki participated in its production—was not necessarily received favorably by other Sozosha members.

Despite its radicalism, because the word 'landscape' was used, landscape theory became widespread; however at the same time, because of the neutrality of the word 'landscape', interpreting the theory was fraught with ambiguity and misunderstanding. Under these circumstances, poet and Provoke member Takahiko Okada conducted a theoretical mapping of various remarks on landscape. In the commentary on *Kitarubeki Kotoba no Tameni* (For a Language to Come), centering on landscapes in the work of poet Rainer Maria Rilke, and *Landscape into Art* by art historian Kenneth Clark, Okada discusses the western concept of landscape and organizes its lineage.

---

<sup>155</sup> Oshimaa Nagisa, "Shohyo Matsuda Masao cho, 'Fukey no Shimetsu'," [Book review of Matsuda Masao's 'The Extinction of Landscape'], *Kinema Jumbo*, no.568, (15<sup>th</sup> December 1971): 155.

<sup>156</sup> "The person who became the angriest of all after watching [the film] was Mr. Tamura Tsutomu. He made a genuine and strong critique saying that [we] created a film that it was not necessary to make, and knowing the impossibility of presenting people in the way [that is shown in the film] [we] set something that is initially impossible at its methodic core and made it into a movie. That is unacceptable." Adachi Masao, *Eiga/Kakumei* [Film/Revolution] (Tokyo: Kawadeshoboshinsha), 297-298.

However, in order to return to the subtle character or attraction of landscape which brings about this many subtle issues, I would like to deliberately inquire about the previous state of landscape, and understand its current state. For this, I believe that it is appropriate to focus my discussion on the point at which the concept of landscape became prominent in the transition of landscape paintings.<sup>157</sup>

A theoretical introduction such as this was particularly important at a time when the concept of 'landscape' had not been thoroughly elaborated, in providing theoretical support to Nakahira's practice and landscape theory. However, a seemingly essential attempt to locate landscape in a theoretical and historical lineage had the danger of pushing Matsuda/Nakahira's landscape theory—which derived from outside the framework of the other 'theories' of landscape in the west or Japan, and were meant to remain in that position—back into an existing framework, thrusting the actual core of their novel landscape theory to the background.<sup>158</sup> In fact, discrepancies and gaps that came up due to the use and abuse of the term landscape theory can be found in some of the arguments at the time. For instance *Dento to Bunka* (Tradition and Culture), a journal of thought, had specialists from various fields, including Japanese cultural history, folklore studies, literature, art history and visual arts, discuss histories and concepts of landscape in Japan and the west. A roundtable was held, called *Toshi to fukei*"(City and landscape), which included Nakahira as one of the participants. It was evident that this special issue was published in response to a landscape boom. Though superb as a project to reexamine the so-called theories of landscape, employing multifarious disciplinary perspectives neutralized the discussion, causing one to lose sight of why landscape had become an issue in 1970.<sup>159</sup> On the other hand, the concept of landscape,

---

<sup>157</sup> Okada Takahiko "Fukei ni tsuite," [Concerning Landscape] in Nakahira Takuma, *Kitarubeki Kotoba no Tameni* [For a Language to Come] (Tokyo: Fudoshu, 1970), 187.

<sup>158</sup> In his review of *For a Language to Come*, addressing the difficulty of publishing the work of photographer like Nakahira as a photography book, Adachi commented on Okada's argument as follows: "It will be also fortunate for his <work> to have Okada Takahiko authoritatively specify the meaning of 'landscape' with attention paid to both east and west." Adachi Masao, "Yami kara sosei suru <kotoba> e," ["Words' resuscitating from the darkness], *Kozo* [Structure] (January 1970): 132-133.

<sup>159</sup> In his discussion of landscape via visual media, critic Eto Fumio commented on the landscape boom at the time as follows. "Now again, theories of landscape are becoming a popular phenomenon. Most of them are in praise of Japanese beauty prior to [the time of] Shiga Shigetaka, which was denied by his scientific eyes. Even in what had gone through the machine called visual images, by conversely passing through the machine, its aesthetic sense is surviving. Landscape must change now." Eto Fumio, "Fukei o miru me" (The Eyes that See the Landscape), *Dento to Genzai* (Tradition and Now), no.4, (March 1971): 68. In response to this critique, Matsuda refuted as follows: "As far as I know in the <landscape theory> boom since last year, aside from whether the writers stance is hardcore or

which exhibited new potential—through the Osaka Expo, and the subsequent massive state-level "Discover Japan,"<sup>160</sup> campaign, accompanied by urban engineering, urbanism and architectural theories—was again assimilated by the state and capitalism itself. Nakahara noted the uproar, commenting on the limits of landscape theory as follows:

The world that even now spreads across the viewfinder is still far away and beautiful, remaining purely as landscape. That is a fact. However, I think I will stop talking about it as landscape anymore. Landscape has penetrated almost all media to the point that it has become cultural jargon. The word landscape should have been uttered as 'thought' that is rooted in, starts from, and then should be tested against reality. The impact that the term 'landscape' had when it was initially put out into the world by Matsuda Masao and his peers appears to be somewhat weakening. [...] Landscape theory must not lose its substance. To prevent this, perhaps, the spark of the word landscape must be sought after again in other language.<sup>161</sup>

In response to the landscape theory boom, Matsuda also points out that the condition is absolutely contrary to what they intended.

However, what was initially important was an encounter with the landscape, and it should never be for unnecessarily rigorous study. Just like a blind man touching an elephant, in the course of caressing the landscape, people have stepped into a serious maze.<sup>162</sup>

Meanwhile, young critic Tsumura Takashi, who was also writing for *Eiga Hihyo*, wrote a theoretical critique on landscape theory in the review section of *Japan Reader's Newspaper*.

It is of no small significance that Matsuda's 'landscape theory' raised the point that, for modern man as *voyant*, landscape is constituted itself as a text of state power. I would venture to say, however, that the problems he raised were always too clean. The text of the state and its enforcing message to a natural standpoint is extremely diverse and covered with complex 'noise.' Though

---

softcore, there was absolutely no one who expressed his/her opinion from the viewpoint of praising Japanese beauty. It is indeed in the special issue of the journal that such a dubious view of the praise of Japanese beauty revived in the name of <landscape theory>." "Fukei" [Landscape] in *Eiga Hihyo* [Film criticism], no.7 (April 1971): 11.

<sup>160</sup> The Osaka World Expo, which was held from March to September 1970 attracted approximately 64,000,000 people from all over Japan the course of about six months. This means that an average of one out of two people in Japan visited Osaka. The event caused a crazed migration of people, prompting individual travel whereas up until then, group tours had been the norm in Japan. In order to retain those individual travel consumers after the Worlds Fair, Japan National Railways teamed up with the Japanese advertising agency Dentsu (even before the World Expo) and created a nation-wide ad campaign called "Discover Japan." With the subtitle "Beautiful Japan and Me" and the tag line "Discover Japan, rediscover yourself," the campaign sought to promote tourism to places of scenic beauty across Japan.

<sup>161</sup> Nakahira Takuma, "Imaji karano Dasshutsu"[Escape from Images], *Design* (February 1971): 16; *Mitsuzukeru Hate ni Hi ga...* [Fire at the Limits of My Perpetual Gazing: Collection of Criticism 1965-1977] (Tokyo: Osiris, 2007), 161.

<sup>162</sup> Matsuda Masao, "Fukei"[Landscape] in *Eiga Hihyo*, no.5 (February 1971): 10.

Matsuda states that what is beyond the landscape is the State, this 'noise' that is in this world, is also the State. What it means is that the State cannot be a simple apparatus of violence; it means the presence of the State as a structure of terror.<sup>163</sup>

However, in another <culture>, or everyday life as cultural residue, it is rather a gaze that becomes a fetish and is consumed like a commodity. In other words, something like <reading ability = commodity> exists against <labor power = commodity>. In this culture of 'ke' (everyday), people believe that cities and landscapes are something <natural>. It is however the gap between this fetishized gaze and the city or landscape, or the noise existing between them that is a hole where the state is hiding itself. Through various urban realities—in particular, through living space and space of journalism—the state splits people apart.<sup>164</sup>

Though these short texts were not originally written with the main purpose of developing a critique of landscape theory, Matsuda received them as basically the first serious critiques of his landscape theory, determined to present the reconstruction from the landscape theory to the theory of State.

Yes, "Landscape is the text of the State power", and according to what Tsumura Takashi discussed elsewhere, "Landscape is a mask where power conceals itself, and points to itself at the same time." (*Eiga Hihyo*, July issue, 1971) When the technological-aesthetic 'mask' is unveiled, we confront the giant iron claws of a dying State. Thus, 'landscape theory' cannot help but be accurately reconstructed as 'State theory'.<sup>165</sup>

Tsumura's critique was that Matsuda's understanding of landscape as equal to State and power was simplistic, arguing that all aspects, even the 'noise' that constitute the landscape are embodiments of State=power, and understanding landscape as total subsumption of everyday life. It was a fair critique, however, that Matsuda's attempt to shift focus to the theory of the State was somewhat hasty. Matsuda had already developed his argument on landscape as apparatus of control and governance, a complex assemblage that encompasses all aspects of everyday life, apparently indicating the contemporaneity and possibility of landscape. In this sense, Tsumura's critique provided a supplementary insight into what Matsuda's 'incomplete' argument could not express. Possibly Matsuda needed to proceed with an even more precise theorization of landscape theory—since, in his discussions of new media theory, even after his critique of landscape theory, Tsumura continuously referred to 'landscape' as a concept crucial in

---

<sup>163</sup> Tsumura Takashi, *Rekishino Dakkan* [Recapturing History] (Tokyo: Serika Shobo, 1972), 233-234.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, 235.

<sup>165</sup> Matsuda, *Fukei no shimetsu*, 287

analyzing the structure of power.<sup>166</sup> As critic Takenaka Ro ironically commented, "[Matsuda] easily bowed (pretended to bow) before Tsumura Takashi 's criticism"<sup>167</sup> in the review of *The Extinction of landscape*, Tsumura's criticism could have been taken as a strategic excuse for Matsuda to wrap up the controversy over landscape theory in one form or another. As a result, rather than shifting to State theory as proposed by Matsuda, landscape theory would develop into a theory of reportage, or theory of information media. In his conversation with Nakahira, Adachi discusses the development as follows:

We—Mr. Nakahira, Matsuda Masao and others—discussed landscape theory, the landscape of the situations that endlessly confronts us, as a reflection of our flexibly-structured society. We said that, if we try to act as revolutionary soldiers, we should penetrate into the landscape as into an 'ocean,' and swim in the landscape like 'fish.' Mr. Nakahira talked about the words of life that arise from within the landscape. Matsuda Masao called for a struggle against the landscape of the State, in search of the "extinction of landscape" as a reflection of the State. And, we continued to consider that a theory of information media must be established so that even discussing landscape theory could not be 'episode-ized.' Specifying that 'information' is what we create, and 'news report' is what we struggle to win, we came to consider 'news report' on our landscape.<sup>168</sup>

Matsuda's writings on the theory of reportage as a new media theory were later compiled into the book, *Fukanosei no Media* (Media of Impossibility, 1973). At the same time, realizing that "in the early 70's, I myself now feel strongly about the need to re-evaluate the process of how our feud with landscape theory is both gradually and rapidly sublated into a strategic development of cinema=movement,"<sup>169</sup> Matsuda published his collected essays on cinema/movement, titled *Hakuchumu o Ute* (Shoot the Daydream, 1972). Meanwhile, after putting the theory of reportage into practice in *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*, Adachi compiled his theoretical essays in the book *Eiga eno Senryaku* (Strategies for Cinema, 1974). Nakahira turned towards his theory of materiality for photographing things themselves, which would lead to his book of collected essays on the theory of photography, *Naze Shokubutsu zukan ka* (Why an Illustrated Book of Plants, 1973).

---

<sup>166</sup> For instance, see Tsumura Takashi, "Hiyo=Undo no Kochiku no tameni,"(For the construction of criticism=movement) in *Media no Seiji* [Politics of Media] (Tokyo: Shobunsha, 1974), 114-157.

<sup>167</sup> Takenaka Ro, "Ken o Okashi yuku Kiten," (Embark on the Adventure to the Origin), *Tosho Shimibun* [The Book Review Press], no.1141 (11<sup>th</sup> December 1971): 3.

<sup>168</sup> Adachi Masao, "Mediaron eno kaitai puran," [Deconstructing plan toward media theory], Adachi Masao and Nakahira Takuma, *Eiga Hiyo*, no.32 (May 1973): 93.

<sup>169</sup> Matsuda, *Hakuchumu o Ute*, 331.

## 12. Theories of Landscape from the Same Period in Literature, Urban Studies and Architecture

Contemporaneous to Matsuda and others' landscape theory, literary critic Okuno Takeo, discussed landscape in the context of literature. Okuno published *Gendai Bungaku Fudoki* (Regional Gazetteers for Contemporary Literature), which discussed the relationship between climate, landscape and literature in 1968. He also wrote multiple essays on landscape in the literary journal *Subaru* between October 1970 and November 1971. In his serial work *Bungaku ni okeru Genfukei* (Primal Landscapes in Literature), which analyzed creative foundations for literary authors such as Yoshimoto, Sakaguchi Ango, Dazai Osamu, and Muro Saisei, Okuno addressed the concept of primal landscape.

In other words, I would like to define space-time, or the symbolic image of it which adheres to the subconscious, as a space of self-formation during childhood and adolescence. Furthermore, it is intrinsically intertwined with human relations that are deeply based on blood relationships and regional bonds, and unknowingly rules their literature. The "primal landscape" is the womb of literature, and the mother earth for the author. The "primal landscape," though providing a backbone to his literature, is a landscape that is impossible for the author to depict objectively. The author's eyes to the "primal landscape," unlike the eyes of the tourists of course, are warped further towards the inside that can be neither glimpsed nor depicted by the eyes of others. Because the "primal landscape" is not someone else, but none other than himself.<sup>170</sup>

Okuno describes landscape not only in light of visual elements, but also the totality of space and time that physically and mentally surrounds authors, as the primal landscape, and makes clear mainly the relationship between the prewar literature and primal landscape. He further describes landscapes of farming villages and rice fields as archetypes of the primal landscape. While making rural landscapes and rice paddies the prototypes of the primal landscape, he refers back to the origins of Japan such as the Jomon-Yayoi period (ca. 14,000 BCE–300 CE). On the other hand, he mentions the emergence of new landscapes in the present time, stating that he embarked on his investigation of the primal landscape due to the sense of discomfort that he had with postwar literature and contemporary novels.

Reading the works of emerging artists such as Goto Meisei and Kuroi Senji, who have become reputable these days, I feel that [this is] a generation who does not have their own "primal landscapes" in a traditional sense, with neither homeland, as in the past, a local hometown, nor

---

<sup>170</sup> Okuno Takeo, *Bungaku ni okeru Genfukei Harappa, Dokutsu no Genso* [The Primal Landscape in Literature: Fantasy of Open Fields and Caves] (Tokyo: Shueisha, 1972), 45.



an invariable space for self-formation in the city, or rather who deny that a "primal landscape" has emerged. Goto Meisei, Kuroi Senji and others anticipate their future, and write with empathy, however, I strongly feel the presence of a generation who grew up in a completely different space of self-formation, without having "primal landscapes" behind their literature. They attest to the fact that artificial housing complexes, new towns, and high-rise condominiums cannot in any way become invariable spaces of self-formation, nor primal landscapes for humans, nor can they become fixed and stable coordinates in which to explore changes in human relationships. In other words, that novels in the traditional sense can no longer be established.<sup>171</sup>

However, rather than suggesting a return to the traditional Japanese landscapes, Okuno criticized both the traditional and the new ones.

Through "Ogura Hyakunin Isshu" *Utamakura* influenced the aesthetics and views on landscapes of common Japanese people. Paintings such as illustrated handscrolls, pictures of famous places, woodcut prints of Hokusai and Hiroshige, *kakiwari* backdrops in Kabuki, and also Chinese landscape paintings, determined the images of the Japanese landscape. The three most beautiful views and scenic places in Japan associated with *utamakura* were designated. People visited those scenic spots, along with shrines and temples, overlaying them with patterns of landscape created in their minds, and became satisfied that they looked exactly like they saw in pictures of famous places or *ukiyo-e* paintings. Or, they might be disappointed that they were not that great, but after being informed of the origins of *makurakotoba* and legends, they become impressed again, and return home. The scene is no different from that of today's tour group. It is just that the number of new scenic spots that are quickly prepared through today's TV dramas or advertisements called "Discover Japan," is increasing. Apparently, the Japanese people cannot appreciate landscapes unless their origins or reputations in history, legend, and literature are included. It may be that they have characters because of which literary and linguistic impressions precede visual impressions.<sup>172</sup>

Okuno examines works of authors who resisted this introduction of Japanese landscapes in literature, including Okuno discussed Tokutomi Roka's *Shizen to Jinsei* (Nature and Life), Kunikida Doppo's *Musashino*, Tayama Katai's *Futon* (The Quilt), Shohei Ooka's *Musashino Fujin* (Mrs. Musashino), as well as ironically, authors who cannot describe landscapes, Abe Kobo and Mishima Yukio. While Okuno shares similar problematics with Matsuda and others in terms of critiquing existing landscapes, their approaches are significantly different; one is to trace the primal landscape through its absence, and the other is inversely to see the landscape without primal landscape as an opportunity for new possibilities. In addition, Okuno's approach of tracing primal landscape as either expression of personal history or spirits was diametrically opposed to Matsuda's understanding of landscape as

---

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., 13-14.

<sup>172</sup> Ibid., 198-199.

something not personal, but rather political and class-based.<sup>173</sup> Okuno's view of the landscape as spirit (*seishin*) or interiority (*naimen*) were passed on to literary critic Karatani Kojin, for one.

In the domain of architecture and urban studies, architect Miyauchi Ko, who was involved in the *Zenkyoto* movement as a faculty member of the university following the Anpo Struggle, carried out an analysis of power that is extremely close to landscape theory. In "*Enkon no Yutopia*" (Utopia of Grudges) published in *Kenchiku Nenkan* (Annals of Architecture in Japan) in 1969, Miyauchi discusses the new city and space seen through barricades as follows:

Barricades make invisible cities visible in one fell swoop. It is a violent questioning with respect to the mechanism of the urban control, dragging to the streets the true oppressors of the city, which until now were hidden and invisible. Every corner of this city, this space, this wall, was controlled, and none of it was at our disposal. Things inside the barricades pile/piled up, are stripped of all value and meaning, and are given a single meaning, that is, a clear meaning of protecting the life of the oppressed people, things restore their authenticity. Objects fetishized as commodities revert to mere things.<sup>174</sup>

Miyauchi conceived of barricading, which can be called anti-architectural in the traditional framework of architecture, as a practical moment of making the normally invisible power structure visible in an urban space, and then confronting things themselves. In *Kindai toshi ideorogi jihan* (Ideological critique of modern city) published in *Contemporary Eye*, he proceeds with an analysis of urban space which he sees as moving toward a society of control.

No matter how disorderly its partial and visual forms may appear, a city is covered over with a system of management and an iron chain of order. Cities are not merely moving and expanding arbitrarily. In cities, the will of capital pervades every corner of space. What information supremacists and cybernetics followers have deliberately overlooked, rather than forgotten, is that finer-grained control and feedback of information transforms cities into increasingly oppressive ones. If we can manage to live in today's oppressive city, it must be because there is some gap in

---

<sup>173</sup> Matsuda refers to Okuno's argument as follows. "At last, landscape theory spread to a tip of the unshakable literary world; for instance, Takeo Okuno started a serialization of long essays on the journal *Subaru* concerning *Bungaku ni okeru Genfukei* [Primal Landscape in Literature] referencing various resources [...]" Matsuda, *Fukei no Shimetsu*, 283. Based on the fact that *Gendai Bungaku Fudoki* [Regional Gazetteers for Contemporary Literature] was published in 1968, it can be pointed out that Okuno's interest in 'climate' or 'landscape' preceded the landscape theory by Matsuda and others. For theories of urban studies that thereafter developed in the context related to theories of landscape, see Isoda Koichi, *Shiso toshiteno Tokyo* [Tokyo as Thoughts] (Tokyo: Kobunsha, 1978); Maeda Ai, *Toshikukan nonakano Bungaku* [Literature in Urban Space], (Tokyo: Chikumashobo, 1982); *Genkei no Machi* [Mirage City] (Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1986).

<sup>174</sup> Miyauchi Ko, *Enkon no Yutopia*, 152.

the system of oppression. It is clear that more sophisticated systems, combined with the application of ideologies to demands on the system will become increasingly oppressive to us.<sup>175</sup>

Miyauchi published an essay in 1970 for the student newspaper at Tokyo University of Science, in which his critique of the university, which subsequently led to him being labelled a dissident instructor and fired, was carried out through his observation of 'landscapes,' such as a new school buildings, the campus, students, and teachers.<sup>176</sup> In the February 24, 1971 issue of *The Japan Reader's Newspaper*, he published the essay *Tobaku toshi* (Gambling city), mentioning landscape theory by Matsuda and others.

There used to be something called "landscape theory." I am not familiar with the details, but I remember that the premise of this strangely resonating theory was to confirm that today's urban landscapes in Japan were all homogenized. I had a fresh impression on the word "landscape" rather than "landscape theory," as a theory, in comparison to concepts such as situations, space, or environment— of which ambiguity cannot be wiped out—that became popular in the sixties. In any event, it is certain that the spatial aspects of today's cities across Japan are endlessly moving toward homogenization.<sup>177</sup>

Although it did not pertain to the content of landscape theory, Miyauchi perceptively pointed out the potential of the word landscape—instead of situations, space, and environment. While calling the city under advanced capitalism 'gamble city,' he discussed the homogenization of urban space. As Miyauchi published his essay *Fukei toshiteno toshi* (City as landscape)—the same title as Matsuda's second essay on landscape theory— in the October 1975 issue of *Gendai Shiso* (Contemporary Thoughts), and furthermore, as he titled his book of his essays, *Fukei o ute* (Shoot the Landscape), a series of Miyauchi's discussions at the time, the shift in his focus from theories of architecture and urban studies, to his resonance with the theory of landscape is reflected.

Architect Hara Hiroshi, founder of RAS, where Miyauchi worked for three years, also published an essay, *Hara Hiroshi niyoru kukan gainenron no tameno soko* (Notes for spatial concept by Hara Hiroshi) in a special issue of the journal SD, also featuring his own work, in the September 1972 issue. The "Notes," consisting of forty-five theses with his comments were based on lectures he had given at the

---

<sup>175</sup> Ibid., 213.

<sup>176</sup> Miyauchi Ko, "*Fukei— Unga 1970*," [Landscapes—Canals 1970], *Fukei o Ute Daigaku 1970-75* [Shoot the Landscape: University 1970-1975] (Tokyo: Sagamishobo, 1976), 3-9.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., 243.

university, and were later edited as an essay, *Kinshitsu kukanron* (On Homogeneous Space) in the August-September 1976 issue of the journal *Shiso* (Thoughts).<sup>178</sup> Though the latter's importance as a theory is evident, these "Notes" were noteworthy in terms of their contemporaneity with landscape theory. While examining the evolution of concepts of space in Europe, Hara critiques functionalism and nationalism in modern architecture, indicating problems of contemporary spatial concepts.

30. We may now share homogenous quality, non-directionality, and, in addition, continuous spatial perception or sense of space in common. If we call this the contemporary concept of space, it may be that the concept of space permeates deep inside our consciousness, and functions not only as a way to simply understand physical space, but also as a <cognitive receptacle> for things.<sup>179</sup>

43. The overall culture that the concept of homogeneous space supports (or, that is supported by it) is characterized by the absence of meanings and their accompanying values. Modernization accompanied by this spatial concept will produce the system that is mentioned in today's advanced capitalism.<sup>180</sup>

Importantly, as similar to landscape theory, Hara saw the homogenization in the ubiquity of this new concept of space as an apparatus of governance over all domains of human activities. Hara participated in a round-table discussion with Nakahira, graphic designers Awazu Kiyoshi, and Kimura Tsunehisa for the November 1970 issue of the journal *Dezain Hihyo* (Design Criticism) (for which he himself served as an editorial board member), during which his theory's specific relevance to landscape theory becomes clear. In response to Nakahira's statement referring to landscape theory and theories of vision, Hara made the following remark on modern architecture, using the concept of "scenes" (*bamen*).

Going back to the topic of architecture, if I explain what 'architecture's entry into modernity' means, it means creating by eliminating <scenes>. Instead of the concept of <scenes>, it introduces an abstract concept such as mobility, and what comes out of it is central to all possibilities. Architects give up the responsibility of representing <scenes>, and uses the idea of "their invisibility" or the fact that "they did not see <scenes>" as a weapon to create.<sup>181</sup>

---

<sup>178</sup> It was later published as Hara Hiroshi, *Kukan <Sakujitsu kara Yoso e>* [Space <from Yesterday to Modality>] (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1987).

<sup>179</sup> Hara Hiroshi, "Hara Hiroshi niyoru kukan gainenron no tameno soko," [Notes for spatial concept by Hara Hiroshi], *SD*, no.96 (September 1972): 74.

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid.*, 75.

<sup>181</sup> Hara Hiroshi, "Wareware wa nani ni mukatte jiyu nanoka," [Towards what are we free], Awatsu Kiyoshi, Kimura Tsunehisa, Nakahira Takuma, Hara Hiroshi, *Dezain Hihyo* [Design Criticism], no.12 (November 1970): 33.

Hara's concept of "scenes" seems to refer to space that is established on the basis of the accumulated realities and histories, and his statement that modern architecture is the result of their bracketing and abstraction has some elements of his later Notes. Though Hara's concept of space was more abstract and not as politically loaded as Miyauchi's, it shared with it an exploration of issues that were contemporaneous with landscape theory.<sup>182</sup> Meanwhile, due to the popularity of theories on landscape from the realm of landscape architecture and landscape engineering, against the background of *A Plan for Remodeling the Japanese Archipelago* around the same period<sup>183</sup>, theoretical and historical inquiries on landscape and space from the domain of architecture gradually became marginalized within the overwhelming material presence of State and capitalism.

### 13. After Landscape Theory

Matsuda and others shifted from landscape theory to the theory of reportage and information media in 1971. Along with the decline of the movement, landscape theory was hardly ever discussed thereafter. In turn, literary critic Karatani Kojin, set out to develop arguments that can be referred to as post-landscape theory. He published a series of essays titled *Yanagita Kunio shiron* (Essays on Yanagita Kunio) in the journal *Gekkan Ekonomisuto* (Monthly Economist) in January 1974, in which Karatani discusses Yanagita's notion of landscape, citing his descriptions concerning landscapes in *Meiji Taisho-shi Seso-hen* (A History of Meiji and Taisho: Customs and Manners):

This kind of landscape theory was unprecedented before Yanagita. In particular, Yanagita's insight lies in his view of landscapes as "human creation." It does not mean that humans fabricate or model as they please, but that it is gradually accumulated human practices over generations. What is remarkable about Yanagita's idea is his understanding that not only landscapes, but also the eyes that see them are something created. In short, Yanagita sees the natural environment as one of accumulated culture, i.e. history. To see landscapes as culture, in other words, is to see the culture as landscape. In other words, Yanagita sees culture as "something to create", or like a verb

---

<sup>182</sup> For a similar discussion, see Isozaki Arata, "Mienai Toshi," [Invisible City], in *Kukan e* [To Space], (Tokyo: Bijutsu Shuppan-Sha, 1971).

<sup>183</sup> For instance, see, Higuchi Tadahiko, *Keikan no Kozo Randsukepu toshiteno Nihon no Kukan* [Structure of Landscapes: Japanese Space as Landscapes] (Tokyo: Gihodoshuppan, 1975); Nakamura Yoshio, *Fukeigaku Nyumon* [Introduction to Landscape Studies] (Tokyo: Chuokoronshinsha, 1982).

form (cultivate). Culture as existence (noun) — that is, things such as cultural properties and famous places—was out of the question for Yanagita.<sup>184</sup>

Karatani argues that the uniqueness of Yanagita's landscape theory lies in his discovery that landscapes are products of human creation, and are as dynamic as culture or history. He further continues that Yanagita's discovery of landscape is synonymous with the discovery of *jomin* (ordinary people) who created the landscapes. In 1975 Karatani published a series of essays on Sakaguchi Ango, *Genjitsu ni tsuite 'Nihon Bunka Shikan ron'*, (Concerning reality: on *A Personal View of Japanese Culture*), *Shizen ni tsuite zoku Nihon Bunka Shikan ron* (Concerning nature: *Personal View of the Japanese Culture* part two) for the May and July 1975 issues of *Bungei*, as well as *Seishin no fukei— Sakaguchi Ango ni okeru hiho no gensen* (Landscape of the mind: Sakaguchi Ango's critical foundation) in the May 1975 issue of *Kokubungaku* (Japanese Literature), in which he continues his discussions on landscape through the work of Ango.

The intensity of landscapes corresponds to his spiritual intensity. His eyes looking upon architecture that has nothing but "necessity" is none other than his spiritual eyes. It is not that such a spirit made landscapes look that way. That is just aesthetic idealism. I must say, what kind of spirit that is detached from the object can exist. Undoubtedly at that time, that is, when he was at Toride around Showa 13, Ango was in the midst of an inner experience in which everything converged into the word 'necessity.' In the midst of it he could not say a word. It was in such times of aphasia that he encountered landscapes.<sup>185</sup>

Karatani pays attention to Ango's spiritual intensity to discover beauty in landscapes that were defined neither aesthetically nor culturally, but based upon the notion of "necessity," i.e. modern rationality. In the earlier part of his analysis of *A Personal View of Japanese Culture*, Karatani, quoting Freud, introduces the concept of the "real," which is something remote and uncanny that pushes one away, or leaves one behind, arguing that landscapes where Ango discovered beauty were what Karatani called "real," or what Kant referred to as thing-in-itself. In the summer and fall 1978 issues of *Kikan Geijutsu* (Art Quarterly), Karatani published *Fukei no hakken: josetsu* (Introduction: discovery of landscape) and *Naimen no hakken* (Discovery of interiority)—in which he examined literature, Japan, and its modernity

---

<sup>184</sup> Karatani Kojin, *Yanagita Kunio ron* [Theory of Yanagita Kunio] (Tokyo: Inscript, 2013), 231.

<sup>185</sup> Karatani Kojin, *Sakaguchi Ango to Nakagami Kenji* [Sakaguchi Ango and Nakagami Kenji] (Tokyo: Otashuppan, 1996), 31.

through landscape—which were later compiled in a book *Nihon Kindai Bungaku no Kigen* (Origins of Modern Japanese Literature).<sup>186</sup> In this book, referencing landscape, Karatani discusses "what is literature" through Natsume Soseki's theory of literature.

The same may be said of "*kanbungaku*" (Chinese classical literature). Although Soseki uses the term to differentiate certain practices from those of modern literature, it is itself rooted in the consciousness that produced the category "literature" and has no existence apart from it. Literature makes the objectification of *kanbungaku* possible. In this sense to compare *kanbungaku* and English literature is to ignore the historicity of literature itself— of "literature" as a kind of "landscape". It is to fail to take into account the fact that, through the emergence of "literature" and "landscape", the very structure of our perceptions has been transformed. I would like to propose that the notion of "landscape" developed in Japan sometime during the third decade of the Meiji period. Of course, there were landscapes long before they were "discovered". But "landscapes" as such did not exist prior to the 1890s, and it is only when we think about it in this way that the layers of meaning entailed in the notion of a "discovery of landscape" become apparent.<sup>187</sup>

Referring to Soseki's discomfort with English literature, Karatani addresses the necessity to examine the historicity of origins of 'literature' and 'landscape'. He further discusses "emergence of landscape" through Kunikida Doppo's *Wasure enu Hitobito* (Unforgettable People).

This passage clearly reveals the link between landscape and an introverted, solitary condition. While the narrator can feel a solidarity such that "the boundary between myself and others" disappears in the case of people who are of no consequence to him, he is the very picture of indifference when it comes to those in his immediate surroundings. It is only within the "inner man", who appears to be indifferent to his external surroundings, that landscape is discovered. It is perceived by those who do not look "outside".<sup>188</sup>

In *Unforgettable People*, the story of an unknown literary writer, who talks about "unforgettable people" to a man he meets at an inn along the Tama River, people who would be forgotten under normal circumstances—as it is in fact that he just passed by them—are talked about as "forgettable people".

Karatani finds a fundamental inversion in this work, which sees humans as landscapes, further indicating the role of landscape in modern literature.

---

<sup>186</sup> The English translation of *Nihon Kindai Bungaku no Kigen* was published as *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature* by Duke University Press in 1993, and has been translated into different languages. This book tends to be referenced with regard to theories of landscape in Japan. Importantly, however, this book was written based on a historical accumulation of existing theories of landscape, as well as those of literature. Also, a revised new edition, *Teibon Karatani Kojinshu Nihon Kindai Bungaku no Kigen* [Standard Edition: Karatani Kojin: Origins of Modern Japanese Literature] (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 2004) was published.

<sup>187</sup> Karatani Kojin, *Nihon Kindai Bungaku no Kigen* (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1980), 17. All quotations from the book hereafter are based on the English version. Karatani Kojin, *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*, trans. and ed., Brett de Bary (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993), 18-19.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

It is clear, then, that realism in modern literature established itself within the context of landscape. Both the landscapes and the "ordinary people" (what I have called people-as-landscapes) that realism represents were not "out there" from the start, but had to be discovered as landscapes from which we had become alienated.<sup>189</sup>

Furthermore, Karatani argues that the perception of subject and object as well as realism in literature derives from the landscapes.

Once a landscape has been established, its origins are repressed from memory. It takes on the appearance of an "object" which has been there, outside us, from the start. An "object," however, can only be constituted within a landscape. The same may be said of the "subject" or self. The philosophical standpoint which distinguishes between subject and object came into existence within what I refer to as "landscape." Rather than existing prior to landscape, subject and object emerged from within it.<sup>190</sup>

Furthermore, he argues that the landscape thus discovered during the modernization of Japan as a new concept, became a system as soon as it was born:

The most significant development in the third decade of the Meiji period was rather the consolidation of modern systems and the emergence of "landscape", not so much as a phenomenon contesting such systems, but as itself a system.<sup>191</sup>

It was remarkable that Karatani's theory of landscape, while introducing Freud and Marx, attempted to analyze the notion of landscape from theoretical and historical perspectives, with a focus on Japanese literature. It also shed light on Japan's warped modernity, and reexamined concepts such as State and modernity beyond the framework of theories of literature or those of landscape. While on one hand Karatani's discussion on the discovery of landscape in connection with 'interiority' or 'spirit' contributed significantly to existing theories of landscape, as well as to the history of literature and the modern history of Japan, it, on the other hand ended up diverting from what was at the core of Matsuda and others' landscape theory.<sup>192</sup> Whereas what was at stake for them was to pursue the ambivalent potential of the

---

<sup>189</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid., 34.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid., 38.

<sup>192</sup> There are few references with regard to the relations between Matsuda's landscape theory and Karatani's theory of landscape. Photography critic Kuraishi Shino argues on Nakahira comparing landscape theories between them. "I would imagine that a rise of politics=aesthetic-based landscape theory around 1970 led by Matsuda and others should be the basis for the achievements of discourses of the meta-theories of landscape that emerged in the latter half of 1907's represented by Hasumi and Karatani. It was photographer Nakahira Takuma who as one of the protagonists in the midst of this, was not only familiar with the deceptive process of landscape, but also accomplished self-deconstruction=self-realization by wrestling with landscapes." Kuraishi Shino, "*Fukei no*



concept of landscape, while aiming to identify landscapes as manifestations of power and dismantling them, Karatani introduced a framework of landscape=system=modernity for the purpose of tracing the origins of landscape.

[...] no one can describe as if having transcended the confine of landscape. I myself, in writing this essay, do not seek to break away from this "sphere." I seek simply to shed light on its historicity.<sup>193</sup>

Since the conceptualization of 'landscape = system' was originally the premise of Matsuda's landscape theory, landscape was discussed as central in the context of the then new radical movement and theory. As Karatani himself pointed out, the discovery of interiority was not synonymous with simple self-recognition or consciousness of existence, but was rather constituted for the first time in a homogeneous space or civil society.<sup>194</sup> Even though "interiority" was considered identical with "landscape" Karatani's theory of landscape was not necessarily in conflict with landscape theory derived from the context of collective movement, and it can be said in this sense, that both Matsuda and Karatani in part, had a common understanding of landscape. It is important to note however, that the discovery of landscape was discussed within a condition in which high consumer society was being established through the segmentation of groups or collective movements into individuals. Karatani's theory of landscape, albeit based on accumulated discussions by Matsuda and others, headed towards a completely different theoretical horizon, and the subsequent theories of landscape following this context returned to an investigation of landscapes before landscape theory.<sup>195</sup>

---

*fukushu*" [Reviewing landscape], 2014. <https://morishitadaisuke.com/風景の復習-倉石信乃/> [Accessed 31 August, 2020]

<sup>193</sup> Karatani, *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*, 34. (I slightly modified the original translation) .

<sup>194</sup> Karatani, *Ibid.*, 36.

<sup>195</sup> Though Karatani did not directly refer to Matsuda's landscape theory, he indirectly engaged in polemical debates. In the essay, "Jiritsu to kindaiteki jiga," [Autonomy and Modern Ego], *Jokyo* [Situation] (August 1970): 44-53, critic Kan Takayuki criticized Karatani, who, despite participating in the Anpo Struggle in 1960, thereafter came to deny the movement and turned to theory, along with also his theory of landscape. In response, Karatani refuted Kan's argument in "Jiritsuron no zentei," [Premise of the autonomy theory], *Gendai no Me* [Contemporary Eyes] (November 1970): 74-81, and Kan then further refuted in "Shiso niokeru," <shiyu no kankaku> [<Sense of private ownership> in Thoughts], *Jokyo* (February 1971): 91-102. Karatani also contributed essays on film for *Eiga Geijutsu* around 1970. It is presumed that Karatani was not unaware of this polemical debate, since *Eiga Geijutsu* was a major publication media for critiquing landscape theory by Matsuda. Also, Karatani subsequently used 'landscape' as an important concept. For instance, see Karatani Kojin, "*Murakami Haruki no 'Fuukei'— '1973 nen no*

Meanwhile, following Karatani's theory of landscape, literary and film and literary critic Hasumi Shigehiko discussed landscape in the context of the theory of representation.<sup>196</sup> He published the essay *Kyoiku sochi toshite no fukei* (Landscape as an educational device) in the April 1978 issue of *Tenbo* (Outlook), arguing the difficulty of speaking about landscape itself:

In other words, the landscape functions steadily as an educational apparatus that introduces what is thought to be a sensibility, along with imagination and thought, into a system of "knowledge" distribution, and regulates its exchange and distribution. Education is an incessant activity that divides existence into a system suitable for landscape as apparatus, and makes thought, sensitivity and imagination familiarize themselves to it. It is therefore obvious that the sensibility of being astonished or bored with the landscape will be properly incorporated into the narrative of beauty that the landscape as an apparatus continues telling. Existence does not interpret the landscape. The landscape interprets the existence. What 'landscape educates' means the process by which existence gradually becomes familiar with this deciphering movement by the landscape.<sup>197</sup>

Hasumi, similar to Matsuda and others recognized landscape as an apparatus of subsumption, however, like Karatani, only pointed out its structure and existence. Or, rather it can be said that Hasumi's proposal was that one should do no more than identifying landscape and pointing that out. Hasumi started his career as a film critic by participating in the film journal *Cinema 68*. During the second incarnation of *Eiga Hihyo*, when essays on Godard political films were dominant, Hasumi's criticism focused on a meticulous analysis of representation, and he was known for his essays on Godard's post-Dziga Vertov Group work, as well as more broadly, film criticism devoid of political references after the era of the movement. Hasumi's text and film analysis became a strong critical force at a time when much of the discourses was leaning toward capital 'P' politics, but its significance was lost sight of in the wake of high consumer society, when his theory was consumed more as a commodity.

The mid to late 1970's saw a resurgence of interest in landscape theories in various areas. For instance, in 1977, with the efforts of scientist Shiga Fujio (the son of Shiga Shigetaka), alpinist Yamazaki Yasuji, and critic Inose Naoki, the long-out-of-print *Nihon Fukeiron* (On Japanese Landscape) was

---

*pinboru'*," [Landscape of Haruki Murakami—Pinball, 1973], *Kaien* (November and December 1989): 296-307 and 236-251.

<sup>196</sup> For the shift in the discussions of Godard from the Dziga Vertov Group period to after in Japan, see ed. Hirasawa Go, "*Kaidai*" [Bibliographical introduction], in *Bungei Bessatsu Godaru* [Art and Literature Extra Issue: Godard], (Tokyo: Kawadeshobosha, 2002), 85 and 197.

<sup>197</sup> Hasumi Shigehiko, *Hyoso Hihyo Sengen* [Manifesto for Surface Criticism] (Tokyo: Chikumashobo, 1979), 169.

reprinted in its original format, along with the booklet *Nihon Fukeiron Kaidai* (A Bibliographical introduction to 'On Japanese Landscape'), bringing a new appreciation to Shiga's theory of landscape. Agronomist and bureaucrat Katsuhara Fumio's *No no bigaku: Nihon fukeiron josetsu* (Aesthetics of farming: Introduction to the theory of Japanese landscape), a compilation of essays about the history and establishment of landscape in Japan that he had been writing since the mid-1970's, was published in 1979. In the essays he analyzed in detail the history of the landscape of rural areas of Japan, with a focus on Okuno as primal landscape, as well as theories of landscape from the past. These discussions, albeit interesting in historical, cultural, and literary sense, reverted to pre-Matsuda, et al. theories of 'Japanese' landscape. In fact, except in the domains of photography and film, in the landscape theory discussions that followed, there were a very limited number of discussions that referred to Matsuda's landscape theory, with the exception of Kato Norihiro's *Nihon Fukeiron* (Japanese Landscape Theory); Matsuda's landscape theory was again thrust into the background through this characteristically Japanese transition of the notions of landscape and theories of landscape.<sup>198</sup>

#### **14. Theory of Reportage (*Hodoron*)**

In May, 1971 Adachi and Wakamatsu were invited to Director's Week at the Cannes Film Festival for their film *Okasareta Byakui* (Violated Angels, 1967) and *Sex Jack*, together with Oshima for his *Man Who Left His Will on Film* and *Gishiki* (The Ceremony, 1971). On the return trip, they went to Beirut to produce a newsreel film as a 'text' for world revolution which depicted the everyday life of Arab guerillas, *Red Army/PFLP: Declarations of World War*, in collaboration with Shigenobu Fusako, a leader of the Japanese Red Army Faction, who was already in Beirut, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of

---

<sup>198</sup> "Speaking of "landscape theory" in my recollection, what immediately comes to mind is actually that of critic Matsuda Masao around 1970, but when I read through some of the claims that are introduced therein, I understand that Matsuda's "landscape," which used to be often used as a counter-term to "situation" in those days, was deliberately employed as a word to indicate the aspect of reality that appears when "situation" are extracted from "the reality in front of us." Norihiro Kato, *Nihon Fukeiron* [Japanese Landscape Theory] (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1990), 49.

Palestine (PFLP). It was in this film that they embarked on a theoretical shift from landscape theory to the theory of reportage.

A strategic theory is in our hands: "Propaganda immediately is 'information' and information serves to communicate truth. In addition, the best form of our (PFLP) truth is armed struggle. Therefore, it is armed struggle that is the best form of propaganda." Hence, the newsreel film must be presented as one of the strategic theories to be used in order to take hold of the truth to be communicated, the methods to communicate, and the language of propaganda=armed struggle from reality—and return them back as a language, again to reality, i.e. as an actual form of propaganda. Therefore, propaganda=armed struggle; propaganda = newsreel film. And the strategic theory for the manifesto of the world revolutionary front as newsreel film=propaganda=armed struggle must be lived. Our task is to determine whether our newsreel film can represent the language of truth or not; and given that it is the language of truth, how and where will the language have to be told? How will the manifesto have to be implemented? The fundamental questions of the cinema=movement have to be posed for language itself.<sup>199</sup>

Based on the statement by Ghassan Kanafani, a spokesperson for the PFLP, Adachi discusses the question of what are the 'newsreel films' that he creates. He then goes on to organize a screening movement (*joei undo*) and screening troop movement (*joei tai undo*) to seek new screening venues, rather than holding conventional theatrical screenings. Meanwhile, Matsuda refers to what newsreel film stands for in his essay on the *Red Army/PFLP: Declarations of World War*.

If the operating base for guerillas who hide in the mountainous terrain, where the borders of Lebanon, Syria and Jordan meet Israel, can be assumed as a front line, then it must be appropriate to say that plain, i.e., urban areas can be the so-called homefront for the guerillas. Based on this dichotomy, the composition would take shape in which Arab guerillas always stand at the front line as special strong men, to whom the refugees on the homefront supply aid. However, our newsreel film boldly overturns this common-sense, dichotomous conception: as part of their everyday lives, the masses behind the front line are trained to use guns. The young and old, adults and children, men and women, all study guns indoors and outdoors, day and night, as if it were a study group. At the front line as well, <guns> are repeatedly learned. Even if the frontline and the home front, from the viewpoint of Lenin's theory of organization, are considered to be analogous to the avant-garde and the masses, the circuit that connects the two will never be like some empty words written on a sheet of paper, that is, like a nationwide political newspaper. The front line and the home front communicate only by <guns>. The home front serves as a continuing supply line for the front line, and it's likely that this relationship would suddenly be reversed as needed at a specific time and space. In other words, the home front is also a potential battleground.<sup>200</sup>

While developing new theories of newsreel films and the theory of reportage, Matsuda also provides analysis in the context of landscape theory, such as the circumstances where the dichotomy

---

<sup>199</sup> Adachi Masao, *Eiga eno senryaku* [Strategies for cinema] (Tokyo: Shobunsha 1974), 11-12.

<sup>200</sup> Matsuda, "Arabu gerira e mukau kamera ai" [Camera eyes towards Arab guerillas] in *Hakuchumu o ute*, 232.

between the front line and home front can no longer be validated. Matsuda pays attention to the fact that in Palestine, Adachi not only pointed his camera at militaristic spectacle, but also—albeit mediated by 'gun'—the quotidian landscape. This, in a sense, testifies to the fact that the transition in theoretical approach from landscape theory to the theory of reportage did not take place in a clear-cut manner: films that seemed to have acquired new forms of expression—through various cinematic experiments during the period of 'New Wave' and the season of politics that arose in the 60's—were being co-opted by conventional frameworks, such as in Hollywood and Moscow, (or the 'Big Four' film companies in Japan). Furthermore, television, as a new medium of communication, developed robustly, and its utility value, along with that of the existing print media was also being maximized by the State and capitalism. New tactics were required to prepare for the de-territorializing media war, or the information war against the existing mass media—including film and television—and thus the theory of reportage was proposed. As the *Red Army/PFLP* depicts both landscapes of military activities and everyday as equal, the transition from landscape theory to theory of reportage should not be said to mark the introduction of a completely new theoretical proposition, but rather should be reframed as part of the radical development of media theory, which initially had its root in landscape theory. Extending from street to landscape, from landscape to media, the ontological and philosophical horizons of landscape theory led to a more practical theory of reportage, by way of experiences of popular armed struggle in everyday life in Palestine. When, with the arrival of the 70's, media and advertisements became the forefront for State power and capitalism, Matsuda was to further radicalize the confrontation against them as new landscapes.

Contrary to the existing media, convert it into a new form of media, in other words, how is it possible to convert the apparatus of transmission=reception of oppression into the apparatus of transmission=reception of revolt? There is only one answer. It only exists within the act of activating this equal sign <=> set between transmission and reception, from 'codified information' to 'gesture.'<sup>201</sup>

Contrary to the existing media -- media means something urban organized by gestures, in other words, the expression of the popular revolt itself. When violence as something ineffable on the

---

<sup>201</sup> Matsuda Masao, "*Media to wa gyakuni media ni,*" in *Fukanosei no media* [Impossibility of media] (Tokyo: Tabata Shoten 1973), 312.

individual level is connected to the network in the city, it will flow into a revolt of the highest level in the existing media, in other words, into a collective level.<sup>202</sup>

Matsuda suggests that, instead of a language that has already become part of the apparatus, what Bertolt Brecht called, *Gestus*, or gesture that still remains un-co-opted, should be organized horizontally as a network, through the appropriation of information media. The subsequent development of his theory of reportage were compiled in *Fukanosei no media* (Media of Impossibility), wherein a fair number of essays on the theory of reportage were written in parallel with landscape theory. Originally an essay, *Media of Impossibility*, which also became the title of the book was published in the June, 1969 issue of Design Criticism, preceding the publication of Matsuda's first essay on landscape theory. In this essay Matsuda introduces the definition of what he refers to as 'direct' or 'immediate' media (*chokusetsusei no media*), which includes *aji-bira* (New Left propaganda handout), *tatekanban* (signboard), graffiti, and speeches in Zenkyoto movement, as opposed to other 'indirect' mass media, such as printing and broadcast for large-scale communication. While the former praises and consumes expressions of the movement in terms of form, he proposes the importance of the notion of '*rigen*' (reverse expression), which is the opposite of '*hyogen*' (expression) as the other side of the same coin, calling for the practice and theory of revolutionary media created by it.

What is needed now is not to discuss an "information revolution" or "consciousness revolution" in terms of 'original or copy', or 'direct or indirect' as in the domain of media theory, but to create "revolutionary information" or "revolutionary consciousness."<sup>203</sup>

In his discussion of the Dziga Vertov Group's *Lotte in Italia* in October 1970, based on the concept of 'news report' proposed by Godard, Matsuda examined his methodology.

Godard's method, by the way, which went beyond the traditional dichotomy of fiction and nonfiction, drama and documentary, and aimed for the fundamental reorganization of the news report by sublating reportage-like methods, was frequent use of <black screen>, which I must say, like Egg of Columbus, was a straightforward method that made everyone dumbfounded, regardless of whether one was a writer, critic or audience.<sup>204</sup>

---

<sup>202</sup> Ibid. , 313

<sup>203</sup> Matsuda Masao, "Fukanosei no media" [Media of impossibility], *Dezain Hihyo*, no.9 (June 1969): 23; *Fukanosei no media*, 57-71.

<sup>204</sup> Matsuda Masao, "*Hodo no mosaku*" [Search for reportage], Ibid., 92. For Godard's concept of news report, see Jean Luc Godard and Alain Jouffroy, "Le guérillero et le savant", *Le Fait public*, no.2 (Janvier, 1969).

Given the fact that Matsuda's argument on Godard's concept of news report led to landscape theory, or otherwise it proceeded in parallel with landscape theory, leading up to the full-fledged development of the theory of reportage, landscape theory and the theory of media are inseparably connected, and they and their development should be reexamined together. Matsuda looks back on the development of the theory of reportage as follows.

Together with Adachi Masao, I established the concept of <news report> (*hodo*) as a key word that opened up our "strategic outlook". With the interpenetration of deskwork and fieldwork, we attempted to shift from <landscape theory> to <theory of reportage>. From the beginning there was no predecessor to rely on. We had no choice but to search for the location of the existence of <reporters> during the transition period, mediated only by the attempts of the Dziga Vertov Group by Godard et al.<sup>205</sup>

Though Matsuda had already discussed media and journalism through his involvement with the movement, it can be said that the conceptualization of reportage or news report was carried out in the process of discussing the Dziga Vertov Group, as well as the *Red Army/PFLP*. Meanwhile, this concept was put into practice when Matsuda became editor-in-chief for the second incarnation of *Eiga Hihyo*.<sup>206</sup>

## 15 Cinema=Movement

During the same period, concurrent with landscape theory and the theory of reportage, Matsuda and Adachi developed the theory of movement films (*undoeigaron*), or theory of "cinema=movement." Reviewing significant events in film history, such as the advent of the New Wave in the late fifties to early sixties, and changes within the major film companies, including their commercial aspects, they intended to advance a new form of cinema based on the movement-based cinematic current, particularly centered on political documentary films in the wake of '68. Looking back on the circumstance of cinema in the seventies, they first proposed the term, 'movement film' (*eiga no undo*) in an essay titled, *Nihon*

---

<sup>205</sup> Matsuda, "Atogaki" [Afterwords], in *Fukanosei no media*, 317.

<sup>206</sup> In fact, Matsuda has clearly defined this film journal as a news report weapon. See Matsuda Masao, "Bekko ni susunde issho ni ute" [Move forward separately and shoot together] in *Eiga Hihyo* [Film Criticism], no.14 (November 1971): 12-13. In addition, in a series of discussions on reportage such as this, the development of Tsumura's media theory, made possible through his analysis of Brecht and Vertov Group, was extremely important. See Tsumura Takashi, "Kakumei eno kenri" [Right to Revolution] (Tokyo: Serikashobo, 1971); *Media no Seiji*, Ibid.

*eiga to sekai eiga* (Japanese cinema and world cinema) in the December 14th, 1970 issue of the journal *Shukan Dokushojin* (Reader's Weekly).

Thus, among the 'auteurist films,' we can exclusively praise Oshima Nagisa's *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* only because it mobilized 'young power,' including the use of Hara Masataka, who is only nineteen years old, as the script writer, and sought where a connection with new energy nurtured not by <company films> but only by <auteurist films> lies in the development of the image itself. Undoubtedly here, there is a burgeoning sign of trying to step out from <auteurist films> to <movement films>. I dare to stake the 70's Japanese cinema exclusively on this one point, even though I will be criticized as being sectarian. The times we live peacefully in the domain of the auteurist film is gone. How can the <author> as an individual be engaged in <movement> as a collective? Based on the evaluation criteria set up in this way, meaning of Ogawa Shinsuke and his group, who continue to film "Sanrizuka" even at a time where Zenkyoto Movement is entering a stage of retreat, as well as Wakamatsu Production, who have continued to create only <auteurist films> since the early sixties will be reconsidered.<sup>207</sup>

While important Japanese filmmakers were declining commercially as well as artistically, Matsuda argued that it was only Oshima's *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* that, despite being an auteurist film, seems to have potential of leading to this idea of movement film. Furthermore he claimed that movement films should be understood not only in Japan, but also from the international perspective. The "Critical Front" was being formed, and cinema movement was called for as a critique. The term 'movement film' became official around that time. Matsuda further presented the concept of 'cinema=movement'<sup>208</sup> in his essays on Wakamatsu Production and Ogawa Shinsuke. In addition, with *Eiga Hihyo* as a forum for discussion, Matsuda further tried to theorize the movement film, while actively promoting representative filmmakers of new documentary film movements, including Nihon Documentarist Union, Hoshi Kiichi, Onozawa Naruhiko and others, who strongly criticized older filmmakers and groups.

In other words, cinema=movement means to promote the dismantling of "company films," to sublimate "auteur's films" and fearlessly step forward into "cinema of movement". If the 50's were the age of 'company films', and the 60's were the age of 'auteur films', precisely the 70's must be the age of 'movement films'. Also, as if corresponding to the fact that the auteur became the harbinger of the transitional period from the fifties to the sixties, 'criticism' clearly became aware of its role as harbinger in a new transitional period from the sixties to the seventies, and if the fact that the criticism has actively continued to present issues for the independence of "auteur films"

---

<sup>207</sup> Matsuda, *Hakuchumu o Ute*, 84.

<sup>208</sup> *Ibid.*, 139.



is confirmed, as the publication of *Eiga Hiho* was unmistakably its index, the answer to the question of who should take the initiative in this 70's, i.e. in the decade of 'movement films' is now self-evident. Namely, now is the time for the 'audience' to make an appearance. At last, the hiatus of the established cine-club movement at the end of the 60's is about to be broken. Movements of countless anonymous audiences are swelling and rising like a flood tide by myriad ingenuities. The organization theory in masquerade (*kaso no soshikiron*) -which has been introduced but suspended since the sixties, with an aim to activate the cycle of cinema=movement, by having each part of creation-criticism-distribution at full operation – has now ripened to the stage of realization by the rise of new activists in the distribution part.<sup>209</sup>

Whereas during the 60's, Matsuda—who had been responsible for launching the movement for independent productions, which was a counter to major film companies, and had then rejected auteurist independent filmmakers such as Oshima and Wakamatsu, who he had previously supported—in the 70's now gave significant importance to the role of audience in the screening movement, thereby making a crucially important step towards cinema of movement. It is important to note here, that Matsuda's argument involves the fundamental question of 'who is the author', not only in film but in art. The hierarchy in film production, with director, producer and actors on the top—even more prominent in commercial films—was to be eliminated, and re-acquiring cinema's collective potential or collective creativity was sought. This of course does not mean that film and art should be subordinated to politics. It was rather an attempt to redefine a new possibility for cinema through a collaborative endeavor between the *auteurs*, critics and the audience on equal footing. Clearly, in this sense "cinema=movement" was declared, rather than maintaining clear borders between cinema and movement, and between politics and cinema.

As I mentioned earlier, due to the sudden firing of Suzuki Seijun from Nikkatsu and the studio's refusal of film rentals for his film retrospective scheduled by Cine-club Study Group in 1968, the Suzuki Seijun Joint Struggle Committee was organized. Centering around the Cine-club Study Group, a wide spectrum of movement groups were formed by filmmakers affiliated with major film companies, independent production companies, including Sozoshu and Wakamatsu Production, documentary groups of Ogawa Production and others, critics, student film groups and independent screening organizations in different regions - since the Communist Party-affiliated labor union at Nikkatsu was taking a political

---

<sup>209</sup> "*Undo no eiga' notamen*" [For 'cinema of movement'] in *Hakuchumu o ute*, 219-220.

stance against Seijun - their alliance bore the aspects of *Zenkyoto* movement in the film world. Through discussions such as this, Adachi developed his own theory of film movement.

At times by renouncing myself as auteur, the attempt was made to exclusively organize the energy of the movement that is immediately attributed to the work. However, unless the auteur's act, which always betrays the work, is firmly rooted in him/herself consciously as a creative activist for changing reality, I believe that, as far as renunciation goes, the movement can be conceived only within the illusion. It is on this standpoint that we claim the ethical ideal of auteur/activist (*sakka soku undosha*).<sup>210</sup>

In the description of the screening movement for *Closed Vagina* at the Nihon University Film Club, Adachi claims that it is impossible to acquire the substance of the movement simply by renouncing the auteur, and proposes the notion 'auteur/activist', an expression under formation leading to the equation 'cinema=movement'. Rather than either auteur or activist, or art or politics, it is the concept of connecting everything equally—genres of expression, *auteurs*, spectators, culture and revolution—that Matsuda and Adachi created out of a series of struggles they had experienced against capital 'P' politics or vanguardism. The theory cinema=movement was crucial for supporting landscape theory and landscape films, in the sense that it sought a cinematic expression that was collective, anonymous, and de-subjectivizing; and practically and aesthetically—in the sense that it sharply critiqued existing methodologies of cinematic expression—sought new forms and content.

Interestingly, the theory behind new movement films like this unfolded in various forms, as if echoing the swell of anti-establishment movements throughout the world from the late sixties onwards. For instance, the Dziga Vertov Group, formed by Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin argued that there are three categories in film: imperialistic films, revisionist films and militant films, which were defined respectively as Hollywood and Moscow films, auteur films, and truly revolutionary films.

During the projection of a militant film, the screen is no more than a blackboard, the wall of a school offering concrete analysis of a concrete situation.<sup>211</sup>

---

<sup>210</sup> Adachi Masao, "Izaya hajimen" ["We shall begin"], *Suzuki Seijun mondai kyoto kaigi hokoku*, [Suzuki Seijun Joint Struggle League Report], no. 4 (1<sup>st</sup> December 1968): 6-9.

<sup>211</sup> Ed., Alain Bergala, *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard: Tome 1 1950-1984* (Paris: Cahiers du Cinema, 1998), 344

Fernando Solanas in Argentina and Octavio Getino in Spain defined Hollywood cinema as first cinema, European cinema as second cinema, and third world cinema as third cinema. Using the concept of 'cinema as a gun' they asserted that in Latin America, holding a camera was synonymous with holding a gun, and that cinema did not remain merely cinema, but became a weapon aiming for liberation from American neocolonialism.<sup>212</sup> Meanwhile, Cuban film director Julio Garcia Espinoza contrasted the third cinema against the first and second cinemas of technical and artistic mastery, and declared that an Imperfect Cinema is an anti-establishment, partisan, committed cinema. Likewise, the Bolivian Ukamau group defined the first and second cinema as bourgeois cinema, and third cinema as the people's revolutionary and collective cinema, while Glauber Rocha in Brazil emphasized the aesthetic of hunger in Third World cinema, all of which were defined respectively within a specific local, historical and political context in Latin America.<sup>213</sup>

In addition, Rocha appeared in the Vertov Group's *Wind from the East* (1969) and Godard supported the European screening of *Hour of the Furnaces* (1968) by Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino. In Japan, a movement for screening the works of the Dziga Vertov Group was developed by Oshima's Sozosha, Matsuda, Adachi and Tsumura. For this particular screening, a Japanese dubbed version was created, and in addition to Sozosha-affiliated actors and real activists, Adachi participated as a voice-actor in *Struggle in Italy*. The voiceover narration then established a link to *Red Army/PFLP*.<sup>214</sup> In addition, since the cameraman for Godard's *Jusqu'à la victoire* came to Japan immediately before Adachi

---

<sup>212</sup> Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino's "Toward a third cinema" was translated into Japanese for *Eiga Hiho*, and their theory was often introduced by Matsuda and others. Solanas and Getino, "Toward a third cinema" in *Reviewing Histories: Selections from New Latin American Cinema*, ed. Coco Fusco, (NY: Hallwalls Contemporary Arts Center, 1987), 56-81.

<sup>213</sup> Glauber Rocha was introduced to Japan by ATG at the time, and as a representative filmmaker of the Third World Cinema. His texts were also translated into Japanese. Oshima also wrote about his interactions with Rocha, Godard and Gorin in Paris and Venice. See Oshima Nagisa, *Waga Nihon Seishin Kaizo Keikaku* [My plan for reconstructing Japanese spirit], (Tokyo: Sanpo, 1972), 38-43.

<sup>214</sup> *Lotte in Italia* was narrated by female activist and member of *Kurotento* (the Black Tent Theatre) Nakajima Aoi, Adachi, Hasegawa Genkichi cinematographer for Yoshida Kiju's *Erosu purasu gyakusatsu* [*Eros + Massacre*, 1969] and Iwabuchi Sumu of Wakamatsu Production. *British Sounds* and *Pravda* was narrated by Komatsu Hosei of Sozosha, Yoshida Hideko, an actress from the Black Tent theatre— who played a Japanese Korean girl in *Nihonshunkako* (*Sing a Song of Sex*, 1967). *The Red Army/PFLP* was narrated by Toura Rokko of Sozosha and Nakajima, Matsuda and Iwabuchi. Oshima's short film, *Yunbogi no nikki* (*Diary of Yunbogi*, 1965) was narrated by Komatsu.

and his peers entered Lebanon, information relevant to the filming was known to have been exchanged. On the other hand, the second incarnation of *Eiga Hihyo* often introduced the Vertov Group and other Latin-American revolutionary film theories, to supplement discussions in Japan. Examples of actual exchanges could be cited, but more important than the attribution of influences based on direct personal relations, theories, thoughts, or films are the movements of invisible solidarity that superseded these, or, a kind of global simultaneity. Matsuda expresses it as follows:

I, however would like to see a genuine arrangement, in which methodological agonies analogous to those color patches of paints that were slammed too carelessly on the canvas in *Le Vent d'est*, have to pass through when they are finally about to crystallize into a single direction inside Godard himself. If it is in the case of Adachi Masao, Sasaki Mamoru or I, instead of a black screen, 'landscape' will definitely be proposed. However the problem does not lie within a simple dichotomous opposition between a black screen and a landscape. Indeed, what is at stake is [the question], what is the mediation between the two, whose methodological agonies are shared in global simultaneity? <sup>215</sup>

What is remarkable about the vanguard filmmakers of this era is the extremely close proximity between them, because of a strong awareness of the issue of revolution that they shared in common, beyond national, regional and linguistic boundaries. However, similar to the development of landscape theory and the theory of reportage, 'invisible' networks such as this were also forced to retreat in the face of the maturation of the capitalist system. With the return of major film companies and auteurism, films were to be consumed as commodities themselves.

---

<sup>215</sup> Matsuda, *Fukanosei no media*, 93