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Abstract

"Our Dissolution:"
Subjectivity, Collectivity, and the Politics of Form in 1960s Japan

by

Patrick James Noonan

Doctor of Philosophy in Japanese Language
And the Designated Emphasis in Film Studies

Professor Alan Tansman, Chair

This dissertation argues that conceptions and representations of subjectivity in the Japanese 1960s negotiated a precarious balance between social critique and an extremism embracing violence against others and one's self. I define subjectivity as the modes of perception, affective responses, and self-consciousness that shape identity and motivate human beings to act. At one extreme, reflections on subjectivity in 1960s Japan revealed how individuals were complicit with social structures and institutions of power. At another, it led thinkers and artists to call for the rejection of the self so as to undermine the very structures shaping and limiting personal agency. The conflicts of 1960s Japan grew out of Japan's history of capitalist modernization and the global relations, economic developments, and social transformations specific to the postwar era. Japan's rapid recovery from the end of the Pacific War through the 1960s required mobilizing the Japanese citizenry to rebuild social institutions and to compete within a thriving global economy. For artists and thinkers alike, I argue, the exploration of perception, affect, and shifting grounds of consciousness held the potential to disrupt individuals' assimilation into dominant narratives of personal and social development compelled by Japan's domestic expansion and global aspirations.

My first chapter examines how the critic Yoshimoto Taka'aki, in his theories of language, argued for a notion of political agency rooted not in abstract ideas or theories of revolution, but unsystematic visceral experience. I then consider in the second chapter how the poet, playwright, and raconteur Terayama Shūji's ideas and representations of "action poetry" corresponded to a form of collective social revolt based in the emotions and affective experience. The third chapter analyzes how the New Wave filmmaker Yoshida Kijū considered the "objecthood" of narrative cinema – sensuous perception, the body, and the image – as the basis for creating a form of cinema that treated filmmaker, actors, and spectators as autonomous agents. In the last chapter, I examine two films by the filmmaker Adachi Masao to show a shift from representing subjectivity as a means to critique 1960s capitalism to forging a revolutionary subjectivity, or consciousness, aimed at overthrowing capitalist imperialism at this time.
Together, these chapters show how subjectivity was a vital and contradictory concept across media and political inclinations throughout the 1960s.
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Introduction:
The Japanese Sixties

By most accounts, the Japanese sixties ended in notorious acts of extreme political violence. The final blow to radical politics of the era, many claim, came in late-February, 1972 when five members of the United Red Army broke into a lodge at the base of Mount Asama in Karuizawa, Gunma Prefecture. A ten-day standoff, known as the Asama Lodge Incident, ensued between the five revolutionaries and the Japanese National Police Agency. This standoff ended when, on February 28th, the police stormed the lodge and arrested the five Red Army members.

Soon after the arrest of these revolutionaries, their recent brutal and self-abusive activities came to light. In December of 1971, they moved to Gunma Prefecture where, based out of a small cabin, they trained in revolutionary tactics and ideas. There, they violently purged twelve members of their own group through uchi-geba, or internal violence. Part of their training involved performing confessional self-reflections called sōkatsu: a critical self-analysis through which one must fully realize the bourgeois attitudes and patterns of thought preventing one from becoming fully committed to the revolution. Those who seemed to fail in this task were subject to mass beatings, starvation, and exposure. Becoming a revolutionar in the United Red Army was thus not simply a matter of participation and action, but a matter of consciousness. It was a matter of subjectivity.

This dissertation examines how the rhetoric of subjectivity, which manifest this violent inflection, informed aesthetic representation and critical thought during the Japanese sixties. Subjectivity, in Japan and throughout the globe, was central to the many forms of revolt that defined this moment. Countercultures, decolonization and national liberation struggles, and anti-capitalist rebellions all based their revolutionary and anti-systemic projects on notions of subjectivity, at both the individual and collective levels. Transforming how people thought, felt, and identified was, for many movements in this period, often as important as direct interventions—demonstrations, sit-ins, boycotts, armed conflict, and hijackings—in the material conditions producing and reproducing uneven power relations. In Japan, I show here, subjectivity was vital to forms of refusal and rebellion. But why the Japanese Sixties? Why subjectivity?

Recent scholarship on social movements and artists in 1960s Japan have shown how the events and forms of resistance that defined this historical moment were simultaneously global and region-specific. Wesley Sasaki-Uemura's work on citizen protests in the early-1960s illustrates how grass-roots organizations "spontaneously" protested the Japanese state and American imperialism at this time. Steven Ridgely's study of the poet and playwright Terayama Shūji explores the subversive tactics of the global counterculture as reflected in Teryama's work. In

---

2 Wesley Sasaki-Uemura, Organizing the Spontaneous (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2001).
3 Steven C. Ridgely, Japanese Counterculture: The Antiestablishment Art of Terayama Shūji (Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press, 2010).
addition, surrounding the fortieth anniversary of May 1968, a number of scholars in Japan released studies situating Japan within this global event. Ōguma Eiji's two-volume two-thousand page book, 1968, exhaustively documents the events of the student protest movements at various universities at the time. As a corrective to Ōguma's book, Yomota Inuhiko and Hirasawa Go's *Cultural Theory of 1968* (1968nen bunkaron) considers how various cultural transformations defined this moment in Japan. This dissertation builds on such work by considering how subjectivity played a vital role in the forms of refusal that traversed areas of aesthetic representation, social movements, and critical thought.

Although this project is not a history of 1960s Japan nor of the global sixties, historical and regional questions inform its approach. When and where were the sixties? Why claim the sixties as a particular historical period? Why focus on Japan at this moment?

Methodologically, periodization and regionalization run similar risks of essentializing a particular time or place. Periodizing may define an historical moment according to shared attitudes or stages of development: the sixties was about liberation or they were still “catching up.” Regionalizing may reiterate cliched cultural claims: even in the Japanese counterculture we still see hierarchical group dynamics. Despite such risks, I believe, both periodization and regionalization are necessary for understanding the global dynamics of a particular historical moment like the sixties. And both have necessary political stakes.

As Fredric Jameson has shown, periodization is essential to thinking historically. It allows us to imagine beginnings and endings; it allows us to imagine historical change. To think of the sixties as a particular historical period, Jameson argues, involves understanding the moment not as “some omnipresent and uniform shared style and way of thinking and acting, but rather as the sharing of a common objective situation, to which a whole range of varied responses and creative innovations is then possible, but always within that situation's structural limits.” That is, the sixties is defined not by homogeneity or influences, but by the totality of contradictions, “breaks,” and lags within the shared situation of the time: the Cold War, U.S. capitalist and cultural expansion, the formation of new communist states, and the Third World.

In addition, as Christopher Connery has argued, regionalization is essential to thinking both historically and spatially. Any spatial imaginary, Connery notes, requires constructing regional or national categories – Asia, the West, or Japan – and understanding those regions as existing within a network of material, economic, and geopolitical relations. (The figures I consider in this dissertation were keenly aware of the constructedness of such categories). And, as Connery writes, “this relationality...will always have an ideological character.” Where boundaries are drawn, which networks established, and how regions are characterized are integral to the consolidation of and resistance to forms of hegemonic power.

---

7 Fredric Jameson, “Periodizing the 60s,” *Social Text* 9(10) 1984, 178.
9 Connery, 546.
The ideological nature of regionalization is nowhere more apparent than in how regions are periodized. In the sixties, modernization theory provided the dominant model for dividing up not only time but also place. Modernization theory defines nations and regions according to achieved levels of “modern” infrastructural, industrial, technological, and social development. It marks nations’ proximities to or distances from the “developed” world by years. The Japanese postwar “economic miracle” is famous for how fast it propelled Japan through time. In less than 20 years after Japan's defeat, Japan once again “caught up” with the modern world, a moment marked by the 1964 Tokyo Olympics.

The sixties, as Connery has argued, offers an alternative conception to this dominant model for measuring time and marking place. It characterizes the various regions and nations of the period not according to a teleological trajectory or their distance from the most advanced stages of capitalism (or communism), but according to cultural homologies: differential responses to a shared objective situation. In Jameson's famous example, the modernist aesthetics of Wallace Stevens shared the same dynamics as liberation movements in the Third World. This conception of the sixties is not a history of influence: Che read Sartre, the students read Sartre. Rather, it is an attempt to understand this moment as itself offering an alternative to historical narratives of development and determinacy. Connery thus contends, “[p]eriodizing the Sixties, at the regional, global, and national levels, allows a coeval anti-modernization story to be told.”

To think of Japan in the Sixties thus involves not simply recognizing that Japan was part of the Asian Sixties, the World Sixties, or both. Rather, it involves recognizing that the very category of “Japan” in the sixties represents an array of contradictory forces, power struggles, transnational solidarities, and “co-presences,” to use Connery's term, specific to this era. Certainly one could define Japan in previous and later periods in similar terms. However, the confluence of the “common objective situation” of the World Sixties and Japan's history of capitalist modernization, I want to argue, distinguished this moment from others.

The Japanese sixties, in this dissertation, refers roughly to the period from 1955 to 1974: from Japan's return to pre-war levels of production to the 1973 oil shock that produced the country's first postwar economic decline. This period corresponds to the global shift in power relations following World War II and the Korean War, characterized by the struggles between American hegemony and new communist states defining the Cold War. It ends with new forms of organization and resistance – distinct pockets of armed struggle identifying with one another - to new forms of global capitalist imperialism, particularly American-run and abetted wars in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. This period also encompasses the foundations and activities of the figures and movements I consider in this dissertation: the publication of the New Left thinker Yoshimoto Taka'aki's seminal works and the beginning of “new waves” in cinema in 1956, Terayama Shūji's entrance onto the literary scene in the mid-1950s, and Adachi Masao's moving to Lebanon to join the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine in 1974.

---

10 Connery 548.
12 Connery, 548.
Japan in the 1960s is often represented as experiencing a period of social and political stability. High economic growth followed quashed social and labor movements in 1960. A single political party, the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), maintained rule from 1955 until 1993. Prime Minister Ikeda Hayato's famous doubling of the GNP in the early part of the decade led to unprecedented employment rates and increased the average standard of living. This economic boom financed infrastructural changes that altered the nation's urban and rural landscapes while cities were organized around ease of transportation and consumption. Integral to these developments were discourses of time, place, and community which, like any period or place, were "ideological in character."

Rebuilding a globally competitive capitalist economy at this time involved representing Japan's past, present and future through narratives of teleological development. The devastation of the war was portrayed as laying the foundation for postwar prosperity. Popular and official discourse, as historian Yoshikuni Igarashi writes, "promoted a linear image of history that reduced the war to nothing more than a necessary condition for Japan's present day prosperity." In 1964, Japan had ostensibly "caught up" with the postwar industrialized nations and was "ahead" of other Asian nations, as represented in Kaname Akamatsu's infamous "Flying Geese Paradigm": an economic theory that represented Japan as flying at the head of migrating geese in formation, the other Asian nations following its lead. At this time, the nation became increasingly cast as a homogenous entity with a coherent, stable history despite the regional movements and shifting boundaries that indicated its internal contradictions and unstable borders. The specter of the prewar family system haunted its postwar counterpart. The economic demands of the government and corporations required men devote themselves to their places of employment while women were asked to return to roles in the home. The government re-established mandatory ethics training for children in 1959 and, in 1965, the Ministry of Education released its edict, "The Image of the Ideal Japanese" (Kitai saeru ningenzô), which advanced a number of ideals resembling those promoted in prewar proclamations, most conspicuously, filial piety and love for the nation.

For the thinkers and artists I consider in this dissertation, subjectivity held the potential to disrupt individuals' assimilation into these narratives of development and social unity. Moreover, this rhetoric of subjectivity, I argue, formed one level in the dynamic relations that defined the World Sixties. That is, subjectivity was a response to the common historical situation of Japan, Asia, and the world at this moment.

I define subjectivity in this dissertation as the modes of perception, affective responses, and self-consciousness that shape identity and motivate human beings to act. I base this definition on the concepts circulating within discourses in Japan at the time. Although two terms in Japanese – shukansei and shutaisei - commonly translate to the English word, "subjectivity," the later term, shutaisei and the variant shutai (subject) were privileged parlance at the time. Shutaisei gained currency through the “subjectivity debates” (shutaisei ronsô) amongst Leftist

---

14 Yoshikuni Igarashi, Bodies of Memory (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000), 144.
intellectuals over the proper course for social transformation during the American Occupation.\textsuperscript{17} In these debates, shutaisei was, the historian Rikki Kersten explains, “in essence a conceptual matrix, combining within itself several related and intertwined political ideas, notably subjectivity, autonomy, and the self.”\textsuperscript{18} In the 1960s, shutaisei maintained these connotations while also denoting more specified meanings depending on the context in which it was used. Moreover, subjectivity as I understand it here encompasses notions and representations of the body, emotion, human perception, and affective experience. For the artists and thinkers I consider, the direct expression of individual sensation served as a starting point for rejecting one's position within prescribed roles and communities in an attempt to establish individual agency and open up possibilities for personal and social transformation.

My first chapter examines a work of popular criticism – What is Beauty in Language? (Gengo ni totte bi to wa nani ka) - by the thinker Yoshimoto Taka'aki. In the 1960s, Yoshimoto's ideas had significant influence on the New Left in Japan and radical student groups that occupied universities at the end of the era. By reading What is Beauty in Language alongside his interpretations of Karl Marx at the time, I show that Yoshimoto argues for a notion of political agency as rooted not in abstract ideas or theories of revolution, but unsystematic visceral experience. This text exemplifies the tendency during the 1960s in Japan, which I locate in other chapters, to resist incorporation into social structures – like the nation and family – through individual emotions and affective states.

I then consider in the second chapter how the poet, playwright, and raconteur Terayama Shūji's ideas and representations of "action poetry" corresponded to a form of collective social revolt. For Terayama, action poetry was not simply the act of putting pen to paper but the "event" of expressing oneself in a contingent situation. This aesthetic form, I show, paralleled an actual subversive act - "leaving home" (iede suru) - that he promoted and represented in the book Documentary Runaway (Dokyumentarī iede). This book illustrates how both running away from home and action poetry, for Terayama, were attempts to establish individual autonomy through contradicting the homogenizing technologies and systems of 1960s Japan through the apparent singularity and illogic of subjectivity: the emotions, perception, and affective experience.

In my third and fourth chapters, I turn to conceptions and representations of subjectivity in cinema. The numerous “new waves” and experimental movements in Japanese cinema during the 1960s conceptually based their approaches to representing the contradictions and inequalities of the 1960s on notions of subjectivity. The terms shutai and shutaisei were nearly ubiquitous throughout discussions in cinema at this time, providing filmmakers with the vocabulary to distinguish themselves from the received conventions of the Japanese studio system, documentary film, and other practices. Representing one's autonomy in novel forms offered filmmakers a means to expose the ideologies that they believed formal conventions concealed while transforming spectators' understandings of themselves and the world.

My third chapter considers the work of the “New Wave” filmmaker Yoshida Kijū who, in both his written criticism and films, challenged the conventions of the Japanese studio system.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item For a discussion of these debates see Victor Koschmann, Revolution and Subjectivity in Postwar Japan (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Yoshida based his approach to filmmaking on a notion of “self-negation” that privileged, I argue, the “objecthood,” or indeterminable presence of the cinematic image and bodies of his actors over a narrative telos. Moreover, Yoshida’s focus on the “materiality” of narrative cinema—sensuous perception, the body, and the image—served as the basis for a notion and form of cinema that treated filmmaker, actors, and spectators as autonomous agents.

Two films by the pink and revolutionary filmmaker Adachi Masao constitute the fourth and final chapter. I argue here that Adachi’s last two films in the Sixties, which he directed between 1970 and 1971, reflected a shift in the representation of subjectivity in cinema at this moment. In his final pink film, *Gushing Prayer: 15 Year-Old Prostitute* (Funshutsu kigan - 15sai baishunfu, 1970), Adachi represents the affective state of the film’s protagonist and the late-1960s more generally in order to critique the effects of capitalism on individual subjects at this historical juncture. In his following film, *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War* (Sekigun/PFLP – sekai sensō sensen, 1971), Adachi uses cinema to produce in spectators a revolutionary subjectivity, or consciousness, that could compel them to participate in armed revolt against capitalist imperialism at this time. This film and the criticism Adachi wrote for it exemplifies the cultural homology of the sixties, a revolutionary theory paralleling an experimental aesthetic both of which challenged the situation of capitalist imperialism at the time.

Ultimately, these conceptions and representations of subjectivity negotiated a precarious balance between social critique and extremism advocating violence against others and one’s self. At one extreme, they revealed how individuals were complicit with social structures and institutions of power. At another, they led these thinkers and artists to call for the rejection of the self so as to undermine the very structures shaping and limiting personal agency. These poles defining the rhetoric of subjectivity at this moment give this dissertation its title. The title itself I borrow from the scholar and novelist Takahashi Kazumi’s lament for the pitfalls of the student movement in the late-1960s. In his book, “Our Dissolution” (Waga kaitai), Takahashi traces what he believes were the self-destructive practices and ideas of the movements at this time, which, some might argue, led to the Asama Lodge Incident.19 While this title certainly refers to this potential outcome, it also refers, in this dissertation, to a potentially more productive practice of dismantling dominant conceptions of time, place, and community. Dissolution, here, refers to attempts at abandoning prescribed social roles in social structures like the family and nation for future possibilities; it refers to attempts at establishing new forms of individual and collective agency; and it refers to the breaks and disjunctures that defined the disparate yet co-present struggles of the sixties in Japan, Asia, and the world.

Chapter 1:
The Expressive Self

Human beings are the producers of their conceptions, ideas, etc. real, active human beings, as they are conditioned by a definite development of their productive forces and of the intercourse corresponding to these, up to its furthest forms. Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of human beings in their actual life-process.

- Karl Marx, The German Ideology

If we think of literature as what Marx called the "wealth of the objective development of humanity's essential powers," then we can think of literature as the fruit produced through the struggle between our essential powers and contemporary society; literature is what remains in the wake of that struggle.

- Yoshimoto Taka'aki, What is Beauty in Language?

Introduction

Few thinkers in 1960s Japan explored the relationship between human subjectivity and social structures more thoroughly than Yoshimoto Taka'aki (Ryūmei, 1924 – 2012). A poet, literary critic, and iconoclastic theorist, Yoshimoto was one of the most influential thinkers of the radical left through much of the sixties. He preached independence from political parties, the state, and civic society. He participated in the 1960 protests against the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty (Ampo) and famously addressed a crowd of protestors after they breached the outer gates surrounding the Diet. During the university occupations in the late-1960s, he gave lectures behind the barricades on the relationship between the university system and capitalist imperialism. But it was in three books published between the mid-1960s and early-1970s - What is Beauty in Language? (Gengo ni totte bi to wa nanika, 1965), Communal Illusions (Kyōdō genshōron, 1968), and Introduction to A Phenomenological Theory of the Mind (Kokoroteki genshōron josetsu, 1971) – that Yoshimoto examined most intensively the interaction between collective norms - from linguistic conventions to dominant social discourses – and human consciousness, perception, and expression.

2 Yoshimoto Taka'aki, Teihon: Gengo ni totte bi to wa nani ka Vol.1 [What is Beauty in Language?] (Tokyo: Kadokawa bunko), 107.
3 By the time Yoshimoto finished writing What is Beauty in Language? in 1965, he was quickly becoming one of the leading thinkers of radical politics in 1960s Japan. He had made a name for himself during the 1950s as a poet and iconoclastic critic with the publication of poetry collections and critiques of the wartime generation of thinkers and writers. In 1960, he participated in the anti-Anpo protests and famously addressed the Zengakuren students in a speech after they had breached the outer fence surrounding the National Diet. Despite the sense of "failure" that he and others sensed in the wake of Anpo, he engaged in a torrent of political activity in the years after the protests. In 1961, he founded along with the poet-activist Tanikawa Gan and critic Murakami Ichirō the journal Shikō, which by the end of the decade was practically required reading for any student radical. (He serialized What is Beauty in this journal between 1961 and 1965). The journal Shikō itself, by 1965, exhibited Yoshimoto's own political bent; it featured literature and poetry from a range of writers, and polemics against nearly any political orthodoxy. In 1962, not long after establishing the journal, Yoshimoto and Tanikawa organized the "autonomy school" (jiritsu
In these books, Yoshimoto developed theories of literary expression, the nation as an “illusion,” and phenomenological experience, which he grounded in idiosyncratic readings of Karl Marx at the time. Whereas Soviet and Communist thinkers argued that Marx's materialism was contained within his critiques of capitalism, Yoshimoto argued the opposite. Orthodox readings of Marx, based in Marx's later economic studies like Capital, claimed that the material economic conditions of a particular historical moment determined “superstructural” elements of society and human subjectivity like language, literature, and consciousness. According to Yoshimoto, however, Marx's critique of capitalism was already contained within his notion of the material relationship between human beings and nature. Basing his interpretations on Marx's earlier work, from Marx's dissertation through The German Ideology, Yoshimoto insisted that language and consciousness did not develop solely according to the productive forces of a particular historical moment, but through an essential relationship between human beings and nature.

By juxtaposing Yoshimoto's interpretation of Marx and his first seminal 1960s text, *What is Beauty in Language*, this chapter shows that Yoshimoto developed a theory of subjectivity and political agency as arising out of a conflict between conventionalized social systems and the sensuous experience of individuals' daily lives. I first consider two concepts - the “masses” (taishū) and “autonomy” (jiritsu) - which were central to Yoshimoto's understanding of subjectivity and political agency at the time. From the late-1950s to the early-1960s, Yoshimoto proposed, in diatribes against the intellectual establishment of postwar Japan, that only the lived experience of the “masses” (taishū) could form the foundation for a truly free society. I then trace this populism through his first essay on Marx, “Travels in Marx” (Marukusu kikō) which he serialized at the same time as *What is Beauty*. In this text, Yoshimoto proposed a theory of alienation not based within capitalist society, but in the relationship between human beings and nature. In this understanding of alienation, Yoshimoto developed a concept of sensuous experience and the body as the foundations for human subjectivity. This notion of subjectivity, I then show, informed his understanding of linguistic and literary expression in *What is Beauty in Language*. Although *What is Beauty* solely treats the development and nature of language and literary expression, it is, I argue, a theory of subjectivity and agency, or the possibilities for individual action and social change in 1960s Japan.

The Autonomy of the Masses

Yoshimoto's interest in agency was nowhere more apparent than in his notions of the “masses” (taishū) and “autonomy” (jiritsu). He developed both of these concepts in polemics against the postwar intellectual establishment – particularly proponents of liberal democracy and the Communist intelligentsia. He argued that dominant notions of political subjectivity failed to

gakko) where they both occasionally lectured. During this period, Yoshimoto also published a number of seminal works that defined his ideological position vis-a-vis the intellectual establishment in postwar Japan. These pieces laied the conceptual groundwork for the ideas that would inform his major theoretical works - like *What is Beauty* - in the mid to late-1960s.

4 In these critiques, Yoshimoto famously admitted to his own fervent support for the military state during the war as a tactic for indicating the proper course of reflection for the postwar intelligentsia. In order to fully understand why and how Japan had become a "fascist" state one had to confront one's own position within the rationalizing
account for the actual lives of the “masses” in their concrete existence as individuals. He consequently championed “autonomy” (jiritsu) from the governing discourses and social institutions mediating inter-personal life in postwar Japan. In doing so, Yoshimoto proposed a notion of political “subjectivity” (shutaisei) grounded in the immanent relations and experiences of daily life.

Yoshimoto situated his notion of the "autonomy of the masses" in direct opposition to ideas about the self that formed one of the key concerns in discussions on political agency in postwar Japan. In the wake of World War II, the self formed the conceptual matrix of discussions on war responsibility, the future of political participation, and the role of artists in society. The ideas of the self proposed within and in response to the well-known “subjectivity debates” (shutai ronso) illustrated the predominant approaches to theorizing political agency from the end of the war and into the 1960s. These debates focused on a fundamental question regarding historical and social change: who or what can bring about a truly equitable society? Progressive leftists like the political scientist Maruyama Masao argued that a participatory democracy, which could keep in check unlimited state power, required individuals who acted with shutaisei (a kind of autonomy) or actively participated in the public sphere – civic organizations, political debates, and social movements. Communist party members, disagreeing with the individualist premise of “modernists” like Maruyama, contended that only class at the proper stage of capitalist development could produce the collective shutaisei necessary for social transformation. Yoshimoto challenged both of these positions.

According to Yoshimoto, both the “progressive” and “materialist” stances perpetuated a hierarchy that differed little from the prewar era. In Yoshimoto's mind, intellectuals, much like state politicians, constituted an oligarchy that sought to subordinate the common people, or the “masses” to ideological ends. In the wake of the 1960 anti-Anpo protests, for example, Maruyama lauded the segment of the Japanese population that had participated in the demonstrations while criticizing those who had apathetically remained on the sidelines to pursue their own personal interests. The former, according to Maruyama, were testament to the possibility for shutaisei to effect political reform, while the latter exhibited the prewar tendency to yield to state power and the ruling class. To Yoshimoto, Maruyama's position smacked of the very elitism that had proved so dangerous during the war; Maruyama exemplified the intellectual elite who sought to regulate the lives of actual people in accordance with abstract notions of how society should be organized. The masses whom Maruyama had disparaged were, for Yoshimoto, the actual agents of change. Their experiences, inter-personal interactions, labor, and feelings of alienation formed the foundation from which an equitable society would arise.

For Yoshimoto, the “masses” thus referred not to an abstract concept, but to the concrete existence of people in their daily lives. He writes, “When I use the name ‘masses,’ I am not using it on ethical or political grounds, nor as a theoretical prescription. I am speaking of the mechanisms that had mobilized the Japanese people for total war. However, according to Yoshimoto, the previous generation of thinkers - communist and non-communist alike - failed to properly consider their roles within the wartime hegemony. They blithely accepted the tenants of American democracy in the postwar or continued to toe the Communist party line without stopping to fully understand how power functioned ideologically.

masses as an illusion in order to treat the masses that actually exist in practice." That is, Yoshimoto had to first critique the idea, or "illusion" of the masses as represented in contemporary political thought in order arrive, in his own thought, at their "actual existence in practice." He elaborates, "for example, the only thing of importance, for now, is how I actually live my life, or what I will do tomorrow. Because of that, wondering whether or not the situation of society or the political situation, or considering how the situation directly or indirectly influences 'my life is unimportant.' According to Yoshimoto, "abstract" political and social issues do not concern the masses. Rather they are most concerned with the matters that directly confront them in their daily lives. As the critic Kashima Shigeru explains: "the masses are those who wish to spend the day with their family, eat, excrete, and sleep quietly; they sometimes play, copulate, and procreate; and they want to do the same thing again tomorrow." As Kashima indicates here, the material existence of the "masses" for Yoshimoto, inheres in their physical, sensuous activities: eating, copulating, and procreating. And this corporeality formed the basis for a concept of immediate political agency.

Now, it is worth noting that this concept of the masses is quite ambiguous in Yoshimoto's work. On the one hand, he uses the concept to make a polemical point: intellectuals use the idea of the masses to propose political and social theories that have no bearing on the lives of real people. On the other, Yoshimoto seems to believe that this social stratum actually exists. At the foundation of society, he seems, to suggest is a hoard of people who live their lives with little concern for the abstract ideas and systems that rule their lives. In either case, however, Yoshimoto is invested in both a theory and a practice of lived life free from abstractions mediating political and social life. And, this desire to see the masses as living an immanent existence has led scholars to criticize Yoshimoto on a number of grounds.

Lawrence Olson, for example, sees little difference between Yoshimoto's notion of the "masses," which Olsen translates as "the people," and a resurgent nationalism in the postwar period. Olsen writes:

His ideas about "the people," which he said lay at the core of his thought had no sustained political consequence. He built no system, proposed no special theory, but persistently exalted the notion of emotional solidarity between intellectuals and "ordinary" Japanese. Like the American poet Carl Sandburg, he proclaimed "the people, Yes!" He was a symptom of the pluralistic intellectual search for cultural identity that accompanied economic recovery and political confrontation in the postwar period, and especially in the decade 1955-65.

Like many of Yoshimoto's critics, Olsen casts Yoshimoto as a proto-nationalist who saw the "Japanese people" as living proof of a distinct national identity rooted in authentic cultural practices. Although Yoshimoto championed the masses, he did not see the masses as the bearers
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7 Yoshimoto "Jokyo," 102
of a "cultural identity." In fact, during the 1960s, Yoshimoto argued the exact opposite. He saw such notions as culture, the nation, and the individual self as illusions, or ideological constructions, imposed onto concrete individuals. Olsen thus fails to see that, for Yoshimoto, the notion of the masses was an attempt to shift the definition of politics at the time away from the very abstractions, like a cultural identity, that intellectuals and bureaucrats used to organize people's perceptions of themselves and their practices in daily life.

Recognizing the political stakes, but still critical of Yoshimoto's project, Carl Cassegard has contended that Yoshimoto's notion of the "autonomy of the masses" supported privatization and political apathy. Cassegard argues that Yoshimoto's notion of autonomy corresponded to an endorsement for an "exit from the public," or a retreat from participation in the civic organizations, political parties, and debates that constituted the sphere of public politics in postwar Japan. Yoshimoto, Cassegard contends, championed a "privatized consciousness" that was "free from exalting state authority and also from idolizing organization." As a result, according to Cassegard, Yoshimoto promoted absolute political indifference in ensuing decades. Cassegard writes:

Instead of defining radicalism in terms of revolt, as he had done in his early texts, Yoshimoto now redefines it as championing the "autonomy" of the "masses," meaning their ability to lead a life without interference or directives from elitist intellectuals or other authorities. In fact, his defense of the 'masses' is also explicitly a defense of the right to live an apolitical life. To 'live and die indifferently to whatever ruling power,' he asserts, is of more weight than any politician and 'the basis for the thought of 'autonomy.'"

In Yoshimoto's later work, especially in his defense of hikikomori (reclusive youth), "autonomy" certainly came to refer to a retreat from society into the private life and space of one's home, particularly one's room. However, in the 1960, the "autonomy of the masses" still implied a form rebellion against the "illusions" mediating everyday life and political representation.

Indeed, as Riki Kersten argues, Yoshimoto's notion of autonomy was an attempt to return the autonomous self to the center of postwar politics, the self whom the intellectual elite had deprived of true shutaisei (subjectivity/ independence). Kersten writes:

Yoshimoto attempted to preserve the essential premises of shutaisei, seeking only to free them [the masses] from the embrace of the self-deceived progressive thinkers of the prewar generation. Yoshimoto's focus on everyday life, lived experience and direct action as the foundation of the value-action nexus was a reversal of everything he thought Maruyama and his ilk had done.

11 Cassegard, 6.  
12 The term hikikomori primarily refers to youth have seclude themselves in their rooms. Yoshimoto supported this practice in his book, Hikikomore: hitori no jikan o motsu to iu koto [Withdraw! Possessing Time of One's Own] (Tokyo: Daiwa shobō, 2002).
Yoshimoto's notion of the masses, according to Kersten, was a proposal for a form of politics in which personal life and desire bypassed conventional avenues of democratic representation. Yoshimoto identified, Kersten continues, “mediated agency as the most contested aspect of the self and as the containment undermining authentic selfhood – and postwar democracy – that had to be purged.”

For Yoshimoto, the possibility for unmediated agency was thus not based in the democratic system, ideas of democracy, nor in revolutionary theories. Rather, as his writing on Marx and later What is Beauty show, it was based in the human body and sensuous experience.

Subjective Alienation: Yoshimoto on Marx

Between the end of World War II and the late-1960s, Yoshimoto experienced two separate periods during which he actively studied the writings of Karl Marx; both came in the wake of historical "defeats." He first encountered Marx in the late-1940s not long after Japan's defeat in the war. In that time, Yoshimoto was drawn as much to the style of Marx's writing in translation as he was to Marx's ideas. He found in Marx, particularly the Marx of Capital, a method for "practical philosophy," or a mode of thinking that existed in relation to human "will and passion." These early writing were rather short impressionistic essays, but in them Yoshimoto indicated how he would later come to read Marx: as a thinker primarily concerned with human subjectivity, not just social structures.

His second phase came in the wake of the "defeat" of the protests against the re-signing of the U.S.-Japan Joint Security Treaty in the summer of 1960. In the years following the demonstrations, Yoshimoto all but disengaged from direct-action politics and devoted himself to reading, writing, and publishing radical cultural criticism. As he was issuing his invectives against the postwar intellectual establishment, as discussed above, he began an intensive study of Marx's oeuvre, which resulted in two 1964 publications, "Travels in Marx" (Marukusu kikō) and "Marx Biography" (Marukusuden). These texts were compiled into a single volume titled Karl Marx (Kāru Marukusu) in 1966.

In "Travels in Marx," the more theoretical of the two studies, Yoshimoto sought to rethink the very premise of Marx's concept of "alienation" in capitalist society. For Marx, "alienation" generally refers to an historical process whereby human beings, through their own activity, become separated from an "essential nature." In a class-society, for Marx, alienation occurs within the division of labor when workers sell their labor power and the products of their labor to capitalists. As a consequence the capitalist and the commodity itself come to rule workers. As Raymond Williams explains, "the world man has made confronts him as stranger.
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14 These texts were compiled into a single volume titled Karl Marx (Kāru Marukusu) in 1966.
15 Raymond Williams, Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society (New York: Oxford University Press), 33.
and enemy, having power over him who has transferred power to it." When Yoshimoto was writing during the 1960s, conventional interpretations, primarily Soviet and Communist party, assumed that in Marx alienation only occurs within capitalist society. Yoshimoto contested this assumption by returning to Marx's early writings.

Through a radical re-reading of Marx's works from his dissertation through *The German Ideology* Yoshimoto argued that alienation did not originate in the labor process but in the relationship between human beings and "nature." According to Yoshimoto the concept of alienation in Marx's philosophy of nature was not an "economic category," but a biological process essential to the "species-being" of humanity, which Marx later transposed to the sphere of economics, civil society, and the state in his later works like *Capital*.

Although Yoshimoto does not explicitly address the stakes of this project within "Travels in Marx," they were implicitly located in his defense of the masses.

As explained above, Yoshimoto attempted to theorize society not according to abstract concepts imposed on actual living beings, but the opposite: according to the nebulous "masses" onto whom intellectuals, bureaucrats, and politicians imposed abstract concepts. He took this idea to an extreme to argue that *any* conceptual category through which human beings understood and organized themselves - class, nation, family, and the individual self - were "illusions." Failing to recognize the imaginary nature of such categories, he argued, resulted in the very stratification that plagued Japan from the wartime era and into the postwar; it perpetuated the rule of the "vanguard" elites over the "masses." True thought and true politics had to arise from within the masses who were themselves already capable of thinking and "theorizing." In other words, Yoshimoto sought a form of immediate self-representation on the part of the masses that somehow eluded the concepts mediating their lives. Yoshimoto's re-reading of Marx's notion of alienation reflected this very logic.

After dismissing contemporary debates on the continuity of Marx's thought between his early "humanist" period to his later "scientific" period, Yoshimoto turns to how Marx conceptualized alienation in his dissertation, "The Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature." In his dissertation, Marx argued against the assumption that the Greek philosophers Epicurus and Democritus held similar views on nature and human freedom. According to Marx, Epicurus proposed a notion of human freedom that directly opposed the causality of Democritus's "positive science." In this work Marx was primarily interested in exploring the relationship between human agency and determinism, a problem that he grappled with throughout his work and which became a point of contention between Marxists for generations.

In "Travel in Marx," Yoshimoto interestingly does not explicitly address this central aporia in Marx's thought. Rather, he focuses on how Marx developed, out of Epicurus's materialism, a notion of alienation in the relationship between human beings and nature. According to Yoshimoto, Marx based his notion of alienation on Epicurus's idea that the physical senses provide the most reliable means to verify the existence of the objective world.
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first explains, "Unlike Democritus, Epicurus put more emphasis on sensation than thinking and thought. He claimed that "all must be seen through the senses in order to arrive at a foundation for interpreting things that await confirmation or things that are unclear."\textsuperscript{19} The senses for Epicurus thus confirmed, in Yoshimoto's reading, "<what is>" within the world. Marx saw this sensuous experience in Epicurus not as pure subjectivism, but as forming a dialectical relationship between human beings and the objective world. Yoshimoto continues:

\begin{quote}
The point Marx appropriately appreciated, with the use of Hegelian terminology, was Epicurus's positing of the world as the object of the senses....Marx appreciated what seemed at first glance to be Epicurus's subjectivist and sensorially idealist correction with Democritus's objectivity was, in fact, something premised on the concept of reciprocal determination.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

Marx bases his notion of alienation, according to Yoshimoto, on a visceral, sensory relationship to nature. Alienation occurs when the human body is divorced from the natural world and through that separation enters into a dialectical relationship with nature - shaping nature as nature shapes human beings.

By returning to Marx's philosophy of nature, Yoshimoto sought to locate an organic, pre-ideological premise for the formation of the illusory structures mediating society: religion, class, law, state, etc. Only from this conceptual point of departure, he maintained, could thought properly correspond to concrete life, or the everyday life of the masses. Yoshimoto thus contends, "The essence of Marx's philosophy of nature is the <alienated> relationship between human beings and nature. When so-called Marxists represent this <alienation> in civic society, they confuse it with <alienation> as a conceptualized economic category; they treat both on the same level." That is, human beings, in Yoshimoto's reading of Marx, are not separated from nature because they are alienated from their labor; rather, they are separated from their labor because they have already been separated from nature. This proto-alienation (the separation from nature) underlies all ensuing forms of alienation as "represented in civil society." Yoshimoto thus continues, "The concepts of <alienation> and <self-alienation>, which represent the reciprocal relationship between human beings and nature in Marx's philosophy of <nature>, are essential and therefore immutable concepts. Marx does not conceptualize them as changing with social change.\textsuperscript{21} In other words, according to Yoshimoto human society and all human relations originate from this essential moment of biological alienation. This very instance of alienation also constituted the origin of language and provided the possibility for individual agency within society.

\textsuperscript{19} Yoshimoto, \textit{Karu Marukusu}, 29.
\textsuperscript{20} Yoshimoto, \textit{Karu Marukusu}, 29
\textsuperscript{21} Yoshimoto, \textit{Karu Marukusu}, 23.
The Expressive Self: *What is Beauty in Language*

In Yoshimoto's first major work of the 1960s, *What is Beauty in Language*, he transposed his interpretations of Marx into a theory of linguistic and literary expression. As in his studies on Marx, Yoshimoto attempted to re-think the dominant assumptions underlying prominent theories of human and social development. In this work, he proposed a theory of how human beings came to possess spoken language and how various literary forms then evolved out of the capacity to speak. However, although language and literature formed the explicit objects of this study, Yoshimoto was not interested in language and literature *per se*. Rather, he was invested in a fundamental question about the relationship between the individual and the social, which carried inherent political stakes.

In *What is Beauty*, Yoshimoto sought to reconsider, through language and literature, the possibilities for human agency within historically specific social structures. For Yoshimoto, as for Marx and a number of Marxists, language was directly tied to the formation of human consciousness and the dominant paradigms, "illusions" in Yoshimoto's terms, of a particular society and historical moment. Language, for Yoshimoto, was the primary medium through which human beings entered into a dialectical relationship with one another, society, and the objective world. It was the product of the human attempt to express internal states and represent external phenomenon. Once established as a stable yet constantly transforming and transformable medium, language shaped and delimited human consciousness. However, despite ..., language also provided the very foundation for individual self expression, or the possibility for personal agency within these restraints. As a total system, for Yoshimoto, language developed through this contradiction between the individual and the social.

Methodologically, Yoshimoto's approach to theorizing language and literature mirrored his approach to theorizing alienation in Marx. He again polemically dismissed the ideas of prominent "vulgar Marxist" linguists and literary critics who, according to Yoshimoto, contended that language and literature simply reflected the material economic base. Figures like Josef Stalin and Georg Lukacs, Yoshimoto argued, considered these media in purely "instrumental" and "utilitarian" terms. They based their ideas not on analyses of how people and writers actually used language, but on pre-conceived "illusory" notions of the relationship between society and subjectivity.

Yoshimoto differentiates himself from these thinkers by referring to an often cited passage from Marx's *The German Ideology* in which Marx expressly addresses the relationship between language and consciousness. I quote it at length, for the passage significantly informs Yoshimoto's own approach:

> From the start the "spirit" is afflicted with the curse of being "burdened" with matter, which here makes its appearance in the form of agitated layers of air, sounds, in short, of
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22 The book itself consists of seven parts organized conceptually and chronologically. In the first three parts, Yoshimoto moves from a theory of how human beings first developed spoken language to a theory of literary expression. He then examines, in section four, shifts in literary expression through the history of modern Japanese literature from kindai to gendai, and ending with the present moment of the mid-1960s. Sections five through seven each center on a particular concept central to Yoshimoto's theory of literature: "organization," "content and form," and "position."
language. Language is as old as consciousness, language is practical consciousness that exists also for other men, and for that reason alone it really exists for me personally as well; language, like consciousness, only arises from the need, the necessity, of intercourse with other men. Where there exists a relationship, it exists for me: the animal does not enter into "relations" with anything, it does not enter into any relation at all. For the animal, its relation to others does not exist as a relations. Consciousness is, therefore, from the very beginning a social product, and remains so as long as men exist at all. Consciousness is at first, of course, merely consciousness concerning the immediate sensuous environment and consciousness of the limited connection with other persons and things outside the individual who is growing self-conscious. At the same time is is consciousness of nature...23

Yoshimoto cites this passage to launch a critique on Stalin's "On Marxism in Linguistics" and other Soviet thinkers' conceptions of language. "Vulgar Marxists" like Stalin, according to Yoshimoto, use this passage from *The German Ideology* in order to claim that language serves a purely social function. They claim that language exists simply as a communicative tool and, in so doing, they fail to recognize that Marx defines language as both a means for social communication and "self expression" (jiko hyōshutsu), Yoshimoto's own term. Yoshimoto uses this passage from Marx to develop a notion of language based upon individual lived experience.

In Yoshimoto's understanding of this passage, Marx defines consciousness and language as having a dual existence and a dual purpose. They are social and personal, or, more precisely, they are personal *because* they are social. Language and consciousness form through interactions with others and the world: language through inter-personal relations and consciousness through, the "immediate sensuous environment, limited connections with other people, and things outside the individual." Language and consciousness, in Yoshimoto's reading of Marx, take shape through an historical and dialectical development, which Yoshimoto first proposed in "Travels in Marx:" first through the alienation of the human body from nature and then through human beings' personal and social uses of language. This notion of human and social development underpins Yoshimoto's entire notion of language and personal agency.

Yoshimoto's theory of language rests on a hypothetical narrative of how human beings acquired spoken language. He proposes two fundamental stages through which language developed: a stage when human beings simply "felt" (sawaru) the external world, or only grasped it through a direct encounter, and a stage when they had developed the capacity to represent the world without coming into contact with it. The former stage corresponds, for Yoshimoto, to an animalistic reaction to external phenomenon like pain inflicted from without. When one experiences pain, one articulates a sound that directly corresponds to that physical experience with the environment. This stage, when considered in light of his readings of Marx, is the moment before alienation, when there was only a direct relationship between human beings and nature.

In the second stage, human beings begin to acquire the capacity to represent the world without being in direct contact with it. They developed sounds and mental images that at one
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point corresponded directly to the physical environment, but have come to acquire symbolic or indicative properties through use over time. Yoshimoto provides a brief narrative to illustrate this form of linguistic development.

He imagines a scenario in which hunters, in the first stage of linguistic development, encounter the ocean. They see or "feel" the ocean with their eyes and produce the sound "u" (the first sound for the word "ocean," or "umi" in Japanese). This sound, Yoshimoto maintains, indicates something in the external world, but that indication occurs only because the hunters have directly confronted it, they have "felt" the ocean with their consciousness. Once articulated this sound then begins to assume symbolic, or "indicative" properties. People begin to use it to refer to the ocean even when they are not seeing it, or "feelling" it with their consciousnesses. This transformation from the immanent experience with the world (a moment when language directly correlated to physical objects) to the symbolic forms the basis of all linguistic activity.

From this foundational narrative, Yoshimoto proposes two of his most famous linguistic concepts: "self-expression" (jiko hyōshutsu) and "indicative-expression" (shiji hyōshutsu). Both of these terms for expression refer to categories of language after human beings have been alienated from nature. Thus they both denote different forms of symbolic representation that differ in their points of articulation. Although Yoshimoto insists through What is Beauty that these two forms of expression exist in an intertwined relationship, like a "woven cloth" (orimonon), I will briefly introduce them separately. I will then consider the implications of how they work in tandem, which, I argue, forms the basis for Yoshimoto's conception of political agency within language.

Self-expression refers to the movement of consciousness toward an object. It is primarily a mental phenomenon in which as the critic Kamei Hideo explains "the image of a thing is capable of being intended even outside of a direct relationship to that thing." That is, self-expression is basically a mental image that one may have of an object even when one is not directly perceiving that object. It is primarily a subjective phenomenon. It is this form of expression that represents, for Yoshimoto, human alienation from nature. When human beings begin to consciously intend toward an object without being directly in front of it, they have begun to use nature as a tool for human production. One point to keep in mind here is that the self (jiko) of self-expression does not refer, for Yoshimoto to the ego or the individual. Self-expression is not the act of conveying one's private thoughts or inner feelings. Rather, it is an act of consciousness capable of representing the objective world.

Indicative-expression refers to when one attempts to "indicate" an object in the external world through a sound that corresponds to that object. That is, in indicative expression, one voluntarily makes a sound with the intention of making that sound (and the image to which it corresponds) an object of consciousness. This form of expression forms the basis of verbal communication. Through indicative expression, for Yoshimoto, human beings communicate intentions as that act of communication shapes the very language (the sounds that they use to communicate).

As mentioned, Yoshimoto saw these two forms of expression as existing in an interwoven relationship. That is, they dialectically shape one another. Indicative expression (the spoken words and corresponding images that others use) shape one's own self expression, or the mental images that one has of the world. At the same time, self expression shapes the words and the
meanings of the words that one and others use. In this respect, language, as the totality of these two forms of expression, is personal and social. This dialectic between the personal and social provides the basis for, what I believe, is Yoshimoto's notion of agency within language.

Again drawing on Marx, Yoshimoto proposes a "value theory of language" that explains how language signifies and how it means. He differentiates between "meaning" (imi) and "value" (kachi) in language according to the two forms of expression that comprise language (self-expression and indicative-expression). Meaning corresponds to indicative-expression, or to the sounds that represent an image of an object. Meaning is produced only in direct relationship to others, when two people speak to one another. "Value" corresponds to the mental images of self-expression. It is, for example, the "phenomenological image of the ocean."24 The value of language consists of every possible image that individuals have of the objective world. Yoshimoto thus claims that "value is the entirety of the relationships in language seen in the self-expression of consciousness."25 Although a rather opaque statement, Yoshimoto's point here is quite basic and relates back to his theory of the masses.

Yoshimoto's notion of self-expression reflects the plurality that characterizes his notion of the masses. He sees the masses as living a daily existence so varied that no abstract theory can properly represent them without delimiting them. Like the diversity of the masses, self-expression consists of the innumerable mental images that individuals may have of an object at any point in time. The critic Serizawa Shunsuke explains this idea with the example of the word "book." People will all have different images of a book within a particular moment in history, while they will share a general understanding of the word "book" that differs from other moments in history. In this sense, as Yoshimoto himself often contends, language and linguistic "value" is historically and socially specific; it is not universal. At the same time, language is unequivocally personal. Here we arrive at the agency inherent in Yoshimoto's notion of language and literature.

Even though, at certain moments in history, language has "meanings" and "values" specific to that moment, the particularity of each individual's "self expression," or mental images of objects, can transform any socially determined conventions. Thus, for Yoshimoto, language and particularly literature is a constant struggle between the social and the personal. As he writes, "If we think of literature as what Marx called the 'wealth of the objective development of humanity's essential powers,' then we can think of literature as the fruit produced through the struggle between our essential powers and contemporary society; literature is what remains in the wake of that struggle." Language, here, is simultaneously a site of struggle between the individual and the social while it empowers individuals or writers with the agency to engage in that struggle.

Conclusion:

This chapter argued that the critic Yoshimoto Taka’aki theorized individual agency as rooted in the sensuous experience of everyday life. Yoshimoto considered intellectuals’ abstract notions of revolution and ideas for political action as circumscribing the indeterminability of the lived lives of the masses. In response to these abstract ideas, or “illusions” Yoshimoto developed a

24 Yoshimoto, Genogo ni totte, 101.
25 Yoshimoto, Gengo ni totte, 102.
theoretical approach to both society and language that was based on an essential relationship between human beings and nature. Through his readings of Marx, he contended that alienation was not the result of social structures or exploitative systems, but a process directly connected to how human beings affectively encountered the world. He then based his theory of language in *What is Beauty in Language?* on this moment of proto-alienation. He argued that language was not determined by the “economic base” of society, but by the development of the human capacity to speak and imagine the world. The stakes in making this claim, for Yoshimoto, were twofold. First, it allowed him to develop a theory of human processes that were not determined by but existed in tension with social systems. Second, and by extension, it allowed him to develop a notion of language as paralleling the indeterminable plurality of the masses: each individual’s “self-expression,” or mental image of objects, exceeded any systematic ordering of language. This multiplicity manifest itself in literature, as the struggle between humanity’s “essential powers” and the social systems that attempted to dominate them. Agency, here, thus inhered in pure potentiality, and then tension between that potentiality and social structures. This very conflict, I now show, was also at the heart of the poet, playwright, and raconteur Teryama Shūji’s notion of “action poetry.”
Chapter 2: The Poetics of Leaving Home

Language is the main instrument of man's refusal to accept the world as it is. Without that refusal, without the unceasing generation by the mind of 'counter-worlds' -- a generation which cannot be divorced from the grammar of counter-factual and optative forms -- we would turn forever on the treadmill of the present. Reality would be...all that is the case and nothing more. Ours is the ability, the need, to gainsay or 'un-say' the world, to imagine and speak it otherwise.¹

- George Steiner, After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation

From the moment I decided to write poetry, I planned to destroy "form." Destroying form is a resistance against the dominant powers inside me. I have wanted to write poetry while running, write poetry while hitting, write poetry while jumping, while swimming, or write poetry with the rules of American football..."²

- Terayama Shūji, The Golden Age

When the poet, playwright, and raconteur Terayama Shūji defined the type of poetry that he wanted to write in the early-1960s as "action poetry," he was well aware of the aesthetic practice that he was referencing.³ Harold Rosenberg had first coined the term "Action Painting" in 1952 to describe the developing trend in painting when, "the canvas began to appear to one American painter after another as an arena in which to act--rather than as a space in which to reproduce, redesign, analyze or 'express' an object, actual or imagined. What was to go on the canvas was not a picture but an event."⁴ Much of the poetry being written in New York at the time appeared to express similar goals. As the critic Fred Moramarco writes:

If we changed the words "canvas," "painter," and "picture" in this passage to "page," "poet," and "poem" Rosenberg's perceptive statement can describe as well the situation in American poetry at the time. Just as American painters were experiencing the exhilarating freedom of discovering the act of painting as the "event" to be captured and frozen on the canvas, American poets were discovering, in the very act of poetic composition, the subject matter of their poetry.⁵

Like the paintings of Franz Kline or Jackson Pollock, the poems of Frank O'Hara and John Ashbury, Moramarco points out, were self-reflexive textual projects that made the very process of poetic production the art itself. Terayama's own use of the term "action poem" and the poems he produced in the 1960s partook of this self-referential practice.

² Terayama, Ogon Jidai [The Golden Age] (Tokyo: Kawade bunko), 70.
³ Terayama refers to action painting and action poetry throughout his writings on poetry in the 1960s. See: Terayama, Ogon jidai, 95.
Like Rosenberg's notion of action painting, action poetry for Terayama held revolutionary potential. Action painting for Rosenberg was, as Fred Orton writes, "about the possibility for a radical change that had not happened in the 1930s and the 1940s - far from it - and could not happen in the 1950s."6 Action painting was about the possibility of a transformative event the form and outcome of which one could not predict. As such, Orton continues, it was painting "concerned with the dialectical possibility of a revolution whose outlines can neither be defined nor denied."7 For Terayama, action poetry was precisely this possibility for revolution. It not only represented but was a potentially transformative act that had no predetermined goal, or telos. Action poetry was not simply the act of writing a poem; rather it was a viscerally-based action - running away from home in anger, or railing against generational oppression - that refused norms and conventions. It was transformation without theory, or even a singular "event."

Terayama's notion of action poetry instantiated the struggle over subjectivity central to attempts at asserting personal agency in 1960s Japan. How individuals, particularly postwar poets spoke and wrote in the 1960s, reflected what Terayama saw as the pervasive homogenization and mediation of human emotions, consciousness, and actions under capitalist modernity. One's language, feelings, and behavior no longer directly corresponded to one's self but reinforced social institutions, systems, and identities that, Teryama believed, were fabricated "illusions" (gensō), an idea that Terayama likely drew from the thinker Yoshimoto Taka'aki. Affective attachments had become the foundations for phantom communities like the family and nation. One's actions corresponded to prescribed roles in society and the home - son or daughter, husband or wife, salaryman or homemaker. Despite being imagined, according to Terayama, these systems and identities had come to control everyday life.

In others words, for Terayama, 1960s modernity had "reified" language and human relations. Reification, as Timothy Bewes broadly defines the term, "refers to the moment that a process or relation is generalized into an abstraction, and thereby turned into a 'thing.'"8 It is when a "human creation - an institution or an ideology, say - takes on the character of 'a force that controls human beings.'"9 Reification happens when seemingly fixed categories define the indeterminate plurality of human beings and everyday life. Reification had happened, for Terayama, to language and subjectivity in 1960s Japan: when Japanese poets all spoke and wrote in the same language (hyōjungo, or standardized Japanese) and the Japanese people felt the same emotions (love for parents, the emperor, and the nation). And yet, both language and subjectivity, he seemed to believe, held the potential to subvert their own abstraction and 'formalization."

In what follows, I argue, Terayama represented personal agency in the 1960 as arising not directly from individual subjects themselves but from the contradictions between subjects and the socializing systems of capitalist modernity. First, I show that in Terayama's writings on postwar poetry and social critiques of the home, he used language and the emotions as tropes to explain the possibilities for autonomy in 1960s Japan. Technologies like the printing press
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created the illusion of unified communities connected through a homogenized written language. Yet linguistic acts like "action poetry" offered the possibility of revolution, albeit unpredictable. The family "home" (ie) and all family-based structures like the nation, according to Terayama, used family members' love for one another to reinforce bureaucratic social systems that regulated identity and belonging. Yet, by "leaving home" (iede suru) and rejecting such emotional attachments through negative emotions - anger, jealousy, or ennui - one could potentially attain independence. Agency, for Terayama, was thus based on a negation of the very systems and structures that denied agency.

Terayama dramatized this contradiction in the form and content of his 1969 book, *Documentary Runaway* (Dokyumentarī iede). In this book, Terayama and his theater troupe Tenjo Sajiki documented the lives of young runaways who had actually refused their family homes and had runaway to Tokyo. Although the book is about these runaways, its subject is, as in action painting or action poetry, the act of production itself. Terayama self-reflexively represents the distinctive embodied voice of each runaway and each fleeting instance of their speech in the very technology - printed type - that homogenized and "fixed" (tekei suru) such linguistic events. The production that forms the subject, here, is thus not just human production - paint thrown onto a canvas or a scream, as in action painting and action poetry - but the mechanical reproduction of human production itself, or the mediation of effusive language (action poetry) in print.

This contradiction in the book's form correlates to the content, or the community that it represents. Like the languages in which they speak, the lives and actions of the documented runaways are protean and indeterminable. They act on impulses and emotions. They have few personal or political aspirations. Common beliefs do not unite them. As such, they trouble the very categories of "community," "social movement," or even "revolution" founded on shared ideologies or theoretical programs. And yet, when mediated through the technologies of mechanical reproduction and represented in this book, these disparate actors come to form a community; they are a community connected through the act of denying community itself.

**The Tyranny of "Form"**

Terayama's desire to "write" or record action poetry stemmed from the perception that abstract systems, institutions, or "illusions" (gensō) had come to determine the lived practices of everyday life. He saw 1960s Japan as a highly "reified" society in which dynamic processes and lived relations had become abstracted and turned into "fixed forms" (tekei). The quote in the epigraph of this chapter illustrates just how pervasive Terayama believed this reification had become. He writes, "from the moment I decided to write poetry, I planned to destroy 'form.' Destroying form is a resistance against the dominant powers inside me." The external systems and structures of authority that poetry refused did not lie outside Terayama; rather they had already fully permeated his subjectivity - they were "inside" him. Consequently, any oppositional act like action poetry involved, to varying degrees, opposing one's self. Thus, before turning to the possibilities for social revolt that Terayama proposed in his essays and
represented in *Documentary Runaway,* it is first necessary to examine how he understood the very conflict between subjectivity and the systems, technologies, and ideologies that shaped it. In essays critiquing 1960s Japanese society and the institution of postwar poetry, Terayama wrote primarily in figurative terms. He used concepts like "form," or the "home" (ie) not to denote poetic form *per se* or one's actual family home, but traditions and systems. "Form" could imply Japanese tanka poetry, the heteronormative family structure, and the concept of stasis. The "home" could imply all family-based systems - like the "family nation" (kokka) - aesthetic conventions, or the idea of origins. Even "poetry" (shi) itself denoted an entire range of activity: from speaking and writing to how one lived one's live. Thus, when Terayama was critiquing poetry he was often critiquing society; and, when he was critiquing society he was also critiquing aesthetic practices like poetry. Whatever the topic under scrutiny, Terayama's point was often the same: capitalist modernity had come to condition how individuals thought, felt, and spoke.

Indeed, for Terayama, the 1960s was a period of unparalleled abstraction and mediation. It was, in his words, the "era of 'representatives" (dairijin). He writes:

"Direct transmission" is now a social ill. To say anything we must say it by proxy. Most representatives seem busy acting as agents for what I should be doing. Politicians are representatives for my political activities and restaurant cooks are representatives for my kitchen work...However welfare society develops, the representatives of my "anger" or my "sadness" will easily find employment.  

Although phrased metaphorically here, Terayama saw the political and capitalist system of 1960s Japan as alienating human beings from the products of their labor and themselves. One could no longer directly represent one's own emotions or political grievances. Terayama thus lamented the loss of direct access to one's self and an uninterrupted intimacy between the self and the world. Nowhere was this alienation more apparent, for Terayama, than in the realm of linguistic expression and poetry.

Technologies of mass production and language regulations, according to Terayama, had come to condition how individuals, particularly poets, expressed themselves linguistically. He argued, for example, that the Gutenberg printing press and standardized spoken Japanese (hyōjungō) had "socialized" language and separated it from its direct relationship to individual expression. The printing press, Terayama writes, "gave preference to the political use of 'words' - which had [previously] played the vital role of transmitting our sentiments - by allowing them to reach farther places and more people than ever before. By standardizing 'words,' the printing press was useful for the development of knowledge, and ultimately produced a 'great communication.'" According to Terayama, the printing press had replaced a language that directly corresponded to human experience, or "our sentiments," with a conceptual language that made one's self and the world into objects of knowledge. It abstracted language from the human body and gave "words" a rationalized function. Consequently, the circulation of these "words"
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allowed for the formation of communities, like the nation, across ever greater expanses of space. Like the printing press, standardized Japanese was a "social language" (shakaitaki gengo) suited to delivering "news about the economy" or the weather. It served a political function, allowing for abstract public discourse or the creation of a national linguistic community; but it could not properly represent "individual sentiments" (kojinteki na jōnen).

This "formalization" of language, according to Terayama, had homogenized all of postwar poetry. Writing hyperbolically, he explains, "the entire history of postwar Japanese poetry is the history of typeface." The printing press "inserted into the same size lead mold all of our delicate expressions of emotion, our screams, and our whispers." Within postwar poetry, Terayama maintained, there was "hardly an original poem that contained the distinctive sound of the physical voice (nikusei)." Although a direct attack on the institution of postwar Japanese poetry, Terayama's point here applies to a social phenomenon well beyond particular poets' poems. Indeed, inherent in this critique is a social observation: qualitative links between human beings, or between human beings and themselves had been lost.

Now, in this lament for the loss of direct relations between language and the self or between the individual and world, Terayama appeared to express a nostalgia with potentially conservative implications. He seemed to think that at some point in the past human beings had lived a more "authentic" unified existence which had vanished in modern society. However, Terayama was well aware that a return to any such past was impossible and undesirable. A moment when subject and object, or language and the world were unified was, he believed, as much a product of modern society as any other "illusion" of communal solidarity. He thus writes, "I know it is useless to face poets and call in earnest for the simple 'recovery of the physical voice.' Doing so ignores the history of the invention of the printing press and denies reality like a spoiled child screaming for a return to nature." For Terayama, modern technology had irreversibly transformed human life; and, the language of poets illustrated the extent of this transformation. The absence of the "physical voice" in postwar poetry indicated that modernization had fundamentally altered language and human subjectivity along with it. Terayama's critiques of the "home" (ie) and promotions to "leave home" (iede suru) illuminate this point.

In his essay "On Leaving Home" (Iederon) - originally printed as part of a series of essays published in late-1962 in the Student Times and then reprinted in Documentary Runaway - Terayama critiqued how affective attachments to family members undergirded the systems and legal regulations that determined individuals' positions and identities within society. At the beginning of this piece, Terayama drew on American sociologist William Fielding Ogburn's (1886 – 1959) theories of the family to isolate love as the single unifying element of the 1960s "home." According to Terayama, "Ogburn divided the functions of the 'home' into seven categories: economy, class, education, religion, comfort, security, and love." Of these seven, Terayama
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believed, the first six had lost their significance within the home – society and the state had come to provide them. Education had moved from the home to the school while bodies of faith provided religion. Television had brought comfort into the home and outside the home the young found consolation in cabarets and bars. With these functions falling under the purview of the government, private industry, and civic society in postwar Japan, Terayama argued that a political revolution could transform these functions, “expand the domain of the individual, and lead to liberation.”18 Such a revolution, however, could not free individuals from the emotional ties, or the "loving function," uniting family members to one another and to the nation.

For Terayama, modern ideological institutions, from the Meiji period into the 1960s, used love to produce familial and national subjects by restricting them to communally prescribed roles and identities. By the early 1960s, many believed that the home in Japan had become less of an instrument for nation building, as in prewar discourse, and more of a private domain separated from society and politics.19 Terayama, though, recognized that the prewar values used to forge Japanese subjects still lingered within this ostensibly private realm. In his eyes, his mother’s generation, the generation of parents in the 1960s, still believed in the prewar idea that corporeal and visceral bonds united individuals to one another and tied distinct family units to the nation. He recalls an encounter with his mother in his youth to illustrate this point: “When I was fifteen, I told my mother, ‘I can live on my own so let me go to Tokyo.’ She responded by saying, ‘If you run away, I’ll kill you…It’s my duty to the nation that I raise you.’ The fact was, she didn’t want to treat me as an individual. She could only see me as part of her.”20

Terayama located the basis for his mother’s treatment of him as “part of her” (jibun jishin no bunshin) in Essence of the National Polity (Kokutai no hongi), a 1937 ideological treatise that aimed to bolster the people’s commitment to the nation at a time when the government believed it had lost its sway over its subjects.21 He explains:

Of course there were reasons that allowed her to replace the phrase “for the sake of the nation” with “for the sake of the family.” Before the war, the emperor functioned as the bond between the nation and the family; each family unit extended from the head family, which represented the nation. “Essence of the National Polity,” published the year I was born, states, “Our nation’s filial piety is truly unique in terms of how it elevates the natural human to conform to the national body. Our nation-state, the imperial family, is the people’s head family, which remains the center of our nation’s lifestyle. Through their devotion to their ancestors, the people worship the head family, and the emperor in turn loves the people as his offspring. (15)22
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*Essence of the National Polity* presented the tie between subjects, families, and the nation as a natural, physical connection: together, individual subjects constitute familial bodies, which compose the singular national body. Moreover, as in the portion Terayama cites, this treatise presented the relationship between the sovereign and his subjects as mirroring the love between a father and his children.

By citing *Essence of the National Polity*, Terayama was not simply showing how this discourse defined the home and the nation as connected by emotional bonds and blood relations. Rather, he was illustrating how 1960s social institutions like the family and the nation existed as affective attachments and subjective relations. In other words, one's emotions, like one's language, were no longer one's own. They, language and the emotions, had become systemized and used as instruments by which social institutions regulated identity and communal belonging. Thus, how one felt and spoke were always implicated in the social structures of 1960s modernity. What possibilities, then, were there for revolt within this system in which power seemed so pervasive? Terayama's notion of "action poetry" offers an answer.

**The Poetics of Leaving Home**

Terayama considered action poetry an act of "becoming" through contradiction. To once again return to the quote at the beginning of this chapter, Terayama writes, "From the moment I decided to write poetry, I planned to destroy "form." Destroying form is a resistance against the dominant powers inside me. I have wanted to write poetry while running, write poetry while hitting, write poetry while jumping, while swimming, or write poetry with the rules of American football...." Here, "destruction," does not imply direct confrontation or conflict; rather, it implies magnifying the illogic of a logical system, or emphasizing the motion within stasis. It was, like action painting, a singular "event" rooted in the movement of the body, the tone and texture of the voice, or strokes in writing within a given situation. The subject of action poetry was the act of production itself. It existed in a singular moment in time when, for example, Jack Kerouac or Langston Hughes howled at musicians in jazz clubs or when lovers whisper in each other's ears after an embrace. This poetry negated the fixity of the typeset word with speech or undermined the homogeneity of standardized spoken language with individual and regional idiosyncrasies. Translated into social terms, action poetry involved dissolving institutions bound together by emotional attachments through emotional "detachments."

As in Terayama's critiques of society and poetry, his propositions for social change and aesthetic transformation were equally figurative. He advocated "leaving home" (*iede suru*) as an actual and an aesthetic practice. He encouraged 1960s youth to refuse their attachments to family members and head to Tokyo. He also advocated a form of poetry that "ran away" from "home," or fixed conventions and traditional forms, by becoming the act of expression itself. Thus, poetry for Terayama was like poetry for the New York poets. It was, as Moramarco writes, the moment when poets "were discovering, in the very act of poetic composition, the
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subject matter of their poetry." The difference between Terayama and his New York counterparts was that "poetic composition," for Terayama, was not limited to the page. Nor were poets only those who wrote and published poems in literary journals. Terayama's "action poetry" did not have to utilize language per se. Poetry was action. Running away from home was a poetic act, so was talking about one's experiences on the streets. And poets could be anyone who performed such acts.

Above all, poetry, for Terayama, involved transforming the world "as it is," an act George Steiner understood to be fundamental to linguistic expression. Steiner writes:

Language is the main instrument of man's refusal to accept the world as it is. Without that refusal, without the unceasing generation by the mind of 'counter-worlds' -- a generation which cannot be divorced from the grammar of counter-factual and optative forms -- we would turn forever on the treadmill of the present. Reality would be...'all that is the case' and nothing more. Ours is the ability, the need, to gainsay or 'un-say' the world, to imagine and speak it otherwise.24

For Terayama, "un-saying" the world involved not only speaking, but acting and feeling to make it otherwise.

Indeed, although "running away" was often a metaphorical term for him, it was also an existential one. As a poetic act, leaving home meant "un-feeling" the emotions that kept one bound to one's "home" and the family-based systems that those feelings reinforced. As a form of social revolt, "running away" entailed, as Steven Ridgely writes, "unwinding institutionalized society (the kokka, or "family-nation") not from the top, by dismantling the structures of nations, but from below, by dissolving the family with its internal class structure and set of prescribed responsibilities."25 Tactically, this was social revolt through, Ridgely continues, "disinterested abandonment rather than violent destruction."26 Abandonment indeed, but not purely emotionless. Rejecting the affective bonds that undergirded social institutions, for Terayama, did not involve not feeling; on the contrary, it required mobilizing a different set of emotions - like anger and ennui - that precipitated and expressed the break-up of the attachments that united people and communities.

Terayama expressed this idea best in his critique of the home. The parent-child bond was not the only interpersonal relationship that Terayama saw as sustaining conventional familial and social relations. He also maintained that the love between husbands and wives underpinned the institution of monogamous marriage and the heternormative family structure. He thus advocated a more expansive concept of family life. Citing Friedrich Engels, he writes:

Questioning the “home” based on monogamous marriage will expose conventional falsehoods and usher in an era of dynamic change…For example, when Engels wrote in Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State, “Group marriage - the form of family in which whole groups of men and whole groups of women mutually possess one
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another - leaves little room for jealousy” he opened people's eyes to the polygamous “ideas of leaving home.”

In *Origins of the Family*, Engels critiqued the family within bourgeois capitalism through studies, primarily Lewis H. Morgan's *Ancient Society*, which claimed that communal property and group marriage were social norms in pre-capitalist societies. Engels used these analyses to propose that when the proletariat abolished private property, human society would enter a stage when men and women could freely choose their partners without concern for the acquisition and transference of private property through marriage. Terayama used Engels to support his own claim that once the "home" based on the love between two partners was abolished, human beings would create communal, multi-partner families.

However, within this "liberated" (kaihō) community, Terayama wanted to maintain the emotion of jealousy to ensure that conflict continued to disrupt the unity of the "home." He continues:

> We are not interested in the part that says, “no room for jealousy will remain.” That ambiguous complex emotion called jealousy is one thing that makes life worth living. Since people will embrace the illusion of “one husband-one wife” within a group of husbands and wives, they will continue to fret, jealous and alone. Aren't these emotions the point of departure for a wandering “homeless child?”

Even within multi-partner relationships, according to Terayama, people would still desire monogamy. They would perpetuate the very relationship a post-monogamous society was supposed to overcome. Jealousy - and its attending feelings of insecurity, fear, anxiety and anticipated loss - would ensure the continual breakdown of the home.

Likewise, anger formed the fuel for throwing into question the status quo and dissolving any attachments one might have to the past. Terayama writes, "Let's get angry once a day. If you are not infuriated at anything around you, you must do everything in your power to find something. If you pay proper attention, you will see that there are things around you that you 'should be angry' at." Anger, for Terayama, was an emotion that accompanied the realization, or a coming to consciousness of repression in society. It was the expression of a critical awareness of one's lack of power. And, more importantly, anger motivated one to act. He continues:

> Anger is like gasoline. Anger is, in a word, a viality directed toward tomorrow...The past is "the city of death." It is a finished product....You must become more enraged at society, humanity, the home, the city, yourself. (Make getting angry once a day a necessary practice. When you finish reading this, it's okay to rip it up and yell "this is bullshit!" That energy will be the moral gasoline that incites you to live your tomorrow.
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Terayama's call to "get angry," here, verges on a promotion for desultory violence. It resembles a somewhat juvenile cry to express one's rage through a destruction of all that exist - "society, humanity, the home, the city," and oneself. However, this anger and the other emotions involved in "running away" were catalysts for action and agency. They motivated one to act, to speak, and to change one's life. They were the emotional components of action poetry.

In this respect, action poetry and emotional detachment partook of a homologous logic, or illogic to be more precise. They both were dialectical refusals (negations from within apparently coherent structures) that had no predetermined form or outcome. As such, action poetry and running away from home were in constant tension with the machines that homogenized the heterogeneity of language, and the "illusory" systems which ruled the indeterminate plurality of human life. Terayama dramatized this very tension in *Documentary Runaway*. Both the form and content of this book represented the contradiction between systematization and the embodied unpredictability of subjective action, which Terayama saw at the core of capitalist modernity in 1960s Japan.

*Documentary Runaway*

*Documentary Runaway* was Terayama's second foray into bookmaking at the end of the 1960s. His first book - *Throw Out Your Books, Take to the Streets* (Sho o suteyo, machi e deyo, 1967) - was a much more conspicuous subversion of the medium of print.³⁰ Whereas *Documentary Runaway* assumed a similar form as *Throw Out Your Books*, it maintained a greater degree of dialectical tension between the systematic and the subjective.

By contrast, *Throw Out Your Books* - which Terayama later produced as a play between 1968 and 1970, and as a film in 1971 - is an all-out assault on bookmaking itself.³¹ The book is an eclectic array of essays (some from *In Praise of Leaving Home*), photographs, newsprint, cartoons, and fake advertisements. Text is printed upside down and in varying directions on the same page. Although it has a table of contents about twenty pages in when reading from one direction, the content is printed so that a reader can begin from either side of the covers. There is no beginning or end in this book, no linear direction in which one should read or simply flip through. It was, as Steven Ridgely writes, "a conspicuous treatment of the materiality rather than the transparency of words as distributed through the printing industry."³²

*Documentary Runaway* assumed a similar form as *Throw Out Your Books*, but its theme and content were somewhat more coherent. In this book, Terayama and members of his theater troupe Tenjō Sajiki presented the lives and culture of runaways who had actually left their homes and moved to Tokyo. Like *Throw Out Your Books, Documentary Runaway* consists of an array of printed and visual media. It imitates the layout and content of popular journals with a table of contents that presents its eleven sections and multiple subsections. The first section is a reprinting of Terayama's essay, "On Leaving Home" (explained above) which he first published in
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1962 in the *Student Times*. The following sections consist of runaways' transcribed personal testimonies; a roundtable discussion amongst a group of runaways on the topic of running away; written correspondences between two runaways who joined Terayama’s troupe, Akizawa Yukiko and Ukai Masahiro, and two fathers; an excerpt from Suwa Yu’s translation of Allen Ginsberg’s poem *Kaddish*; the score and lyrics to the banned late 1950s anthem “Let’s go to Tokyo” (Tōkyō e ikō); and an essay by the poet and critic Matsunga Goichi, in which he explains the history of leaving home and theorizes it as an anti-institutional act. Inserted at various points are a small chapbook of one runaway’s poetry and a folding book of the photographer Moriyama Daido’s photogravure photos. At the end of the book is a guidebook for the current and potential runaway, providing maps of the Tokyo streets and transportation systems marked with locations popular amongst those already inhabiting the city. On the final two pages of the book appear two images: the first, Terayama’s playhouse – an architectural collage of wheels, human clay figures, a “wanted sign,” half of a clown face with a clock for a nose, and other seemingly in-motion objects and figures; the second is a blank “Runaway Declaration Form” (Iede senkokusho) that one can fill out to proclaim his or her status as a runaway.

Unlike *Throw Out Your Books*, *Documentary Runaway* is "about" something other than the materiality of "words as as distributed through the printing industry." It does document the lives and culture of young runaways who left their homes for Tokyo. However, in this ostensibly transparent production of language through the technology of the printing industry - the printing press - the book, in fact, foregrounds the materiality of its own production. The "subject" here, though, is not just the materiality of the page, text, or the printing press itself. Nor is it the act of subjective human production as in "action painting" or in "action poetry:" splattering paint onto the canvas, or screaming. Rather, the subject of *Documentary Runaway* is the conflict between systematization and disruption inherent in the mechanical reproduction of human production, or the mediation and "reification" of subjective "poetic actions."

*Documentary Runaway* most conspicuously represents this tension through its primary medium: printed type. Most of the book consists of monologues, interviews and discussions recorded on magnetic tape and then transcribed and printed with a press. Within the homogeneity of this typeface Terayama attempts to capture the distinct "physical voice" (nikusei) of each runaway, their expressions of emotion and the fleeting moment, or the "action" of their "poetry." In the second section of the book, “Memoirs of Leaving Home," Terayama explains his approach to documenting his subjects: “These are the confessions of four young runaways. I recorded their voices on a tape recorder and then transcribed them onto paper as they were. I have tried as best I could not to mar the nuances of their physical voices (nikusei). They spoke of themselves while crying at times, screaming at others” (28). The transcriptions themselves illustrate this technique.

In Matsuzaki Chikashi’s testimony, for example, Terayama reproduces word-for-word his voice as it must have sounded on tape. He writes:

Y’know … like…those um nights, when you’ve turned off the lights, but you can’t sleep? On those nights, from my window, I um look at the moon, and I get so scared… I feel so lonely, so lonely… that I want to go home, and I start remembering
I sleep with my roommate, but sometimes I just get so inexplicably lonely…I want to like see my mom…so badly. (37)

Here, the melancholy of Matsuzaki's homesickness comes through in long pauses, represented with ellipses; the repetition of “lonely” (sabishii), the term that most aptly describes his psychic and emotional state; and his reiteration of the word "like" or "um" (nanka), an interjection often used while one is thinking or struggling for the right word. Like Matsuzaki, other runaways repeat themselves and pause while speaking, but the timing, rhythm and use of different linguistic conventions differentiates one from another.

For example, in her story of giving birth to a stillborn child, Irami Eriko speaks in a rhythmic stutter, often reiterating previous words, phrases, and interjections. She says:

I, was pregnant then, you know and – I, I thought I was infertile. For a loooong time……I thought about it like about a child, when I thought about giving birth to a child, I felt nothing, nothing that is, I didn’t feel any like fear at all, I felt nothing…I was numb, you know. And, anyway, I had the child – and, I, you know, at that time, you know, felt, you know, that a child, a child, you know, belongs to the mother, you know. I thought it was her property, you know. (30)

Here, the recurrence of words and phrases in short succession, like "I" (watashi), "child" (kodomo), "about" (tai suru), and “ne” (“you know”) – an interjection often used to involve a listener in one’s speech and commonly used repetitively amongst adolescent girls – creates a staccato rhythm that expresses the difficulty that Irami has in speaking of her loss. These patterns clearly distinguish her voice from that of Matsuzaki’s and display the emotions and embodied quality of her aural voice through homogenized typeface.

Similarly, the language these runaways use in writing reflects their affective states within the uniform appearance of print. The reproduced correspondence between runaway and Tenjō Sajiki actress Akizawa Yuko and her father in the fourth section, “Two Generations,” exemplifies this written language. Akizawa’s father writes his letter using conventional grammar and a logical structure:

Today, I was surprised by what came by telegram; it was your telegram asking me to send you money. It was a pleasant surprise. I knew you would be asking for money, but sending a letter would have been best. You may have completely forgotten about the previous letter I sent you with a large sum of money. If you have anything to say, you should write me a reply, but without a reply how can I send you any more money?...If I have to continue to pursue your acknowledgement of my previous letter, I won’t be able to send you any money. (80)

Here, even though her father expresses both surprise and anger, he does so in a steady, grammatically sound language.

By contrast, Akizawa’s letters eschew organizational constraint and the strictures of syntax for a written language that more aptly mirrors the affect of her voice. Her first letter is a
poem that, the introduction to the section explains, she performed aloud in the theatrical version of Terayama’s play, *Throw Out Your Books, Take to the Streets* (*Shō o suteyō, machi e deyō*). The anonymous author of the introduction writes, she “screamed from the stage ‘Tokyo! Tokyo! Tokyo!’” She read this letter addressed to her hometown; it resonated with her generation.” The letter is a stream of consciousness poem, replete with parataxis and a lack of punctuation. It begins with her addressing her father and other people whom she left behind:

Father today I’ve included a poem…
Tokyo Tokyo Tokyo Tokyo Tokyo Tokyo Mariko Sensei are you well did you have the red balloon I let go from the park slide reached you have you recovered from your illness Chizuko Kawamura I won’t write you a letter Sumi Yoshida I’d like to see you again speed freak Shû Kuraoka where did our dried up memories sink…(78)

She then shifts to the world she now inhabits, the city of Tokyo, which she presents in an onslaught of images:

…the “commune” centered in Kokubunji the young wife bothered by the seasick sailor going home the miniskirts speeding down the highway the black cat with golden eyes fishing around the ash can the goatee still without a lover the bow tie man the broken sign kick off the worn out blue sky kick off ahh people people kick off kick off!

Kick off from Shinjuku Station east exit!
Kick off from Shinjuku Station east exit! (79).

In this poem-letter to her father, Yuko addresses her hometown and describes her experience of Tokyo in a continuous flow of language that approximates a spoken rant. Her final call to her readers, or listeners, to “Kick off” from Shinjuku station heightens the sense that the persona is speaking, or yelling, at the reader.

Inherent in these transcriptions and letters are contradictions between mechanical reproduction and human production (typeface and the voice), permanence and transience, uniformity and difference. Although these runaways’ pauses, screams, and habits of speech and writing differ, they nevertheless appear similar in standardized print. We see here the very process that Terayama believed had destroyed postwar poetry. To repeat his lament, the printing press "inserted into the same size lead mold all of our delicate expressions of emotion, our screams, and our whispers." It transformed language, which had once transmitted "our sentiments," into a medium for circulating knowledge and information. In the transcriptions and letters printed in *Documentary Runaway*, we see an attempt to internally "undo" this process, or to instill into "the same size lead mold" emotional expressions and representations of affective experience. In other words, Terayama attempts to use the technology and the medium that had "reified" life in order to negate reification. He self-consciously uses the "fixity" of form to not only represent but to create dynamic motion that corresponds to the immediacy of the human voice. The Moriyama Daidō photographs, which appear near the end of the book, further illustrate this point.
The Moriyama photos are inserted near the end of the book and form unto themselves a small pictorial folding book. The cover and the back of this folding book consist of a single photograph that has been split in half, separating the two subjects - an elderly woman and an elderly man - of the shot. On the front cover, the elderly woman, wearing a kimonono, is sitting seiza (on her knees, Japanese style) on tatami mats within a traditional Japanese room. On the back over is an elderly man, likely her husband, wearing a yukata and sitting in a similar position within the same room. When one opens the book, one finds two photographic negatives - one on the right page, the other on the left page - of the room in which these two are sitting, except they do not appear in this photograph. These pages then unfold to reveal a print of a sequence of film cells. The celluloid from which this print was taken appears damaged on the right side and splotches of white and red blur into an entirely white area at the top-right portion of the print.

Now, one could read this folding book as revealing or "demystifying" the process of photographic production. As "apparatus" film theorists like Jean Louis Comolli or Jean-Louis Baudry have argued, "realistic" formal elements of classical cinema mask the actual technologies - camera, projector, film stock - as well as the labor that produce films themselves. This process reflects the functioning of ideology in society, which masks actual lived social relations to make imagined relations seem real or natural. How a film or a photograph situates or addresses viewers reinforces these imaginary relations within society and viewers' subjectivities. Revealing the materiality of the process of photographic production can thus produce a "knowledge effect" and make spectators aware of the functioning of ideology, or the "illusions" ruling everyday life.

Moriyama's booklet appears to present this very exposure of the materiality of the photograph itself, or the processes of photographic production that produced it. As one opens the book, one moves from a "realistic" image to the negative and then to the filmstock itself. Closing the book enacts a reverse process, out from the filmstock to the negative and to the photographic image. The book reveals its own materiality and the process that produced it. However, Terayama and Moriyama, much like the apparatus theorists themselves, were not so optimistic about the revolutionary potential of such a revelation. "Knowledge" itself was not a precursor to action, for Terayama at least.

Rather than "reveal" the materiality of their own production, these photographs represent the dialectical tension between stasis and motion, or that which seems to "exist" and that which points to future possibility, at the core of Terayama's notion of action poetry. These photographs reflect an aspect of Moriyama's own approach to photography which was itself a kind of dialectical "action" of capturing future potentiality through the "real." As Miryam Sas has shown, in Moriyama's work "the action of photography becomes a momentary grasp of that which is 'most real,' and yet, through that moment that seems to pass through the subject, something beyond or outside of individual subjectivity is attained." For Moriyama, once the photograph is taken he, the subject taking the picture, no longer matters; he captures a fleeting historical event that once existed and through that very act produces something "beyond" his own intention. The photograph itself, although static in its materiality, "allows for the gaze of others beyond the photographer, and one that also encompasses a political/historical event

That which the photograph seems to arrest, in other words, is constantly in flux and oriented toward the future. Moriyama's photographic insert within *Documentary Runaway*, presents precisely this motion within stasis. It offers shifting perspectives and experiences through a material engagement with the photographic image itself. The unpredictability of meaning here inheres in both a visual and embodied encounter: one must open the photographs, turn their pages, take them apart, or put them back together. Different perspectives are produced as one folds the pages differently, giving a sense that, indeed, the "event" captured does not have a fixed meaning.

These photographs, like the transcribed testimonies, instantiate the dialectical tension between the "fixity" of mechanical reproduction and the dynamic motion of subjectivity. Moriyama uses the machine of the camera to "grasp and put out" that which is real inside him. The photograph itself then exceeds his own subjectivity, becoming the possibility itself of a future encounter, a change in what the photograph means. Implicit in this form of photographic production is an attempt to exceed stasis through the mutability and dialectical nature of subjectivity: its capacity to exist at one moment and not exist at another. It is through this very contradiction that the subjects represented in this book find personal agency; and it is this contradiction that links them as a community.

The final section of the book - “A Handy Guide to Leaving Home” - presents the nature of this agency and community in spatial terms. This section consists of large and small-scale maps of the city’s streets and railway systems. They reflect runaways' subjective - emotional, physical, and psychic - relationships to the city of Tokyo. These maps are hand-drawn and present the city according to runaways’ mental image of it. The first map, for example, “A Living Guide and Map of Ueno,” represents the area around the Ueno train station with imprecise sketches of the streets, railroad tracks, buildings, and landmarks relevant to runaways in the area. (234-5) Drawings of small house-like buildings represent coffee shops, a bulbous bus next to a sign indicates a bus stop, and a three-story structure that looks like it might collapse stands for the department store in front of the station. Copied over this cartoon-like city are images from popular culture, which also represent landmarks important to the runaways of the area: the bust of the famous *yakuza* actor Takakura Ken (popular amongst youth at the time) with a triangular sign imprinted on his forehead that reads “Tôei,” marks the Tôei movie theater. Pictures of subway and locomotive trains enable a reader to easily locate the main station. This map presents a sensuous relationship to the city - how these runaways feel about and in the space. It exists in direct contrast to "official" maps of the city that represent the urban space systematically.

In other maps they appropriate such official versions and inscribe onto them how they actually inhabit the city. On an official street map of Ueno, for example, they have written numbers that correspond, in a key below, to a list of restaurants, hostess bars, hotels, and other establishments they frequent. Another map consists of a diagram of the train lines onto which they have circled the stations where runaways hang out. Onto the logical ordering of the street and transportation lines, the runaways have written their own "illogic:" their subjective experiences with the space of Tokyo. The tension between the systemic and the subjective
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appears as a spatial phenomenon here. The city as it "is" - how it has been organized and imagined systematically - stands in direct contrast to the city as it can "become" - how it can be re-organized and re-imagined systematically according to individuals' subjective actions.

However, even in this re-imagining of the city there is a tendency towards coherence, or coherence in incoherence. The maps clearly represent a subjective "psychogeographical," to use Guy Debord's term, image of the city that defies its rational systematization. And yet, when represented in this book, these maps come to have an organizing function. The points of interest may be based on individual's subjective experiences, but they nevertheless create the image of how a community inhabits the urban space of Tokyo.

Now, I do not mean to argue that these runaways reproduce the very logic that they aim to deny. They do not systematically represent Tokyo nor do they create a rationalized conception of the city. Rather, I mean to argue that the community represented through these maps is organized but it is organized around its own incoherency. They are organized through their uncoordinated actions, experiences, and imaginaries of Tokyo. These maps thus represent community not as it "is," but as the potentiality of becoming: how the city can be inhabited and re-imagined in limitless and unexpected ways. And that very becoming is predicated on a denial of the institutional and the systematic, even on the attachments that organize communities like the family and the nation.

The “Runaway Declaration Form,” which comes after the map, illustrates the centrality of refusal to this form of community (269). This form is modeled on an official missing person’s report (Iedenin sósaku negai), a number of which appear throughout the book. Like its official counterpart, the “Runaway Declaration Form” requests evidence of one’s identity: a self-portrait, “preferably with one’s family;” first and last names, date of birth, age, a description of how they will looked when leaving, like the clothes they intend to wear and the articles one will bring. Whereas the missing persons report asks that the person filing the form - most often the people whom a runaway has fled – describe the physical traits of the runaway, the lower half of the “Runaway Declaration Form,” requests a physical description of the people and things one will leave behind: the characteristics of one’s father, mother, and siblings; one’s homes; and the pets, friends, teachers, and loved books remaining. At the bottom of the form appears a prompt for one to declare in 2000 characters one’s reasons for leaving. Whereas the information on the police report identifies a person as existing outside the boundaries of a community – the family – to which he or she is lawfully bound, the “Runaway Declaration Form” allows a runaway to reuse that information to affirm him or herself as having rejected that community. In other words, through this form runaways define themselves first as what they are "not" (i.e. what they used to be) and then, only after having repudiated the grounds on which identity itself is confirmed, can they begin to seek out what they might become. And that which they may become arises not from a pre-determined idea or concept external to them, but from within: how they feel and what they sense. The testimonies of the runaways themselves reinforce this point.

Some runaways, like Hashimoto Yoichi disavow participation in all group life. He writes, “I question the concept of organization itself. I feel it, you know, I want to renounce all organization you know, and now, I’m thinking about living in Shinjuku, living anarchically, you know.” Hashimoto exemplifies the centrality of refusal in the formation of this community of runaways. As he recounts, he had previously joined one of the radical student groups at his
university, but found its organizational structure restrictive. Other runaways, like the Tenjō sajiki actor Sasaki Eimei, show how capricious and apolitical the subjective impulses motivating the participants in this community can be. Sasaki says:

I’ve come to Tokyo twice now, and since I returned twice before, I think I’ll probably return this time as well. If it’s raining I’ll go back, if it’s clear…. There’s nothing in particular that I’m rejecting. It all depends on the weather. When I left for the second time, I thought that it would be a pain if it were raining in Tokyo when I got there. And since it was raining, I went home the next day. (Laughs). (29)

Sasaki’s account, here, best illustrates this form of community and the dynamics at work in the form of the book. While Hashimoto clearly rejects all organizational life, Sasaki rejects rejecting. He acts according to his mood, or how he feels about the weather. He is embodied and protean; he is governed by no abstract ideals or theories. He is not attached to home, yet he returns for shelter as he might any roofed space. Perhaps Sasaki is simply indifferent. But his actions and his feelings illustrate the potentiality for transformation that Terayama sees in action poetry and running away.

Indeed, Sasaki’s is transformation as unpredictability and possibility. He is, to return to the previous chapter, a member of Yoshimoto’s “masses:” someone living his daily life unaffected by the theories of the intellectual elite or political bureaucratic systems. His subjective experience and capriciousness undermines any and all prescribed roles and determining narratives. Taken together with the rest of the runaways in this book, they trouble the very categories of “community” and even “revolution.”

Conclusion

The contradictions inherent in Documentary Runaway – in its form and the community that it represents - raise a number of perhaps irresolvable issues about the nature of revolution in Terayama’s work. On the one hand, Terayama seemed to propose that only pure negativity, or destruction of all that existed could bring about personal and social transformation. On the other, he seemed to propose that this very act of destruction was also productive. Indeed, action poetry and running away, he often maintained, were both acts of "becoming" (naru). They were, he implied, dialectical moments of development and transition. In either case, however, Terayama’s fundamental distrust of abstract and architectonic systems led him to insist that any transformation had to begin with individual subjectivity not as thought or reflection, but as physical and emotional action and impulse. This disruptive nature of subjectivity and affective experience extended to the cinema in the 1960s. As I show in the next chapter, the New Wave filmmaker Yoshida Kijū based his approach to undermining the determinacy of narrative cinema on the indeterminacy of the human body and forms of subjective cinematic perception.
[M]odern man's products and his works function like beings of nature. He must objectify himself, and social objects become things, fetishes, which turn upon him...[I]f man has humanized himself, he has done so only by tearing himself apart, dividing himself, fragmenting himself.¹

Henri Lefebvre, *The Critique of Everyday Life Vol. 1*

“[T]he experience of being distanced by the work in question seems crucial: the beholder knows himself to stand in an indeterminate, open-ended – and unexacting – relation as subject to the impassive object...In fact, being distanced by such objects is not, I suggest, entirely unlike being distanced, or crowded by the silent presence of another person; the experience of coming upon literalist objects unexpectedly – for example, in somewhat darkened rooms – can be strongly, if momentarily, disquieting in just this way.”²

Michael Fried, “Art and Objecthood”

In “The Cinema of Defection: Auteur Theory and Institutional Life,” film scholar Jeff Menne argues that in late-1960s Hollywood auteurism reflected a tension between individual agency and institutional authority pervading the era.³ Corporate acquisitions of the Hollywood studios in the late-1960s, Menne shows, resulted in a “crisis in authority” that was reflected in both the form and content of films from this era. Directors attempted to exert their authority over their films through “stylish theatricality” while their narratives represented characters who sought personal agency by “opting out” of prescribed social roles for lives lacking a determined aim. The claim to autonomy in these films, Menne argues, contained an “inner logic” that led away from “subjectivity” and toward what critics of modern art like Michael Fried have called “objecthood.”⁴ Stylistically, these films approximated the sheer presence of an art “object” while their protagonists emphasized their corporeal existence as a means to refuse their status as “thinking subjects” in rationalized systems imposed from the outside. Although Menne’s claim is specific to Hollywood and the American sixties, the tendency towards “objecthood” in both the content and form of films holds true, I would argue, in the context of the “global 1960s.”

Indeed, the collapse of the Japanese film industry in the late-1950s and early 1960s produced a new generation of directors, like Masumura Yasuzô (1924 - 1986) and Ōshima Nagisa (1932 - ), who challenged the authority that the Japanese film studios exercised over the production of postwar cinema. In written criticism and the content of films, this generation of filmmakers sought to create films rooted in personal agency, which I define here as the capacity for individuals to act in order to change an existing situation or political order. These young filmmakers began writing their own original screenplays, published scathing critiques of the studios and the previous generation of directors, formally subverted the narrative conventions of studio films, and depicted characters who refused the prescribed identities of modern life through
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their sheer physicality. They insisted that postwar cinema and postwar Japan required filmmakers who presented the contradictions of modern life in forms that broke with tradition. Although these filmmakers never used the term “auteur,” they often referred to themselves as “sakka,” individual filmmakers-as-authors.⁵ The period from the late-1950s through the 1960s in Japanese cinema was thus what we might call an “auteurist moment” in which directors claimed authority over their films by rejecting their positions in the studios’ determinate systems of production through styles and narratives that reflected their refusal.

This chapter examines how the very struggle between an individual director and studio filmmaking was reflected in the film criticism and films of the “New Wave” director Yoshida Kijū (1932 - ). Yoshida’s film criticism and films themselves, I argue, exhibited the tendency in the 1960s (which I examine in other chapters of this dissertation) to reject one’s position within rationalized social systems and predetermined social roles by emphasizing the singularity of sensual perception and visceral experience. My aim here is twofold.

First, I show that Yoshida based his approach to filmmaking on what he and his contemporaries called “subjectivity” (shutaisei). For Yoshida, subjectivity referred to an individual’s inner experience, which develops through interactions between one’s perceptual faculties, particularly vision, and the external world. He used this conception of subjectivity as an approach to filmmaking in which the interaction between the filmmaker and his actors’ bodies “negated” the systematic production of meaning in studio narratives. The encounter between a filmmaker’s sheer sense of vision and his actors’ corporeality, according to Yoshida, produced images (eizō) with no predetermined function, allowing for multivalent responses from spectators. Establishing agency in the production and consumption, for Yoshida, thus required rejecting the systematic conventions of narrative and re-constituting cinema as a social encounter lacking a telos.

Second, I argue that Yoshida’s films reflected this rejection of systems in their narrative patterns and formal techniques. Yoshida’s characters, consciously or not, resist the social structures and economic system of modern Japan—the family, nation, and commercial capitalism—through the immediacy of corporeal sensation, emotion, and sensual perception. They physically react against external pressures and overdetermined conceptions of individual purpose, history, and social life. Yoshida upsets the very teloi of narrative cinema—the movement toward meaningful resolution and the intention toward unity—through self-referential techniques: repetition, narrative fragmentation, and intertextuality. In particular, Yoshida subverts spectators’ identification with a film and its characters, a primary aim of narrative cinema, by creating a sense of distance through shots of his characters’ enigmatic gazes and facial expressions. Yoshida treats his characters less as sympathetic agents than as subjects in the process of becoming objects within the narrative itself and within the conventions of cinema. This treatment of characters, along with the use of self-referential techniques renders Yoshida's characters and his films “objects.”

The term “object” in this chapter alludes to a paradox in the thematic content and forms of Yoshida's films. Yoshida often represents the “objectification” of human beings in modern capitalist society, which Henri Lefebvre expresses in the following way:

> [M]odern man's products and his works function like beings of nature. He must objectify himself, and social objects become things, fetishes, which turn upon him...[I]f man has

humanized himself, he has done so only by tearing himself apart, dividing himself, fragmenting himself.⁶

Although Yoshida himself was not a Marxist, his criticism and his films show that he was concerned with how the economic systems and social institutions of modernity – like capitalism, the family, and the nation – dehumanized human beings by transforming them into commodities and functions of power. The characters in his films, I show, attempt to recuperate their agency in the manner that Lefebvre suggests: through “fragmenting,” or “objectifying” themselves as subjects. By object in this chapter I also mean “objecthood,” in Michael Fried’s understanding of the term. For Fried, “objecthood” refers to the nature of 1960s aesthetic works that foregrounded the “materiality” of their mediums as a rejection of received aesthetic conventions. Yoshida, I argue, similarly emphasized a film’s materiality – the gaze, the human body, facial expressions, and the cinematic image (eizō) – in order to subvert dominant modes of perception that the systematized mass-production of films produced. In both the narratives and forms of Yoshida’s films, objecthood served as a means to reject incorporation into systems that reduced human beings and films to objects. This paradoxical refusal served as the basis for a notion of subjective agency in Yoshida’s work that proceeded from experience with the objective world.

**Toward an “Auteurist” Cinema in 1960s Japan**

Yoshida’s attempt to assert his autonomy over the production and form of his films was a direct response to shifts in the Japanese film industry in the 1950s and early 1960s. His career coincided with the postwar revitalization of Japanese cinema and its “death” in the 1960s. These conditions of rapid industrial growth, followed by an equally precipitous decline, produced the conditions for a struggle over the very content of films, which Yoshida’s career, criticism, and his films reflected. Before examining Yoshida’s own notions of subjectivity and his films themselves, it is necessary to understand the context within which he began working as a filmmaker and critic.

Yoshida entered the Shōchiku film studios in 1955, the middle of the “Golden Age” of Japanese cinema and the so-called “end of the postwar.” In this very year, Japan’s gross national product exceeded its prewar peak, leading the Economic White Paper to declare an end to the postwar.⁷ This recovery created the foundation for a new leisure class that spent an unprecedented amount of time and money watching films.⁸ To meet and produce consumer demand, the Japanese film studios dramatically expanded their systems of production and distribution. By 1954, the six major studios - Shōchiku, Tōhō, Shintōhō, Nikkatsu, Tōei, and Daiei - had re-developed a highly rationalized and hierarchical mode of production, churning out an average of one film, or “program picture” as they were known, per week. The studios continued to use an apprentice system in which assistant directors trained for close to fifteen years before being promoted to full director.⁹ Except for a few big-name directors like
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Kurosawa Akira and Ozu Yasujirō, most studio directors had limited control over their films. Head producers maintained final say over what could be created and distributed. They thus produced films that yielded the largest returns at the box office, such as melodramas depicting the sacrifices of the Japanese people in the wartime and postwar eras, period films (*jidageki*), and comedies. These films and the renewed system of production, distribution, and exhibition made the 1950s one of the most productive and profitable eras in the history of Japanese cinema. In every year from the end of the Pacific War, audience attendance of films in Japan increased steadily, reaching a peak in 1958 with 1.127 billion tickets sold.11

However, this very year marked the end of the studio production system. In the mid-1950s, the growth of television had begun to threaten the predominance of film and by 1958 it had eclipsed cinema as the most popular form of moving-image entertainment. 1959 ended with a decline in audience numbers for the film industry, a trend which would continue for decades.12 Within the studios, conflicts between the producers and the rising generation of young filmmakers compounded the decline of the industry. Between the mid-1950s and early 1960s, the studios promoted a few of their young assistant directors to full director, hoping that their films about violent disillusioned youth would draw crowds. Despite such efforts, the entrenched apprentice system was too slow to promote enough directors who could appeal to the dramatic changes in society. Producers continued to maintain ultimate control over the content, form, and exhibition of studio-produced films. Conflicts between these young directors and management thus ensued, resulting in a number of directors leaving their positions in commercial filmmaking by the mid-1960s and establishing independent production companies. The studios themselves ultimately limited the number films they produced and re-structured their businesses around distribution and exhibition.

Although the shifts in popular entertainment and the conflicts within the studios resulted in the end of major studio production, they laid the foundation for the emergence of “new waves” of cinema in the late-1950s and early-1960s. Despite being limited to the conventions of commercial films, the young generation of directors combined formal experimentations with thematic content never before seen in Japanese cinema. In 1956, directors at the Nikkatsu studios like Furukawa Takumi (dates) and Nakahira Kō (1926 - ) adapted popular youth novels depicting a violent and disillusioned postwar generation, or the so-called “Sun Tribe” (*tayōzoku*).13 At Daiei in 1957, the director Masumura Yasuzō presented satiric portrayals of postwar Japanese capitalism in a form known for its “energy.”14 These directors introduced fast-
paced editing, helicopter shots and sensuous physicality to the screen.\textsuperscript{15} The formal experimentation and thematic content of these “new waves” established a paradigm on which the more publicized and studied filmmakers of the “Shōchiku new wave,” which included Yoshida, modeled their early films.

In 1958, Shōchiku, like most of the Japanese film world, experienced a precipitous decline in viewership due to the rise of television. Being one of the most conservative studios in Japan, it was slow to introduce changes to its previously successful system. In 1959, the head of production Kido Shirō finally began promoting a few of his young assistant directors to full director. He requested that they direct Shōchiku versions of the youth films that had been successful for the rival studios in the mid-1950.\textsuperscript{16} He promoted Ōshima Nagisa in 1959 and both Yoshida and Shinoda Masahiro (1931 - ) a year later in 1960. The appearance of these directors on the Japanese film scene coincided with the introduction of Jean-Luc Godard’s \textit{Breathless} (\textit{A bout de souffle}, 1960) and the French \textit{nouvelle vague} to Japan. Thus journalists at the time, eager to find a domestic equivalent, readily applied the name “new wave” to these directors, labeling them the “Shōchiku nuberu bagu,” or the “Shōchiku new wave.”\textsuperscript{17} Yoshida and his cohort at Shōchiku immediately rejected this label and insisted that they, unlike their French counterparts, did not consciously form a collective movement.\textsuperscript{18} Any commonalities between their films, they maintained, were purely coincidental.\textsuperscript{19}

Despite their claims to the contrary, these filmmakers shared a common insistence on producing films that reflected their positions on social issues in an equally idiosyncratic style. Soon after joining the studios in the mid-1950s, Yoshida, Ōshima, and five other members of their generation began writing and publishing original scenarios that unsentimentally examined contemporary social issues facing early 1960s Japan in a journal that they called the \textit{Seven} (\textit{Shichinin}).\textsuperscript{20} They used formal techniques that subverted the studio’s “realistic” narrative conventions which, they believed, presented false representations of the past and contemporary society.\textsuperscript{21} To foreground the role of the spectator in interpreting a film, these filmmakers called attention to the artifice of the cinematic medium through self-referential techniques and by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} Furukawa's \textit{Season of the Sun} (Taiyō no kistetsu, 1956), Nakahira's \textit{Crazed Fruit} (Kurutta Kajitsu, 1956), and Masuruma's \textit{Kisses} (Kuchizuke, 1957) use such techniques.
\item \textsuperscript{16} “\textit{Passhon toshite no eiga: ‘rokudenashi’ kara ‘kagami no onna tachi’ made}” [\textit{The Cinema as Passion: From \textit{Good For Nothing} to Women in the Mirror}] in \textit{Yurika} (Tokyo: Seidosha, 2003), 17.
\item \textsuperscript{17} See, for example, “\textit{Nihon eiga no nuberu bāgu}” [\textit{The New Wave of Japanese Film}, \textit{Shūkan Yomiuri}, 5 June 1960. Michael Raine has argued that the “Shōchiku New Wave” was actually a “belated” response to shifts already occurring in the Japanese film industry. See: Raine, “Youth, Body, and Subjectivity in the Japanese Cinema.”
\item \textsuperscript{18} Ōshima, for example, expressed dismay at being called part of a “movement” when he and the other filmmakers at Shōchiku never actively sought to form a group or a movement organized around any theory of collective activity. See Tamura Takeshi, “\textit{Shōchiku nuberu bāgu no kakochō}” [\textit{Death Register of the Shōchiku New Wave}] in \textit{Nihon Eiga no Mosaku} (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1987), 89.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Yoshida himself also claimed that the French New Wave had no influence on his early films. Rather, he cited postwar Poish filmmaking as having more of an influence on his work. See: “\textit{Jidai no eiga o warera no te de}” [\textit{The Next Generation of Film is in Our Hands}, \textit{Kinema Junpo} No. 264, August 1960, 54.
\item \textsuperscript{20} The seven members of \textit{Shichinin} were: Yoshida Kijū, Ōshima Nagisa, Takahashi Osamu, Uemura Tsutomu, Saito Masao, Tanaka Junkō, and Tamura Takeshi. In addition, Yoshida and the other young turks at Shōchiku trained in screenwriting and some, like Yoshida himself and Oshima, became assistant directors to the studio’s big-name directors. Yoshida became an assistant director to Kinoshita Keisuke, perhaps the most adored filmmaker in Japan during the 1950s.
\item \textsuperscript{21} I will discuss Yoshida' understanding of “negation” (\textit{hitei suru}) later in this chapter. For Ōshima's notion of negation, see: Maureen Turim, \textit{The Films of Ōshima Nagisa: Images of a Japanese Iconoclast} (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1998).
\end{itemize}
privileging the imminence and semantic ambiguity of the cinematic image over plot-driven narratives. Ultimately, this movement was short-lived. Numerous conflicts between management and the individual directors over the content and exhibition of their films forced its major participants to leave the studio and start independent production companies where they could maintain greater control over the content and form of their films.  

Yoshida’s own career exemplified this struggle for artistic agency. While at Shōchiku, Yoshida notoriously demanded that he be allowed to write the scenarios for any of the films he directed. In a now famous example, when one of Shōchiku’s star actresses, Okada Mariko, wanted Yoshida to direct the film that would be her 100th appearance on screen, The Affair At Akitsu (Akitsu onsen, 1962), Yoshida refused until he was allowed to write the script and shoot the film as he wished. After directing six films between 1960 and 1964, he left Shōchiku when the studio cut the final scene of his sixth film, Escape From Japan (Nihon dasshutsu, 1964), without his knowledge. After 1964, Yoshida began directing films independently. He and his wife Okada Mariko—married not long after The Affair At Akitsu—established the production company Gendai Eiga sha in 1965. Together, they produced five films which critics have called “anti-melodramas.” In these films, all of which cast Okada in the lead female role, Yoshida reused the conventions of melodrama to experiment with the representation of gender, the family, sexuality, and history in film. With these films Yoshida established a style that one might call “auteurist:” his attention to bodies in space, the consistent close-up of Okada’s gaze, Okada framed under an umbrella, and the ubiquitous image of character’s reflections in mirrors became stylistic signatures. By the late 1960s, Yoshida worked with the independent production and distribution company Art Theater Guild (ATG) to produce four of his most radical experiments in narrative film before leaving the world of fiction filmmaking altogether in 1973. In addition, throughout the 1960s, Yoshida also contributed to a new culture of politically and theoretically-oriented film journalism that accompanied changes in cinema. Unlike their predecessors (Ōzu, Kinoshita, et al.), Yoshida and the other young directors and screenwriters who began their careers in the mid-1950s pursued university degrees, often in philosophy, literature, or law, and thus brought a highly intellectual sensibility to their film criticism and practice. Yoshida himself graduated from the French literature department at the elite Tokyo University with a graduating thesis on the philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre. He was an avid reader of literature and philosophy throughout the 1960s and kept pace with the philosophical trends in Europe and Japan at the time. He contributed to many of the independent journals - like “Film Comment” (Eiga hyōron), “Film Art” (Eiga geijutsu), and “Documentary Film” (Kiroku eiga) - which provided forums where filmmakers as well as critics invested in the cultural politics of cinema debated the social and political roles of cinema in 1960s Japan. In the late-1950, Yoshida himself participated in founding one of these journals, “Film Criticism” (Eiga hihiyō).  
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22 Ōshima left Shōchiku in 1960 after the studio pulled his film Night and Fog in Japan (Nihon no yoru to kiri, 1960).  
25 After directing Coup d'Etat in 1973, Yoshida left the world of feature filmmaking until 1986. In the thirteen years between these two feature films he continued to make short documentaries for television. From 1974 to 1977, he directed a series titled The Art of Art (Bi no bi) for Tokyo Channel 12. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, he directed a few documentaries about historical figures and historical locales.  
26 Masumura dropped out of a law program at Tokyo University and later studied philosophy. Ōshima graduated from Kyoto University with a degree in law.
The work that Yoshida published in these journals reflected his claims to autonomy as a filmmaker. In articles, interviews, and group discussions, Yoshida critiqued the systematized conventions of narrative cinema as representing the illusions of Japan’s wartime past and the present while restricting the autonomy of directors, actors, and spectators. He proposed a new form of filmmaking that rejected the rationalization of film production for the contingencies of the interaction between filmmakers and actors, cinematic images and spectators.

A Note on Yoshida’s Critical Style

Because Yoshida’s writing was highly polemical, quasi-intellectual, and jargon-ridden, his criticism makes sense only when one accounts for its language. In essays critiquing the Japanese studio system and popular forms of cinema, for example, Yoshida rarely referred to specific films or provided detailed critiques of the formal construction of the films he did name. Rather, he evoked and repeated terms to dismiss *tout court* all of postwar Japanese cinema. He called all films that adhered to genre conventions, “film-like-films” and argued that the “subjectivities” (*shutai*) of the previous generation of filmmakers are “shut” (*tojikomeru*) inside their “selves” (*jiko*) without explicating precisely what these words mean. He regularly used metaphors in place of logical argumentation to persuade his readers, as in his essay, “The Wall of Film: A Critique of Storyism” (*Eiga no kabe – sutorīshugi hihan*). In this case, the image of the wall, drawn from Jean-Paul Sartre’s novella of the same name and nearly ubiquitous in film criticism at this time, characterized received aesthetic form as well as habits of thought and perception. Once introduced, Yoshida continued with the metaphor in place of logical argumentation, arguing that one must “destroy” or “transcend” the “wall” of studio filmmaking. Yoshida seemed to expect his readers were conversant in the notions he advanced, or, if they were not, would nevertheless agree or disagree with his arguments and propositions. Although Yoshida’s inflammatory language might tempt one to dismiss his criticism as purely polemical, the form of his writings indicated more complex and self-conscious purposes. Contentious rhetoric for Yoshida served to provoke discussion between himself and his audience. He was writing for a limited and select group of readers, many of whom were participants in the associations that published Yoshida’s work in their journals. These discussions and journals provided a critical testing ground for his ideas of filmmaking. Thus Yoshida explicitly did not attempt to produce a totalizing theory of film but to “theorize” - postulate and debate ideas - in a manner that provoked readerly participation. Instead of attempting to account for the entirety of cinema, Yoshida sought to integrate this “theorization” into the practical activity of filmmaking. He did not propose a coherent abstract model according to which he shot his films. Rather, writing about film and shooting films was for
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28 Yoshida Kijū, “Eiga no Kabe.”

29 Yoshida primarily published his criticism in film journals aimed at a coterie of filmmakers, critics, and fans. His audience was a rather select group and his writings esoteric. Within the pages of these journals, filmmakers and critics debated the role of the filmmaker in society and the politics of film form with members of the younger generation often denouncing their predecessors. Once Yoshida began directing films in the early 1960s, he became an active participant in these conversations. He used re-terms circulating in them to make critiques and to define his own filmmaking. Yoshida’s writings were thus somewhat hackneyed in their use of terms, which I believe one could call jargon, yet conversational. He as he also desired his readers to actively interpret his language and ideas.
Yoshida a process of integrating critical thought with aesthetic practice, which allowed him to respond to the immanent situation or the historical context in which he was shooting a film. Perhaps most obviously, Yoshida’s polemical tone served to criticize received conventions of representation which reinforced economic and social structures that limited individual autonomy. In short, his rhetoric was a means to exercise his agency as a critic and filmmaker while developing a dialogic and practice-based approach to filmmaking. In this sense, the form of Yoshida’s criticism reflected the content.

The “Objecthood” of Subjectivity in Yoshida’s Film Criticism

Yoshida based his critiques of studio filmmaking and his assertion of agency as a filmmaker on a concept central to modern philosophy, political thought, and postwar filmmaking: subjectivity. In the history of Japanese film criticism, the Japanese term shukan was commonly used to refer to the perspective and inner experience of individuals as well as the philosophical notion of the “subject.” Although critics continued to use the term shukan in the 1950s and the 1960s, the term shutaisei (subjectivity), as well as shutai (subject) and shutaikeki (subjective) became privileged parlance. Shutaisei gained currency in postwar Japan through the “subjectivity debates” (shutaisei ronso) over the proper course for social transformation during the American Occupation. In these debates, the idea of subjectivity held multiple related meanings. It implied the inner experience or perspective of an individual distinct from social norms, communal beliefs, and other people. It also connoted individual action based on personal will or a motivating energy. As such, historian Victor Koschmann writes, subjectivity meant a “firm commitment and a stance of independence in relation to potentially deterministic, external forces.”

The concept retained these connotations when, in the mid-1950s, filmmakers and film critics used it to characterize and propose new forms of cinema that represented and critiqued the contradictions of postwar Japanese modernity. In 1956, critics applied the term to the “Sun Tribe” films to describe the rebellious independence of the characters represented. At the same time, university-educated filmmakers began to use shutaisei to refer to more philosophically-based notions of the individual and inner experience. Masumura Yasuzō used the concept to prescribe a form of filmmaking that represented in both content and form a modern “Western” individuality opposed to state power and what he saw as traditional Japanese conformism pervading postwar cinema. In the late 1950s, the experimental documentary filmmaker Matsumoto Toshio took up the term shutai – which referred more to consciousness than

Critics have often used the word shukansei, or its variants shukan (subject) and shukanteki (subjective) to refer to the perspectives or internal experiences of spectators and filmmakers. In one of the earliest extended studies of cinema, for example, the sociologist Gonda Yasunosuke celebrated the subjectivity (shukan) of individual spectators as being able to fill in the gaps between shots and scenes in Gonda’s notion of subjectivity, film critic Aaron Gerow writes, was based on “the conception of new consumers producing identity by incorporating mass-produced items into their everyday.” The activist and thinker Nakai Masakazu also focused on notions of subjectivity, again using the term shukan in his writings on modernity and cinema.

For a discussion of these debates see Victor Koschmann, Revolution and Subjectivity in Postwar Japan (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996).


individuality - in debates over documentary filmmaking. Matsumoto used *shutai* to propose a documentary form that did not simply record the world “as it is,” but revealed and challenged habits of perception by representing the dialectical relationship between a filmmaker’s interiority and the external world. Although the meaning of subjectivity and subject differed according to context, by the early 1960s critics and filmmakers were using these terms for a similar purpose: to re-think how cinema could alter habits of thought and perception that reinforced systems of power.

In this respect, subjectivity provided the theoretical terminology for politically-inclined avant-garde and modernist projects in 1960s Japanese cinema. Indeed, filmmakers and critics like Yoshida were fundamentally concerned with how formal innovation could re-invent modes of perception, or forms of consciousness, which the norms of the political and cultural order of 1960s Japan systematically denied. Yoshida himself approached this problem through theories proposing that human consciousness formed only in relation to the objective world, free from the determinism of externally imposed systems.

As a student of French philosophy in the 1950s and an avid reader of Japanese and French thought throughout the 1960s, Yoshida’s criticism clearly displayed existential and phenomenological influences: Jean-Paul Sartre, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Nakai Masakazu, to name a few. Drawing on these thinkers, Sartre in particular, Yoshida argued that filmmaking must be an encounter between subjectivity and the objective world with no pre-determined purpose or outcome. For thinkers like Sartre and Merleau-Ponty, human consciousness has no inherent structure and external phenomenon do not wholly constitute consciousness. Rather, consciousness develops through a constant interaction with the external world. Thus one cannot, for example, have a mental image of an object without ever having actually perceived that object. Only through the perceptual encounter with an object can one have an idea or an image of it. Consciousness is thus always a contingent encounter with the external world. Yoshida understood subjectivity similarly. He writes:

“Objects” do no exist as things or entities unto themselves. Believing that they do is a myth that we, without facing reality, have created. In fact, “objects” appears before us as the target our subjectivities move toward, or they appears as the end, the result of our subjective action. “Objects” are inside the filmmaker and they are grasped through constant motion. The subject and its intention are not distinct; “objects” show their
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faces in relation to subjectivity, within the movement of an intense impulse toward an object.  

This idea of subjectivity as a relationship held a number of implications for Yoshida.  First, it disproved the assumption that human beings have an inherent nature and that external forces determine human action.  Consciousness, for Yoshida, was formed only through interactions with the world and other people.  In his criticism, individuals alone did not shape themselves in isolation of the objective world, nor did external circumstances completely determine individual thought and action.  This interaction implied, for Yoshida, that individuals were in a constant state of development as both subjects and objects; subjects, in so far as they act on the world, and objects, in so far as the world acts upon them.  This notion of subjectivity-as-interaction served as the conceptual foundation on which Yoshida grounded a notion of filmmaking rooted in individual agency. Creating films could allow filmmakers, actors, and spectators to autonomously engage in the production of cinema while critiquing the very systems that conditioned perception. 

According to Yoshida, the studio production system and the narrative conventions of studio films imposed on the production and consumption of films a predetermined order that reinforced dominant notions of individuals and society.  He argued that studio filmmakers conformed to the dictates of the studio, drafted generic screenplays, forced actors to conform to the roles that the directors had envisioned, subordinated the cinematic image to the plot of a story, and coerced spectators into identifying with the message of a film or feel a particular emotion.  This process deprived filmmakers of the agency to create films freely while determining actors' performances and spectators' responses.

In addition, these films imposed a false order onto the “reality” of his era  The stories represented in studio films, Yoshida argued, supported the status quo and discourses of the nation, family, and capitalist modernity in postwar Japan.  He contended, for example, that films by big-name directors like Kurosawa Akira and Yoshida’s mentor Kinoshita Keisuke reinforced the prominent notion in postwar Japan that the Japanese people were victims of the wartime state.  This characterization of the Japanese people, Yoshida maintained, prevented them from fully considering their own complicity with wartime atrocities and the inequalities of the present moment.  Yoshida's task as a filmmaker was to subvert how narrative films conditioned habits of thought and perception that reinforced the dominant social order.

Yoshida’s approach to filmmaking thus resembled what D.N. Rodowick has called “political modernism” in France and Europe in the late 1960s and early 1970s.  One of the shared tenants of the various critical approaches that constituted political modernism was what Annette Michelson has called the “critique of illusionism,” or revealing how the formal conventions - continuity, unity and closure - of Hollywood narrative films were “complicit with
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37 Yoshida Kijū, “‘Mono’ e no chosen,” 45.
38 The act of filmmaking, for Yoshida, had to replicate this undetermined interaction in order to properly represent the realities of modern life.  Yoshida writes, “The weapon of the subject is not logic, emotions, nor ideas.  The only single real weapon is the action of the subject, its movement toward a situation.” That is, filmmaking that broke with received conventions, for Yoshida, had to originate from pure action or a “movement toward” the empirical world, free from the structuring limitations of “logic, emotions, and ideas.” Yoshida Kijū, “Gendai ni nani o shuchō suru ka” [What To Contend Now?] in Yoshida Kijū: henbō no rinri, ed. Hasumi Shigehiko (Tokyo: Seidosha, 2006), 50.
a dominant way of seeing and understanding.” Critical cinema, for figures like Jean-Louis Comolli, Peter Gidal, Stephen Heath, and others, had to disrupt the unity of Holly narrative by exposing the materiality of the film or emphasizing discontinuity within narrative structure itself. This disruption, ideally, would provoke spectators to reflect not only on the formal techniques that obfuscated the actual conditions of cinematic production, but also on how “ideology” represented an illusion of actual lived relations in society. The politics of political modernism inhered in the attempt to alter how spectators perceived not only film but their very understanding of how media, education, and other social institutions represented society. Although Yoshida’s intentions as a filmmaker and critic were similar, he developed a less systematic notion of how cinema could critique the conventions of narrative. The political modernist critics based their theories on a confluence of Marxism, psychoanalysis, and semiotics, which led them to argue that socially constructed signifying systems produced human subjectivity and perception. To alter perception thus required altering the systems of signification. By contrast, Yoshida based his critiques of narrative and his notion of subjectivity on existential and phenomenological terms which he rarely explicated. In addition, he rarely analyzed how studio films compelled audiences to identify with the world represented in them. Nevertheless, Yoshida and the practitioners of political modernism shared a common critical approach: they believed that by turning to certain essential elements of the medium, a filmmaker could “negate” narrative and alter spectator’s perceptions of themselves and the world. For Yoshida, the “negation” or “denial” (hitei suru) of one’s “self” (jiko) was central to a form of filmmaking that critiqued the conventions of narrative. Although he often referred to his own approach as “self-negation” (jiko hitei), he rarely explicitly stated what this negation entailed. In one of his first uses of the term, for example, he writes, “cinema is the lively energy born from self-negation (jiko hitei), when I throw myself into a situation and spectators abandon their selves too.” In other instances, he argued for the complete rejection of the bonds that a story created between filmmakers and spectators. He argues:

The problem is not simply the negation of a story’s form. As long as the negation of storyism [narrative] does not cut through the conflict between a situation and the subjectivity of a filmmaker hidden in a story, or a filmmaker’s avoidance of his belief in the intimate sympathies that a story creates between himself and spectators, or spectators’ slumber in that story, or the bond that the warm sympathies of a story create between a filmmaker and spectators, or the production of emotion, then the negation of storyism is in danger of simply becoming a technical problem.

Here, Yoshida appears to define negation less as a matter of film form than an existential issue that filmmakers and audiences must confront within themselves. Although Yoshida’s theorization of negation as a method was rather vague, it was clear that he thought of negation or
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40 Cited in Rodowick, xiv.
41 Rodowick, 30.
42 For critics like Gidal and Heath, “negation” or “negativity” was also central to a form of critical cinema. Gidal defined negation as the act of revealing the “materiality” – the film strip, camera, etc. – of the filmic medium while Heath considered negativity an inherent discontinuity in narrative that filmmaker’s had to emphasize over techniques that produced a sense of continuity. Yoshida’s concept of negation was less clear. Rodowick, 126 – 142; 183 – 192.
43 Yoshida, “Eiga no kabe,” 58.
negativity as a deconstructive strategy: a means to disrupt the unity that a determining system of representation like narrative created within a film, between filmmakers and actors, as well as between a film and spectators. A disruption in that system, Yoshida hoped, would enable filmmakers, actors, and spectators to become active agents in the production and interpretation of films. For Yoshida, this negation involved re-creating the contingent interaction between consciousness and the external world central to notions of subjectivity in existentialism and phenomenology. And re-creating this encounter required foregrounding the perceptual faculties of himself as a filmmaker and the corporeality of actors.

Indeed, enacting this encounter required that Yoshida attempt to render himself, the filmmaker, as the sense of vision. For Yoshida, vision was a means through which human beings encountered others without imposing their intentions on them. He writes, “The act of seeing is an encounter with the existence of another who is completely different from us…We do not violate the existence of the other that appears before our gaze. The other is thrown, as it is, external to us.” According to Yoshida, the act of seeing does not impose order on the world. It is, in his terms, “anarchic.” The eyes simply survey the external world as the world enters one's consciousness through the eyes. When shooting a film, Yoshida sought to recreate this very interaction by negating his self - or any of his own ideas for a particular scene - and use the camera like the human eye to simply observe the scene and the others, or his actors, before him.

This form of filmmaking required that Yoshida consider his actors as distinct from himself. He thus claimed that he allowed his actors to perform as they wished without his direction. He writes:

An actor should have freedom. An actor should transcend the frame that the director chooses, face the audience, and reveal his entire personality, without makeup. Rather than a well-calculated performance, I prefer to see the power of an actor who can destroy the plotted drama with a single emotion, the blink of an eye, or the tension in his muscles. An actor’s physical body can apply a jolt to the tacit collusion that the audience and the director are apt to form. I have filmed actors without giving them any direction…I have tried to reject the use of an actor’s performance to fulfill a pre-established role, to assimilate it as one part of a pre-fabricated film, or as a tool to express a single meaning.

The physical bodies of actors performing freely before the camera, Yoshida argues here, can disrupt actors' determined positions, or their roles, within the logical ordering of narrative. Their corporeal presence – emotions, gazes, and muscles – could short-circuit the conventions, like the
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45 Yoshida, “Mirukoto,” 24-5.
46 Yoshida, “Mirukoto,” 21-42. In her memoir, the actress Okada Mariko whom Yoshida would later marry describes Yoshida’s method of directing. When directing her on *An Affair At Akitusu* (Akitsu Onsen, 1962), their first film together, Okada writes, “without even holding the script in hand, [Yoshida] would determine the first position of the camera and simply tell Akutagawa [Hiroshi] and I that we could perform in that expanse, that radius. He had us rehearse freely…When we had finished our rehearsal, the director [Yoshida] would repeat a few tests while looking through the lens. Then the cameraman and the lighting technician would go to work. In that time, the director would go off by himself and quietly watch. When everything had been prepared, the director would again run a test while looking through the lens and then roll camera. In this way, Yoshida’s directing created a set on which everything went incredibly smoothly with an air of pleasant tension.” Okada 217.
“plotted drama,” that compel actors to conform to a film's narrative. This encounter between a filmmaker and actors, Yoshida argued, could produce an image that did not correspond to a “single meaning” or have a single purpose; the image was not a “tool.”

Yoshida thus explicitly linked his treatment of actors to the cinematic image that he aimed to produce. He writes:

I have tried to reject the use of an actor’s performance to fulfill a pre-established role, to assimilate it as one part of a pre-fabricated film, or as a tool to express a single meaning. In my approach to the image, I assume a similar position. However beautiful the meaning or sentiment an image expresses, as long as it is complete unto itself it is a single picture that the creator has prepared in advance to use as a tool. It is nothing other than a display to ‘to be shown to,’ ‘to be seen by’ a spectator. Let’s assume, for example, that we are shown a shot of a single man slowly crossing a desolate landscape. Did the director need this shot to show that the man is going from one place to another predetermined spot? Or has the filmmaker chosen this desolate landscape to represent something about the man’s interiority? In either case, he probably filmed this scene with the expectation that it will be read as significant. But these are manipulations in which we select images as if they were words. For example, we can understand the image to mean that the man is “wandering.” If such an image mimics what its creators intend to narrate, if it equals that word, then a film is nothing more than a simple illustration of the narrative.48

Here, approximating a semiotic critique of narrative cinema, Yoshida argues that the image itself must exceed logical, systemic signification. He contends that narrative cinema uses images as signifiers that correspond to signified meanings in an abstract signifying system: the image of a man crossing a desolate landscape (signifier) means “wandering” (signified). This use of the cinematic image, according to Yoshida, treated spectators as passive recipients thus limiting the possibilities of their responses.

Thus, Yoshida aimed to create an image that allowed for an unlimited range of responses. He continues:

If anyone can attribute language to the image, it is the audience. The film image radiates the movement of the filmmaker’s interiority, his spirit. The only one who can join that movement, face the future, and give it meaning is the audience, not the filmmaker. In that sense, the image does not belong to the filmmaker, he cannot own it.49

In rather opaque almost mystical language, Yoshida calls for a cinematic image that has no implied significance but allows spectators to give it meaning freely. Here, the image is not the product of a logical system but of the “movement” of a filmmaker's “interiority,” or his subjective interaction with the external world. As such, the image is always oriented toward an unknown future in which it signifies whatever meaning spectators will apply to it. The image thus has no pre-determined purpose. It becomes a free-floating signifier that exceeds a pre-determined signifying system. Its presence on screen allows for endless possible responses from

48 Yoshida, “Watashi no,eigaron” 74-5.
49 Yoshida ,“Watashi no eigaron” 76.
spectators. In this respect, I want to suggest, Yoshida's approach to filmmaking and his understanding of the cinematic image approximated the “objecthood” of art in the 1960s.

In the early part of the era, critics like Clement Greenberg and Michael Fried examined how forms of avant-garde painting and sculpture began to emphasize the materiality of the medium - the canvas and paint itself in painting and the shape of materials in sculpture - over representation. For Greenberg, the trajectory of modern art involved an increasingly reflexive investigation of the very materials and figurative conventions of a medium's expression. While Greenberg tended to celebrate this turn to the materiality of aesthetic media, Fried assumed a more critical stance, distinguishing “modernism” from what he called “literalism.” Whereas modernism attempted to maintain a tension between the materiality of a medium and form, in literalism, Fried writes, “the materials do not represent, signify or allude to anything; they are what they are and nothing more.”

In their status as objects, according to Fried, these works of art “confront” the “ beholder” in their presence. They do not include the beholder in the work but set him or her at a distance from it. As a result, Fried continues, the “beholder knows himself to stand in an indeterminate, open-ended – and unexact - relation as subject to the impassive object.”

This experience of the art object, for Fried, thus maintains an infinite temporality. The experience itself “persists in time” in an “indefinite duration.” Yoshida, I believe, blended these two tendencies in his approach to the image and his filmmaking.

That is, formal self-referentiality and the focus on the sheer presence of the image moved Yoshida's films toward “objecthood.” Through both techniques, his films tended toward the experience of a potentially endless duration, barring the end of a film, in their address to or confrontation with spectators.

The experience of being confronted with the objectivity of the image should, for Yoshida compel spectators to act, or interpret a film. The form of Yoshida's films were thus a means to provoke action, to create subjective agents out of his spectators. His characters assume a similar form of agency. Within his films, Yoshida shows the transformation of his characters from subjects into objects. They act not in accordance with a preconceived plan or their own rationalized decisions, but through their experience with the world. They derive their agency not from themselves, but from their contact with the world and others.

**“Objecthood” and Agency in Good For Nothing and The Affair at Akitsu**

Two of Yoshida's early films – *Good For Nothing* (Rokudenashi, 1960) and *The Affair at Akitsu* (Akitsu onsen, 1964) - reflected the conflict, which he theorized in his film criticism, between subjective agency and rationalized systems of coercion and power. Formally, Yoshida subverts spectators’ identification with the narratives of his films through a number of techniques:

51. Fried also suggests that this experience is similar to confronting another person. Fried, 155.
52. Considering the cinematic image as a static object within an endlessly unfolding temporality is perhaps fundamental to the medium. As Mary Ann Doane has shown, for example, the cinema itself is predicated on the paradox between continuity conveyed through stasis or the capacity to indefinitely preserve a fleeting moment in time. Yoshida himself, I believe, was certainly aware of this nature of the cinematic image. He writes, for example, “for the image to be ripe with new images, forming endless associations – for it to negate itself – it must exist in a single moment.” That is, the cinematic image inherently consists of a relationship between stasis and endlessness - “existing in a single moment” and “endless associations.” Yoshida, “Watshi no eigaron,” 76; Mary Anne Doane, *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, The Archive* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002).
repetition, narrative fragmentation, intertextuality, and shots of his actors' bodies and gazes. In the narratives themselves, he dramatizes his characters' absorption into or exclusion from prescribed positions in modern society. Through displays of his characters' affective states and corporeal presence on screen, Yoshida depicts their transformation from subjective agents into objects, or functions of social and economic systems, as their status as physical beings becomes the basis for their agency as subjects.

In the six films that Yoshida produced while working at Shōchiku between 1960 and 1964, he portrayed contemporary social issues through the formal conventions of studio genre films. He examined class conflict, mass media exploitation, and the failures of Japan's postwar democracy, for example, through the generic frameworks of youth films and melodrama. Although Yoshida's Shōchiku films were stylistically less bold than those of some of his contemporaries at Shōchiku, his use of long-shots, slow pans, and focus on characters’ gazes and bodies in space produced a sense of distance on the events he represented. Yoshida’s films were clearly critical of contemporary Japan, yet maintained an ambiguity at the heart of modern life. Yoshida’s characters find themselves in personal quandaries and, with no obvious solutions, flee, go mad, or die, usually by suicide. They struggle to act with conviction, but are unable to become more than their circumstances or the social identities - class, occupation, and generation - that define them. Yoshida’s characters are thus, as film scholar Hamish Ford describes the characters in 1960s modernist films, “tropes” that represent “subjects in the process of becoming objects” within capitalist modernity.

Yoshida’s first film at Shōchiku, *Good For Nothing*, illustrates this point. The film, modeled on 1950s youth films, centers on four bored college students – Jun (Tsugawa Masahiko), Morishita (Yamshita Junichirō), Akiyama (Kawazu Yūsuke), and Fujieda (Hayashi Yōsuke) – on summer break who represent the division between the upper and lower social classes. Jun and Morishita characterize poor youth from the countryside who have come to Tokyo for school. They sponge off of their bourgeois friends Akiyama, the son of a businessman, and Fujieda who is also from a wealthy background. Akiyama’s father stands for the political and business elite of the generation that drove the country to total destruction during the war, but by 1960 had regained their positions at the top of Japanese society. Akiyama’s father’s secretary, Ikuko (Takachiho Hizuru), personifies the emerging class of white-collar laborers and middle-class consumers that would propel the Japanese postwar economic boom in the ensuing decades. Each of these characters is a projection of a particular class. They are more products of social and economic formations than active agents attempting to determine their own destinies.

Through these characters, Yoshida displays how the repetitions of history and daily life define subjectivity in 1960s modernity. Akiyama’s father himself embodies the return of previous economic structures, which he reveals through clichéd lines about how the dog-eat-dog nature of capitalism has been the same since the pre-war era. Ikuko consistently comments on the feelings of boredom that the repetitiveness of white collar labor produce. For the four youths, affluence and poverty limit them to their respective classes, making social mobility

---


55 As Yoshida himself explains, “The film depicts how thinking that the social conflict between the haves and the have-nots is a game can, in an instant, become a catastrophic tragedy. I sought to represent not a youth drama, but that situation.” Yoshida, “Miru koto,” 130.
undesirable or impossible. These characters have no explicit aims, whether personally or socially defined. They reproduce the identities that society has prescribed them as they repeat physically stimulating transgressive acts – stealing, fighting, drinking, and having sexual relations – in order to reject those identities and break the boredom of daily life.

The opening of the film visually displays how repetition structures subjectivity in this film. Slow, cool jazz music plays as the standard company logo, “Shōchiku Films” over an image of Mt. Fuji, fades in from black. The film then cuts to the credits and “Rokudenashi” (Good For Nothing) appears in the upper left-hand corner of the screen (still 1-1). After a few moments, smaller images of the title fill the entire screen in rows and columns (still 1-2). The names of the crew and actors then appear in the middle of the screen bordered by the title in two columns on the right and left sides. Yoshida’s credit as director and scriptwriter then appears with a single title above it to the left, a replication of the first image in the sequence (still 1-3). The music continues seamlessly as the film cuts to a point of view shot looking out of the windshield of a late 1950s Pontiac driving through the streets of Tokyo’s upscale Ginza district (still 1-4). The music fades as character’s voices from within the car can be heard.

The structure of the credits, beginning and ending with the same image of the title, indicates narrative circularity while the patterning of the title signifies the very concept of systematic repetition itself. The following point of view shot from within the space of the car then links this visual patterning of duplication to subjectivity. This shot and the uninterrupted jazz music place the spectator in two spaces at once. Clearly the music, not mixed with diegetic sound from the car, comes from a source beyond the space of the car while the point-of-view shot places the spectator within it. One simultaneously identifies with and feels at a distance from this perspective, looking out of the windshield as the subject in the car while watching a subjectivity looking out of the car windshield. In this opening sequence, Yoshida uses a visual perspective of replication, a type of mise en abyme, to indicate that duplication structures subjectivity.

Yoshida then builds this relationship between replication and subjectivity into the narrative of the film itself. The film beings and ends with nearly identical robbery scenes. The characters play the same “games” (asobi), as they call them, partying, fighting, and drinking. They repeat one game in particular that returns at the end of the film. In this game, Akiyama lights a cigarette with a gun-shaped lighter (still 1-5). He then aims it at Jun and pretends to shoot him in the stomach. Jun, reacting, doubles over as if acting in a film, says a few dramatic lines, and pretends to die (still 1-6). The repetitions in the film come to an end when this toy gun and the fake robbery become real ones.

At the beginning of the film, the four youths commit a robbery for fun that Jun and Morishita repeat at the end. In first scene of the film, they pull up next to Ikuko who is walking...

---

56 The repetition in the opening sequence of the film, I also want to suggest, indicates the film’s very status as a generic reproduction. The film itself was a Shōchiku version of popular youth films, called “Sun Tribe” (taiyozoku) films, that the Nikkatsu studios produced in the mid to late 1950s. Although Yoshida was given a fair amount of freedom in directing Good for Nothing, he still had to work within the conventions of this genre of youth films. After Yoshida himself had determined the name of the film and before writing the scenario, the head of production Kido shiro approached him and told him to think of the film as a Shōchiku rival to Nikkatsu’s popular “Sun Tribe” films and to consider the young stars Tsugawa Masahiko and Kawazu Yusuke of such film in the leading roles. And indeed, the subject, actors, setting, and formal techniques of the film replicate this genre of youth films. The film focuses on young, violent disaffected characters typical of this genre and both Tsugawa and Kawazu play central roles. The characters spend time at the beach-side town of Enoshima, one of the primary settings of the “Sun Tribe” films, and Yoshida shot the film primarily on location, using fast-paced editing techniques in select sequences that became the hallmark of mid-fifties youth films. “Passhon toshite no eiga,” 17.
down the sidewalk brining a bag of money, as she regularly does, from the bank to her office. Jun forces her into the car and Akiyama, who is driving, tells Ikuko to hand over the bag. She refuses and Morishita takes the bag from her. She scolds them all. Akiyama then tells his friends to return the money. It belongs to his father anyway and this robbery, he says, is “just fun (asobi).” Jun and Morishita reluctantly concede.

By the end of the film, as summer comes to a close, the four youths begin to feel they must do something. Fujieda leaves Japan to study abroad in the United States. Akiyama determines that no matter where he goes or what he does, he will never be able to escape his bourgeois lifestyle. Jun and Morishita decide that to transcend their lower class status they must actually steal the bag of money from Ikuko.

The film ends in a moment of quintessential tragic irony with Jun and Morishita killing each other in the course of this robbery. As in the first scene, they pull up next to Ikuko, tell her to get into the car, and she obliges. Morishita, sitting in the passenger seat turns to her and tells her to hand over the money, using the same lines as Akiyama at the beginning of the film. When she refuses, he rips it from her hands. Ikuko, enraged, starts yelling at Jun who is driving and pounding on his back. “I knew it!” she screams. “You are like that. You are a good-for-nothing.” Jun then suddenly stops the car and tells Morishita to return the bag. Morishita refuses and Jun reaches for the bag. Morishita pulls out a gun which he had bought a few scenes earlier and, in their struggle, the gun goes off. Morishita stumbles out of the car and runs off with the bag. Jun sits up in his seat, his hand covered in blood, and calmly starts the car. He chases after Morishita and runs him down. Jun and Ikuko get out of the car and Jun, bleeding from his stomach, stumbles over to the bag. He picks it up and hands it to Ikuko. Jun then, much like his performance in the game with Akiyama, stumbles away from her down the city streets. Ikuko runs up to him with the bag, opens it and says, “it’s just paper,” before Jun dies in her arms.

The structure of the film leading up to this moment leaves little possibility for Jun and Morishita to act in order to escape the fate that society and the film itself have prescribed. The first scene of the film not only foreshadows but provides the paradigm for the end. Just before the robbery Akiyama calls Ikuko to tip her off thus setting in motion Jun and Morishita’s inevitable failure. Moreover, Jun literally rehearses his death throughout the film in the scenes in which Akiyama shoots him. Yoshida shows that the characters are effects of the film as they are effects of pre-constituted social roles – class, occupation, and generation - within the narrative.

The characters, or active subjects, in the film thus become objects as objects become active subjects. Social and economic structures determine how these characters act and feel. Jun, Morishita, and the others are rendered passive to time, fate, occupation, wealth and poverty. Moreover, objects like the gun and the money that Ikuko carries become more like active subjects. Money compels Jun and Morishita to act while the gun itself kills Jun, thereby motivating the end of the film.

Yoshida formally treats his characters as objects through two conspicuous techniques. First, he focuses on the corporeality of these characters to emphasize their objective presence and near passivity to the forces of the external world. Yoshida represents Jun, in particular, as practically sheer physicality. In the second scene of the film for example, the four youths go back to Akiyama’s mansion and hang out in the parlor drinking whiskey. A maid comes to tell Akiyama that his father has come home early. When Akiyama leaves the room, Jun walks over to the record player puts on a record, turns the music up to full volume, and begins to shimmy in front of the stereo. Fujieda tells him that everyone will hear the music. The film then film cuts to
a close-up of Jun’s profile as he looks off screen, an empty gaze (1-7). He says, “can you hear it? When you turn the volume up all they way, you can grasp it with your whole body,” as the camera pans down his body to his fingers snapping to the rhythm of the music. Later, Yoshida returns to Jun’s body and his off-screen gaze after Akiyama tries to convince Jun to go to the beach with him. Jun refuses and the film cuts to the next scene. The camera pans left up Jun’s legs over his boxer shorts and to his naked torso, a pin-up magazine resting on his chest. The camera stops on his face. Jun is staring up toward the ceiling. His gaze reveals a vaguely agitated emotional state but his feelings are nevertheless inaccessible to spectators (1-8). He appears as an embodied seeing presence, subject to the gaze of the camera and spectators' gazes of the film.

Yoshida renders his characters static through the use of a freeze frame in the final shot of the film. After Jun gets shot and runs down Morishita, he gets out of the car, picks up the bag of money (paper) and hands it to Ikuko. In a medium shot, she opens the bag, pulls out a handful of paper and throws it in his face, telling him that there was just paper in the bag the entire time. Jun then tells her that they are “fifty-fifty” and that they “have no ties, no more.” The camera, still in the same take follows Jun as he walks away from her and goes stumbling down the street framed by the buildings and on-lookers on either side of him (still 1-9). Ikuko catches up to him and tries to tell him that she likes him; she doesn't just want to “be even.” Jun then falls to his knees. She cradles his head in her arms and looks down at him as he looks up to her and the film freezes before fading to black (1-10). In this scene, the film cuts from a shot of movement to a shot of stasis - the long take of Jun stumbling down the street to the freeze frame - which formally mirrors Jun's transformation from a subject to a static object, a corpse.

These moments in the film – the shots of Jun's body and the freeze frame - reflect the paradox of Jun's subjectivity. He lacks internally derived motivation, desire, or identity. He thus appears to be a passive object, compelled to act by other people, situations, and even objects. However, Jun's physicality and element of passivity also functions to make him a subjective agent. Experience, for him, is less the determinations of a system external to him or the logic of his own rational thought. Rather, experience and even action for Jun operate in reverse, through an interaction with other characters and the external world. Jun lacks telos, but he does not lack agency. Moreover, Yoshida's formal treatment of Jun offers a similar form of agency to the film's spectators. Yoshida confronts the spectator with images of Jun's presence and, in the final scene, the sheer presence of a static image. These shots produce an experience of the duration of time itself, an endlessness in conflict with the film's progression toward an ending. These shots resist evident signification but evoke the possibility of signification. As such, they invite spectator's interactions with the images of screen; they create the objective situation necessary for subjective action.

**The Affair at Akitsu**

Yoshida's focus on the presence of his actors is even more salient in his fourth film at Shōchiku, *The Affair at Akitsu*. In this film, Yoshida maps the conflicts of postwar Japanese

---

57 Critics and scholars have contended that Yoshida took this shot from Godard's *Breathless* (A bout de souffle, 1960). Yoshida himself has denied the influence, stating that he saw *Breathless* only after had had made the film. He goes on to state that the actor Tsugawa Masahiko playing Jun had actually scene Godard's film before shooting this scene and thus he may have been inspired by Jean-Paul Belmondo's performance.
history onto the gendered bodies of his characters within the narrative structure of melodrama, a method he would use in the late-1960s and in his more recent work.\(^{58}\) In *Good For Nothing*, I argued, the characters' bodies and affective states exhibited two simultaneous tendencies: they were at once a means for the characters to resist assimilation into externally imposed social structures as they revealed the process of these characters-as-subjects becoming objects.

Whereas the narrative and formal techniques of *Good For Nothing* mirrored this very process, in *Akitsu*, I show, Yoshida used the corporeality and affective states of his characters to disrupt the narrative structure of melodrama itself. Emotions, gazes, and bodies in this film were, for Yoshida, formal strategies to “negate” narrative determinancy and a teleological time. *The Affair At Akitsu* was Yoshida's most commercially successful film in Japan. It was his first big-budget studio production which Shōchiku planned as a commemoration for the lead actress Okada Mariko’s 100th appearance on screen. The film was the first collaboration between the director and Okada who would become Yoshida’s wife, partial financier, and the female lead in Yoshida’s “anti-melodramas” throughout the mid to late 1960s. Okada herself approached the studio about making the film based on the author Fujiwara Shinji’s 1947 novel of the same title and requested that Yoshida direct it.\(^{59}\) The studio approached Yoshida about directing the film but he initially refused. He did not want to make a studio melodrama. He eventually agreed to take on the project after Okada negotiated greater leeway for him in writing the script and in the film's production. Since the studio feared that the film would be a flop, it appointed Okada as co-producer.\(^{60}\) She would have to bear part of the burden if it failed. In the end, the film was Yoshida's greatest commercial success, ranking 10 in the film magazine *The Movie Times*’ top-ten films of 1962.\(^{61}\)

The narrative of the film centers on the unconsummated love relationship between the two main characters Shinko (Okada Mariko), the daughter of a female inn-keeper in the mountain town of Akitsu, and Kawamura Shusaku (Nagato Hiroyuki), a quasi-intellectual who aspires to become a professional writer. It spans the period near the end of the Pacific War in 1945 to the present moment of the film’s production in 1962, during which the characters meet four times at the springs, each time in a different season to mark the passage of time. They first meet when Omin, one of the maids at Akitsu springs, finds Shusaku sick with tuberculosis on a truck taking people to the mountains away from the American bombing of larger coastal towns during the war. Omin brings Shusaku to the inn at Akitsu where, after he falls ill, Shinko nurses him back to health. During his convalescence, Shinko and Shusaku grow close and develop feelings for each other. Eventually, Shusaku returns home to pursue a career as a writer and leaves Shinko in Akitsu, telling her that he will return. However, they never consummate their initial relationship. As time passes, Shusaku gets married, starts his own family and succeeds as a teacher while Shinko remains in Akitsu and takes over the inn after her mother dies. At the end of the film, after having overcome the hardships of the postwar, Shusaku returns to Akitsu. Shinko, realizing that Shusaku has moved on, asks him to commit suicide with her. After he refuses, she slits her wrists and dies by the river that runs near the inn.

The relationship between these two characters in the film, according to Yoshida himself, allegorizes in gendered terms the development of Japan's postwar democracy. Yoshida explains:

---

58 We see this in most of the film's Yoshida directed with Okada as well as his most recent film *Women in the Mirror* (Kagami no onnatachi, 2002).
59 Okada, 217.
60 Okada, 217.
I layered, or double-exposed the changes in the postwar. With the progression of time, the man has a change of heart. By contrast, the woman, sustains her passion by being cut off. The appearance of postwar democracy resembles the relationship between this man and woman. The man forgets the promise of democracy in the postwar, becomes submerged in daily life, and fails. Because the woman is forgotten and betrayed, all she can do is maintain the dream of the postwar. Their failure and missed encounters is the same as those of the postwar era.\(^{62}\)

Each of these characters, according to Yoshida, corresponds to a different temporality and moral economy in the film. Shusaku, the man, represents the passage of time and social transformation. As he “forgets” and “betrays” Shinko, he fails to become a writer, much like postwar democracy failed to realize its potential. Isolated in the mountains of Akitsu, Shinko continues to embody emotionally the possibilities of postwar democracy. She is a victim of the passage of time and Shusaku's negligence of her.

This Manichaean conflict combined with the other formal and narrative elements place the film squarely within the melodramatic mode. Indeed, as the critic Misono Ryoko has shown, the film conforms to the conventions of melodrama not as a genre, but as a mode of filmmaking. Drawing on film scholar Linda Williams, Misono locates within the film a number of the five key elements that Williams shows constitute the melodramatic mode.\(^{63}\) The film begins and ends in a “space of innocence,” the Akitsu springs in the mountains outside of Okayama. The inn, run only by women, and the landscape of the mountains represent a domestic space and the ubiquitous rural “hometown” (kokyō) of Japanese film and literature. Shusaku constantly returns to this space throughout the film as an escape from the hardships and failures of his life in the city. Shinko is an obvious “victim-hero” who suffers Shusaku's abandonment. After Shusaku leaves Shinko, she waits for his return. The film ends in a “paroxysm of pathos” accentuated through the dialectical conflict between “pathos and action.”\(^{64}\) The final scene is a classic chase sequence in which Shinko cuts her wrists as she is running down to the river to die. By cutting between Shusaku running after Shinko and Shinko running to the river, Yoshida delays the final outcome of the film thus heightening the emotional tension and experience of “release,” or tears, when Shusaku arrives “too late” to the river and finds Shinko dead.

While the film clearly operates within the economy of melodrama, other scholars have argued that it has a more critical relationship to the mode. Film scholar Saito Ayako, for example, has argued that the film is a “meta-melodrama” that self-reflexively uses the framework of melodrama to create a narrative in which the woman's (Shinko/Okada) emotional states and body have no signifying function but provide an “affective textual movement” or a “female utterance” to the story.\(^{65}\) Drawing on Yoshida's notion of subjectivity as a relationship between consciousness and others in the external world, Saito sees this film as a collaborative

---

\(^{62}\) “Passhon toshite no eiga,” 23.


encounter between Yoshida and Okada in which Okada herself becomes the author of the film's emotional register. Saito writes:

Yoshida's aim is not to have femininity talk, but to shift the point of view of the narration in order to desubjectivize himself, using femininity as the language of the Other. This is why the look of women, and especially Okada's, in Yoshida's films are tinged with “absence.” Thus arises a special relationship between Yoshida the scenario writer of fantasy and Okada...who functions as a reflection of Yoshida's own subjective position.66

For Saito, through this shift in the narration towards the female Other, Yoshida attempted to critique his own position as a male director and, more generally, the male-dominated gaze of the camera in Japanese cinema. In this critique, according to Saito, the subjectivity of the female Other is her physical body or affective states. This corporeality exceeds the “narrative” (monogatari) and provides the “textual” (tekusuto) difference, or an intrinsic absence that allows for the proliferation of meaning. In this sense, the meaning of the film arises not through coherency but through alterity, or the encounter with something other to the director and the narrative structure. Indeed, in making this film, Yoshida was interested in the absences and otherness that could disrupt the linear temporality of narrative with tableau-like moments of pure emotion.67

However, Saito's deconstruction-inflected reading of Yoshida's approach overlooks Okada's objective status in the film.68 Saito sees Okada as primarily an active agent who provides an emotionality to the film. Although the character Shinko is clearly associated with movement, her subjectivity, I would argue, emerges from her encounter with the objective world and others in it. In addition, while Okada's body and facial expressions provide the emotional register for the film, in Yoshida's formal treatment of her, she embodies the “presence” and dialectic of static endlessness characteristic of “objecthood.” Shinko's acts in the film and Yoshida's shots of Okada illustrate this point.

In contrast to Shusaku, Shinko acts primarily in response to stimuli from the external environment. Shusaku is a typical, self-involved postwar dilettante who acts out of his own self-interests and desires. He leaves Shinko to pursue a career as a writer and returns to Shinko when pining, depressed, or to leave her permanently. Shinko's agency, however, arises from her relationship to specific situations. She enters the film when she tells a group of drunk military officers that Japan is going to lose the war. As it is still wartime, one of the officers becomes

66 Saito, 18
67 Yoshida himself made a similar point when discussing the function the emotions in the film. He explains: Of course, because the film is the story of a man and a woman it naturally assumes the form of a melodrama. However, if I represented their relationship within the flow of time, I would have had to narrate it as a story (monogatari). I wanted to negate the story and sever the flow of time. Over long periods of time, spanning decades, the man and the woman meet only in a few moments. By concealing the long separations between those moments, the emotions during the time they meet become all the more intense. By making the film as a document of the emotions during the moments when they met, I could upset the melodramatic element. Here, the “melodramatic element” for Yoshida seems mean the linear “story” (monogatari) of the relationship between Shinko and Shusaku. Emphasizing the emotions, Yoshida thought, could disrupt the teleological temporality of the narrative structure and create isolate moments in time of pure emotion. “Passhon toshite,” 23
68 By “object,” here I do not mean that Yoshida treats the female body as the object of male pleasure in the manner that Laura Mulvey argues dominant forms of cinema represent women. Nor do I mean that the character Shinko and the actresses Okada Mariko are simply represented as passive in the narrative of the film and before the camera. Laura Mulvey, “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema,” *Screen* 16(3) Autumn 1975, 6-18.
enraged and goes after her with his sword as she flees to a futon storage room. A few scenes later, when she is bringing rice home, she passes a group of people listening to a radio on which the Emperor is announcing Japan's surrender to the United States. She does not understand what he is saying and continues walking. She then comes upon a military hospital and sees all of the wounded soldiers lined up outside of the hospital saluting to the Emperor. She then realizes that Japan has lost the war which drives her to run home back to Shusaku. She enters the room where he is staying and falls to the floor, sobbing. As Shusaku tries to determine what has happened, she lets out a harrowing scream.

Such external events motivate her literal movement – her running, chasing, and fleeing – throughout the film. When Shusaku leaves and returns to the inn, Shinko runs to him. When he hurts her, she runs to escape him. And at the end of the film, after she realizes that they will never consummate their relationship, she runs down to the river to die. Shinko thus represents a model of subjectivity not based on an established subject who acts on the world, but a model in which subjectivity emerges from its encounter with the objective world. The subject emerges from experience, she does not precede it. The process here is thus a movement from the objective to the subjective.

In addition, in these very scenes, Yoshida represents Okada as a paradoxically boundless yet constrained physical and emotional presence. After Shinko flees to the futon storage room, she hides under some futon. Shusaku hears her come in and finds her under the futon sleeping. She wakes up and tries to get him to talk about himself. He is reluctant to speak, so she begins to reveal her past to him as she walks around the room looking at herself in the various mirrors places on stands over the futon (still 2-1). As she plays with her hair, Yoshida frames her so that spectators can see her and reflections in various mirrors simultaneously. Here, she becomes a fragmented body and a near limitless reflection (still 2-2).

In the two later scenes -after she returns from realizing that Japan has lost the war and the final scene of the film when she commits suicide – Okada assumes a status of pure presence on screen. When she returns to the detached room where Shusaku is recovering, she runs to an open sliding door that looks out over the mountains. The film cuts to a medium close up of her face, from a perspective in front of her, as she stares off into the distance before cutting to a low angle shot of Shusaku lying on the floor. He asks her what is wrong. The film then cuts to a shot of Okada from Shusaku's perspective as she begins to fall slowly to her knees. When she tells him that Japan lost the war the film cuts back to the perspective in front of Okada. She repeats herself, “Japan lost the war.” The film then jumps to a shot from within Shusaku's room that opens onto the room where Okada is sitting. Shusaku begins to crawl toward the door as the camera zooms in past him toward her as he stands up, propping himself up on the wall (still 2-3). She continues to sob as the camera cuts to a low angle shot of Shusaku, back to Okada, and then to the disembodied medium close up of her face (still 2-4). She begins to sob, gazes out into a void and then screams (still 2-5).69

Here Okada becomes sheer emotional presence. The sequence of shots places her simultaneously within and outside of the diegesis. Spectators see her from Shusaku's perspective as well as a disembodied perspective outside of the room. Her emotional state and this shot of her arrest the narrative of the film, for a moment of paradoxically static endlessness. The temporality of the scene and the film stops as Okada and the spectator are removed from the space of the room for a momentary yet potentially limitless confrontation. Moreover, the film offers no motivation for her emotional state. In fact, previous scenes would suggest that she

69 Saito also contends that Okada's gaze emphasizes the spectator's own gaze. Saito, 97
expected Japan to lose the war. The spectator is thus confronted with an instant of affect that invites wonder and intellect.

By the end of the film, Shinko has nearly become an emotionless gaze. A few scenes before the end, she and Shusaku make love in the detached room at the inn. As Shusaku lies on top of her, kissing her neck and her body, she stares into a void toward the upper edge of the screen, unaroused by his movements (still 2-6). In a low monotone whisper she asks him to commit suicide with her and he dismisses her request. Then, in the final scene, as she is walking him to town down the road next to the river, she pleads with him to die with her. Again he refuses and she pulls out a blade. He eventually calms her, says goodbye, and walks off down the road. She then turns toward the river, rests her arm on a tree and cuts her wrist. The film then cuts to Shusaku who, from a distance, sees her stumbling down toward the river. Shusaku chases after her as she heads to the river. She eventually reaches the riverbank and falls to her knees on a small sandbar, crawls to the river, and dips her wrist in the water (still 2-7). The film again cuts to a shot from in front of her, the same angle as the shot after the end of the war, and she screams in physical and emotional agony as she looks off into a void (still 2-8). This is the endless duration of a “disquieting” objective presence on screen. Okada's scream evokes shock and sympathy while her gaze invites questions: what is she looking at? Who or what is looking at her? Here, one is confronted with the constituent elements of the cinema: gazes, a face, an image. Spectators, facing an “object,” are asked to respond. This shot, like the previous shot of Okada crying, aims to elicit an affective and intellectual response in spectators. It aims to make spectators emotional and critical subjects.

Moreover, this final moment mirrors Yoshida's own approach to filmmaking. Like Yoshida's rejection of the “self” trained to make narrative films, Shinko's decision to commit suicide is an act of self-assertion through “self-negation,” or suicide. Throughout the film, Shinko has waited for Shusaku and acted in response to his appearance and disappearance. His presence and his absence have determined the course of her life. In this final scene, she refuses the life that Shusaku's actions create for her. She thus asserts her authority over her own life by paradoxically refusing to live. For Yoshida, making a film freely required an existential denial; for Shinko, living freely requires a denial of her entire being. Like Jun in Good For Nothing, Shinko's agency emerges through her objecthood. Throughout the film, she acts through her affective experiences with the world. She is a subject insofar as she is a physical object, a body. And at the end of the film, she realizes her autonomy by fully becoming just that body.

Conclusion

This chapter examined how the New Wave filmmaker Yoshida Kijū theorized and represented subjective agency – the capacity for individuals to act in order to change an existing situation or order - in 1960s cinema. For Yoshida as a filmmaker, agency involved rejecting the film studio's system of production and narrative conventions for filmmaking as an encounter lacking a predetermined telos. In this encounter, subjects were less rationally thinking subjectivities than embodied consciousnesses, perception, and affect. According to Yoshida, through visual perception, he could encounter the world - the bodies of his actors - with the camera; this encounter then produced an image that could elicit from spectators undetermined and multivalent responses. This image, as Yoshida conceived it, was thus oriented toward an unknown future, or an endlessness of possibility. Yoshida's understanding of the image and the
actual images he produced in films like *Good For Nothing* and *The Affair at Akitsu* approximated
the status of objecthood, or pure presence before the spectator. In its presence, the spectator
becomes aware of his or her own status as a viewing subject situated in an indeterminate relation
to the image. He or she is asked to respond affectively, intellectually, or both. A spectator's own
agency in Yoshida's approach to filmmaking thus emerges primarily out of an interaction with
the image rather than from a spectator's presupposed understanding of cinema. The characters of
Yoshida's films, mirrored this embodied, inter-subjective agency. Their social positions and
relations with others rendered them objects in a system or historical trajectory, as that very
status as an object served as the basis for subjective agency. Through their bodies Yoshida's
characters refused their positions and their relations in order to fully become subjective agents by
fully becoming physical objects. In this respect, Yoshida's films, characters, and his critical
approach to filmmaking reflected the tendency in 1960s Japan to assert agency through the
singularity of the body within a social relationship oriented toward the future.
Chapter 4: Toward a Movement Cinema

Introduction

Developments in the aesthetics of cinema have often coincided with the use of films to define subjectivity in struggles for political power. As film scholar Bill Nichols has shown, for example, the formation of a conventional documentary form in the 1920s and 1930s involved creating films in the service of nation-building projects while formally suppressing and assimilating the experiments of the modernist avant-garde. John Grierson, the so-called father of British documentary, Nichols argues, sought to delimit and divert the “radical shifts in subjectivity promoted by the European avant-garde” into a form that contributed to the creation of a national subjectivity, or the sense that each individual could participate in the “rituals” of the nation.\(^1\) Efforts to contest the state followed a similar process, often utilizing the “realist tone of dominant documentary production” rather than “return to the radical potentiality of modernist technique.”\(^2\) While modernist form exposed the conventions constructing stable identities and decentered human subjectivity, conventional documentary, whether complicit with or in direct opposition to the state, attempted the opposite: to fix subjectivity for ideological ends.

In the previous chapter, I examined how the filmmaker Yoshida Kijū used the visual gaze and human body to disrupt modes of perception, or forms of consciousness, that reinforced the political and cultural order of 1960s Japan. Yoshida's portrayals of his characters and his formal techniques represented and produced a form of agency based on rejecting one's position within rationalized social systems and narratives with a predetermined telos. Agency, in Yoshida's films, was rooted in the singularity and indeterminability of subjectivity: sensual perception and visceral experience. Yoshida's approach to filmmaking and his films themselves thus epitomized the modernist tendency to privilege absolute “potentiality” over a determined purpose as a means to contest the status quo.

This chapter examines a shift from the representation of subjectivity as a form of critique toward the didactic production of a revolutionary consciousness in 1960s Japanese film. Here, I focus on two films - *Gushing Prayer: 15 Year-Old Prostitute* (Funshutsu kigan - 15sai baishunfu, 1970) and *Red Army/ PFLP: Declaration of World War* (Sekigun/PFLP – sekai sensō sengen, 1971) - by the pink and revolutionary filmmaker Adachi Masao (1939 - ). These films reflected, I show, different responses to the de-humanizing and oppressive effects of capitalist imperialism in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

In *Gushing Prayer*, Adachi worked within the conventions of 1960s pink film to critique the subjective, somatic effects of late-1960s capitalist modernity. Drawing on the critic Jonathan Flatley’s notion of “affective mapping,” I argue that in this film Adachi “maps” what the critic Fredric Jameson has called a “waning of affect” that defined this moment in history.\(^3\) Adachi portrays this experience through the female protagonist Yasuko (Sasaki Ama) who has lost the capacity to feel physical stimulation. Aesthetically, Adachi combines techniques that evoke
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\(^1\) Bill Nichols, “Documentary Film and the Modernist Avant-Garde,” *Critical Inquiry*, 27.4 (Summer, 2001), 582.

\(^2\) Nichols, 605.

Yasuko’s state of affectlessness in spectators while positioning them at a critical distance from that state. As a result, the film mediates the very conditions of spectators' historical moment, allowing them to intellectually understand their relationship to the economic and social systems structuring late-1960s society.

In Red Army/PFLP, I then show, Adachi utilized cinema to forge a subjectivity that could revolutionize the global order of the late-1960s and early-1970s. With this film, Adachi sought to create what he called “movement cinema” (undō eiga) - a revolutionary aesthetic praxis that united the production, theorization, and independent exhibition of film - in order to instigate armed revolt against the economic power structures of the present moment. Before shooting the film and while screening it, Adachi actively wrote and published film criticism in organs for the New Left like Nihon dokusho shimbun and the film journal Film Criticism (Eiga hihyō), which he re-started along with other experimental and radical filmmakers in 1970.4 In this criticism, Adachi utilized the rhetorical techniques of the written manifesto to produce a collective revolutionary consciousness.

In Red Army/PFLP itself, Adachi combined this manifesto-like language with the formal elements of documentary news films to create a cinematic form that forged a global front engaged in armed revolt. Adachi shot the film when visiting Lebanon on his return to Japan from the 1971 Cannes film festival.5 There he documented the joint activities of the Japanese Red Army and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) in Palestinian refugee camps near the Israeli border. He combined footage of the daily lives, military training, and skirmishes of these revolutionaries with voice-overs and images of the Japanese Red Army to represent this struggle as occurring in different locales yet connected through the very system that they resisted in common. This film, thus represents what Christopher Connery has called the “co-presence” of revolutionary movements at this time in history. It documents and aims to produce revolutionary subjects who transcend temporal and spatial separation in order to realize the immediate future, the revolution to come.

The shift between Gushing Prayer and Red Army/PFLP was not simply attitudinal or generic. Rather, these films represented and produced different temporalities and modes of consciousness which could condition the possibilities for social and political change. In what follows, to provide context for these two films, I will first trace Adachi’s career as a filmmaker and the significant tropes and concepts that came to inform his approaches to Gushing Prayer and Red Army/PFLP. I will then examine Gushing Prayer to show how he used film to critique the affective symptoms of late-1960s capitalism. Lastly I will argue that in his film criticism surrounding Red Army/PFLP and the film itself, Adachi attempted to use the cinematic medium
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4 Nihon dokusho shimbun launched in 1937 and reached its heyday in the 1960s as an outlet for the New Left. In the 1960s, a number of its editors were leftists who were themselves politically involved in political and aesthetic movements. The paper published one of the more famous debates at the time between two thinkers, Yoshimoto Takaaki and Hanada Kiyoteru. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the journal Film Criticism played an important role in the development of the New Wave. That first run of the journal last until 1958. In 1970, Adachi and other politically-oriented filmmakers and critics re-started the journal and used it as a venue for theorizing the political and social uses of cinema. This second run of the journal played a vital role in introducing political films, filmmakers, film criticism, and film movements around the world to Japan in the 1970s.

5 Before leaving Japan for Cannes, Adachi had already determined to stop in the Middle East in order to scout for a location to shoot a film. Filmmakers and media outlets in Japan were covering the war in Vietnam but paid too little attention, Adachi thought, to the conflicts in the Middle East. At the time, Adachi had also begun studying various freedom movements in Japan, like the activities of the Ainu people that would result in the formation of the Ainu Liberation League. In Lebanon, he found his new subject, his new method, and eventually a new home. Adachi Masao, Eiga/Kakumei (Tokyo: Kawade shobō shinsha, 2003), 351.
to produce a political subjectivity that would violently resist capitalist imperialism in the late-1960s.

From Experimental Filmmaker to Revolutionary: Adachi through the 1960s.

Throughout his career as a filmmaker in the 1960s, Adachi consistently sought to combine aesthetic experimentation with political engagement. He started making films in 1959 in the Film Research Association in the Art Department at Nihon University (Nihon daigaku geijutsu gakubu eiga kenkyukai). That year he worked as an assistant director on the documentary filmmaker Tsuchimoto Noriaki’s film *Constructing the Ironworks by the Sea* (Umi ni kizuku seitetsujo, 1959). In the summer of 1960, he became involved in the massive anti-government and anti-American demonstrations against the re-signing of the U.S.-Japan Joint Security Treaty. When these protests reached their peak in May and June, students at Nihon University, a traditionally right-wing institution, could not help but take a position. Some students, fearing the University’s discipline, refrained from even discussing the issue while others joined the various political movements protesting the re-signing of the treaty. Adachi and a few of his colleagues, who preferred to oppose the treaty without committing themselves to the dogma of any party line, formed a group called “Volunteers/ Sympathizers/ the Willing?” which accepted participants of any political affiliation. Their slogans represented the treaty as affecting all of Japan and not a matter of right versus left. At this time Adachi was also exposed to Andre Breton’s Surrealist Manifesto and the Japanese Neo-Dadaists of the early 1960s. Breton’s manifesto and surrealism more generally influenced Adachi’s approach to representing psychological experience in his films while the Neo-Dada movement inspired him to form his own politically oriented film movement, which he did later that year.

In the winter of 1960, Adachi and four other experimental filmmakers started their own filmmaking collective, VAN Film Science Research Center (VAN eiga kagaku kenkyukai). They based themselves in a house that they rented from the American military in the Kunitachi neighborhood west of central Tokyo. Adachi finished his second film, *Bowl* (Wan, 1961) and shot his third, *Closed Vagina* (Sain, 1963), which became known for its surrealist aesthetics and its Kyoto exhibition that became a happening-like performance.

In 1966, Adachi entered the world of “pink film” – a genre of erotic filmmaking characterized less by its sexual content than its low budget, independent mode of production and distribution – when he joined the filmmaker and producer Wakamatsu Kōji’s (1936-2012)
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6 The U.S.-Japan Joint Security Treaty was first signed in 1951 and allowed the United States to station its military on Japanese soil. The treaty is renewed every decade. From 1959 until 1960, Japan and the United States began renegotiating the terms of the original treaty, which provoked citizens throughout Japan to demonstrate en masse against the signing of the treaty. May 19 and June 15, 1960 marked the peak of the demonstrations when protests in front of the Japanese Diet erupted in violence. Adachi participated in these protest at the Diet.

7 Although Adachi refrained from becoming a card-carrying member of any political student group, he did participate in their demonstrations against the state and support for striking workers. In July of 1960, for example, he participated with the Zengakuren (All-Japan League of Student Self-Government) in the Miike coal mine strikes. Adachi, *Eiga/Kakumei*, 503.

8 Adachi, *Eiga/Kakumei*, 52-53

9 Adachi, *Eiga/Kakumei*, 64. They later moved to the Ogikubo neighborhood.

10 Adachi, *Eiga/Kakumei*, 64.

production company Wakamatsu Puro. Although pink film was conventionally a sexually explicit form, Wakamatsu used the independent conditions of production to create politically charged films depicting contemporary events using innovative formal techniques. Adachi worked as an assistant director, screenwriter, and director for Wakamatsu. He wrote twenty-five films often under two different pseudonyms – Ōtani Yoshiaki and Deguchi Izuru - and directed six. The films that Adachi wrote for Wakamatsu presented critical allegories of contemporary society that mapped the violence of 1960s modernity onto gendered bodies. The first films he directed were a series of satires featuring a doctor named Marukido Sadao who attempted to liberate the pleasures of sex from procreation. Other films portrayed rather brutal scenes of the rape and torture of women by otherwise powerless men. Adachi often used a variety of experimental techniques – suddenly cutting to color in black and white films, extreme close-ups of bodies, superimposing written-words over images - to portray the psychologies of his characters and reveal the constructedness of the cinematic medium.

Critics have tended to read Adachi's films from this period through two salient and interconnected tropes: space and the desire to return to the womb. His films were often set in enclosed spaces – locked rooms, rooftops, and desolate landscapes – in which male characters brutally violated female victims. His second script for Wakamatsu, When the Embryo Hunts in Secret (Taiji ga mitsuryū suru toki, 1966) exemplifies the films he wrote at this time. In this film, the male protagonist Marukido Sadao (Yamaya Hatsuo) kidnaps, rapes, and dominates a single female victim, Yuka (Shima Miharu), in the enclosed space of a one-room apartment. The narrative progresses as Marukido's acts grow increasingly sadistic and flashbacks combined with hallucination sequences insinuate his motivations. The experience of being separated from his mother’s womb at birth drove him to have a vasectomy as an adult so as not to inflict that same experience on another human being. His wife, however, decided to have a child through artificial insemination and died while giving birth. In Yuka, Marukido finds a surrogate for his wife. He forces her to wear one of his wife’s gowns, ties her to a bed, rapes, and whips her. He then puts a dog collar on her neck, attaches a leash to it, and commands her to act and bark like a dog. Yuka first resists but eventually performs as she is told. She waits for an opportunity to escape and eventually she does. She ultimately loosens her ties, stabs Marukido to death, and then escapes the apartment. This film, as film scholar Sharon Hayashi has contended, allegorized the gendered and political power relations in 1960s Japan through the sexual relationship between Marukido and Yuka.

By the late 1960s, as Adachi continued to work within and outside of pink film, space became the primary idiom through which he approached filmmaking. Working with the critic Matsuda Masao and Matsuda's concept of “the theory of landscape” (fūkeiron), Adachi (as well as a number of filmmakers in the late 1960s) examined through the cinematic medium how state
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13 See, for example: Horikiri Naoto, “Adachi Masao arui wa suiminsha to bōryokusha,” Eiga Hyōron 28.3 (March, 1971), 56-73.

14 In 1971, Horikiri Naoto examined how this film represented a desire to return to the mother's womb and suggested that this theme formed a common theme throughout much of Adachi's work. Drawing on an extended reading of Freud, Horikiri argued that Adachi’s films represent the symptoms of a pathological narcissism originating in a hatred for the mother. See Horikiri Naoto, 70-72; Sharon Hayashi, “Shikyu e no kaiki: rokuju nendai chuki Wakamatsu Puro sakuhin ni okeru seiji to sei,: in Wakamatsu Koji: hankenryoku no shozo, eds. Yomota Inuhiko and Hirasawa Go (Tokyo: Sakuhinsha, 2007), 95 -111.
and economic power was embedded in the spaces of everyday life. The point of this theory, Adachi himself explains, “was to say that landscape itself is a reflection of the omnipresence of power.” In 1969, Adachi, Matsuda and five other filmmakers produced the film, *A.K.A Serial Killer* (Ryakushō – renzoku shasatsuma, 1969), which became one of the representative works of this theory and anticipated, conceptually and formally, Adachi's approach to *Gushing Prayer* and *Red Army/ PFLP*.

The Theory of Landscape and *A.K.A. Serial Killer*

As film scholar Furuhata Yuriko has argued, Matsuda's notion of “landscape” (*fūkei*), which informed Adachi's approach to filmmaking in the late-1960s, differed from notions of landscape that philosophers have used to theorize the formation of modern subjectivity. The “theory of landscape,” she contends, refers to “neither the aesthetic production of picturesque scenery nor the metaphysical divide between subject and object, but rather the immanent relations of power that produce homogenized landscapes.”

In *A.K.A Serial Killer*, Adachi documented precisely these landscapes throughout Japan by following the course that a nineteen year old man, Nagayama Norio, traveled after stealing a gun and shooting four people in 1969. The film does not follow a plotted narrative. Rather, through a string of shots – long shots, pans, and close-ups - edited together Adachi portrays the towns, train stations, stores, and fields that Nagayama may have seen. The soundtrack to the film places spectators at a distance from images on screen. Slow experimental jazz music runs throughout with little to no diegetic sound providing an aural connection to the scenes portrayed. Throughout the film, Adachi himself provides a voice-over narration chronicling Nagayama's life, the events that led him to kill four people, and his escape. Nagayama's life thus provides a rather loose narrative framework, while the aesthetics of the film - tableau-like images - eschews, as Furuhata argues, a single position that fixes a viewing subject. Instead, the films diagrams how, Furuhata writes, “the very uniformity of the landscape of rural and urban cities throughout Japan corresponds to the serial mass production and standardization of commodities.”

This mapping of capitalism through landscape in *A.K.A Serial Killer* anticipated *Gushing Prayer* and *Red Army/ PFLP* in two conspicuous ways. First, in *Gushing Prayer*, Adachi portrayed the effects that the power embedded in the urban landscape of late 1960s Tokyo had on the subjective states of individuals. Indeed, Adachi often spoke of the affective experience that capital's homogenization of space produced. In a more recent interview he explained how he felt while shooting *A.K.A Serial Killer*. He says:

> The impression that every city is just like the same city did not disappear. While I held my breath, stood still, and wondered from where such stifling feelings originated in these cities, the landscapes in front of my eyes appeared as beautiful postcards. Yet precisely

15 Harry Harootunian and Sabu Kosho, “Messages In A Bottle: An Interview with Filmmaker Adachi Masao,” boundary 2 35.3 (2008), 86.
17 This film was a joint-production between Adachi Masao, Matsuda Masao, Sasaki Mamoru, Iwabuchi Susumu, Nonomura Masayuki, Yamazaki Yutaka, Nakamura Kōsaburō
18 Furuhata, 354.
because of their beauty, which was like that of picture postcards, I began realizing that this was the source of our suffocation, yet it keeps spreading everyday while people walk through the city in order to survive. I felt that perhaps this was the enemy of Nagayama. Then, we thought we could turn these depriving landscapes into a method in order to interrogate landscapes, ourselves, and the images of Nagayama.  

Here, the landscapes Adachi shot induced affective responses, “suffocation” and “deprivation,” which I will show, he represented in Gushing Prayer. Second, in Red Army/PFLP Adachi combined the tableau-like form of A.K.A Serial Killer with propagandistic declarations to represent the power relations embedded in the global landscapes where actual struggles for power were waged. Before turning to the political agency that Adachi sought to produce through Red Army/ PFLP, I will first consider how, in Gushing Prayer, Adachi utilized the representation of subjectivity, particularly sensual perception and emotional responsiveness, to critique the consumer capitalism of late-1960s Japan.

**Gushing Prayer: 15 Year-Old Prostitute**

Gushing Prayer exemplified the tendency in 1960s Japanese pink film to integrate political and social critiques of the present historical moment with aesthetic experimentation. In this film, as in most of his pink films, Adachi allegorized the violence and exploitation of 1960s society through the portrayal of sex and the female body. Gushing Prayer, I show here, combined this allegory with aesthetic techniques – subdued music, extreme close-ups, superimposing text over the image, and sudden cuts to color - aimed to produce affective responses in spectators while positioning them at a critical distance from that response. Through these techniques and the representation of the female body, this film creates and critiques the affective symptoms of late-1960 capitalism.

The film centers on a fifteen year-old girl, Yasuko, and her three friends – Yoko (Makiko Kimu), Bill (Aoki Yūji), and Koichi (Saitō Hiroshi) – who attempt to revolutionize society and transcend the materiality of the adult world by having sex not just with their bodies, but with their souls. They view purely physical sex as an exchange equivalent to the exchange of commodities in capitalism. Yasuko and her friends thus make a pact to have sex not for sensuous pleasure, but for their spiritual development. In the opening scene, the film reveals that Yasuko has broken this pact. She had sex with her teacher, felt pleasure, but now no longer experiences sexual stimulation or any physical sensation. Moreover, she has become pregnant, but does not know who the father is since she has been sexually promiscuous. Her pregnancy and her experience of pleasure create a central conflict between Yasuko and her friends which motivates the narrative of the film; they set out on a quest to recover, through sex, Yasuko’s capacity to feel.

This quest ultimately fails as Yasuko attempts to free herself from her friends' attempts to control her body. Koichi sees Yasuko's pregnancy as a possible means to revolutionize society. Fifteen year-old parents raising a child, he thinks, will certainly alter the status quo. He thus encourages her to have the child as he and the other two friends take her through Tokyo to see if they can recover her responsiveness to stimulation. They revisit the site – Yoyogi park – where she slept with her teacher. She and Koichi re-enact the encounter but to no avail. Her friends
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19 Furuhata, 351.
then decide that Yasuko needs to actually prostitute herself in order to see if sleeping with men for money will stimulate her physically or spiritually. They pimp her to men throughout the city but she fails to feel anything. Eventually Yasuko determines to exercise control over her own body. She confesses to her friends that she lied about sleeping with her teacher and that she is resolved to have the baby on her own. Ultimately, however, Yasuko decides that she cannot have the child but she does not want to have an abortion. In despair, she determines to kill herself and the film ends in scene in which Yasuko locks herself in an empty hotel room and attempts to commit suicide by asphyxiating herself with gas. During her attempted suicide, her teacher, whom the film has not established as being a real character, suddenly barges into the room and tries to stop her. She fights him off and then goes to the bathroom when Koichi suddenly appears at the window of the room. He enters through the window and begins to fight with the teacher. During their struggle, Yasuko has a miscarriage and the film ends.

The film uses Yasuko's friends to rather bluntly critique attempts in the 1960s to revolutionize society through the body. Adachi shows that attempts to use heterosexual sex – whether physical, spiritual, or both – as a means to achieve ideological ends involves a struggle for authority over an individual's body. For Koichi, Yasuko's pregnancy must be harnessed for social revolution while, for Yasuko, it entails determining for herself whether or not to become a mother. Moreover, Adachi suggests that this use of sex ultimately leads to assimilation into the social order. While these youth think that they can overcome the body, or even capitalist exchange, through an enlightened form of sex, they cannot overcome the fact that sex has real consequences, like pregnancy. The film thus suggests that heterosexual sex reinforces a system of exploitation and exchange.

As the film performs this allegorical critique, it also aesthetically re-constructs the affective experience of life under capitalism at the time. With this film, Adachi was seeking a new approach to the theory of landscape – the notion that power relations and modes of capitalist production are embedded in urban space – that informed A.K.A Serial Killer. He directed one film, Woman Rebel/ Vision of Hell (Ranjo/mugenjigoku, 1970) after A.K.A Serial Killer, but had difficulty determining how to approach Gushing Prayer. His young assistant director Yoshizumi Megumi and director's assistant Arai Haruhiko supplied him with the necessary impetus for this film. They brought Adachi a book of collected poetry by a seventeen year-old woman, Nagasawa Nobuko, who had committed suicide in 1949. In 1968, publishers catering to the youth population at the time had released a collection of her poetry, Friends, Because I am Dead... (Tomo yo watashi ga shinda kara tote).20 Nagasawa's poems expressed an emotional despondency in forms resembling suicide letters. Adachi combined the tone of this poetry with the “theory of landscape” to represent the emotional effects that late-1960s consumer capitalism had on subjects.

In this sense, the aesthetics of Adachi's film resemble what the critic Jonathan Flatley has called “affective mapping.” For Flatley, “affective mapping” involves using aesthetic form to represent the “historicity of one's affective experience.”21 The affective map, according to Flatley, provides the reader of a text with a conscious awareness of how the economic and social formations of a particular historical moment produce one's emotional and affective experiences. The affective map, Flatley writes, “gives one a sense of one's relationship to broad historical forces” and “how one's situation is experienced by a community.”22 Aesthetic works “map” this
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21 Flatley, 4.
22 Flatley, 4.
historically-specific and collective affective experience through techniques of “self-estrangement,” or forms of representation that “produce a particular kind of affective response in their readers, and at the same time narrate this very experience.” Affective mapping is thus a technique that evokes an aesthetic experience in an audience while providing them with knowledge about that experience. Adachi's film, I want to suggest, performs this dual function of producing an affective response in spectators while also positioning them at a critical distance from those experiences.

In Gushing Prayer, Adachi represents the historical moment of the late-1960s as producing an affectlessness, or what the critic Fredric Jameson has called a “waning of affect in late capitalism.” For Jameson, “late capitalism” refers to a shift in the history of capitalist production and the cultural sensibilities that accompanied this new economic form. The economic recoveries after World War II, according to Jameson, prepared the basis for the emergence in the 1960s, of new “structures of feeling.” The rapid transformations at this historical juncture in urban space, time, communication networks, and human relations began to exceed the subject's capacity to organize perceptually her position in the world. As a result, the individual subject became fragmented and lost her capacity to represent coherently her experience of the world to herself.

This sense of disorientation has two consequences relevant to Adachi's film. First, it results in the displacement of discernible emotional experiences by a new affective state: a general loss of feeling interspersed with compensatory emotional “intensities.” Jameson writes:

"The liberation of the subject, in contemporary society, from the older anomie of the centered subject may also mean not merely a liberation from anxiety but a liberation from every other kind of feeling as well, since there is no longer a self present to do the feeling. This is not to say that the cultural products of the postmodern era are utterly devoid of feeling, but rather that such feelings...are now free-floating and impersonal and tend to be dominated by a peculiar kind of euphoria..."

The “euphoria” that Jameson refers to here is not necessarily a positive or pleasurable experience, but one in which the subject loses herself within an emotional state. Second, accompanying this very state is a loss of the subject's relationship to “real history” and time. For Jameson, the sense of disorientation symptomatic of late capitalism is a result of the spatialization of time. One's relation to the past or history is displaced by the perpetual presentness of space. Cultural products reflect this spatialization of the past in their lack of depth, or their literal two-dimensional flatness. These works indicate that one cannot move beyond the surface appearances of the world as it is represented into a deeper understanding or “truth” of society and one's self. Gushing Prayer mediates these symptoms of the contemporary historical moment by evoking a diminished affective state and spatio-temporal disorientation while producing a critical perspective on those very experiences.

The first sequence of the film illustrates how it represents this condition. Adachi begins the film with a scene establishing its emotional tone while presenting spectators with the two-
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dimensional surfaces of the characters' bodies. The film opens with an extreme black-and-white close-up of Yasuko's hand resting on the floor; the image is blurred but then gradually comes into focus as the camera pans up over her arm and chest to her face (still 3-1; 3-2). She is looking vacantly off screen to the right. The slow melancholic strumming of an acoustic guitar overlayed with a contrapuntal solo runs throughout. In the same take, the camera pans down over her exposed breast, her friend Koichi is kissing it. The camera continues to move down her body to the top of her friend Bill's head. The proximity of his head to the camera takes the image out of focus, presenting to spectators a black mass contrasting with the white background of Yasuko's body (still 3-3). His head seems to be somewhere near Yasuko's groin. The camera then pans, still in the same take, up to their friend Yoko sitting on a couch topless, smoking a cigarette, and watching her friends' threesome. Looking down at Yasuko she says, “You said you felt something. Where on your body did you feel it? How did it feel?” and the camera pans down to the right to Yasuko's face who is simply gazing upward toward Yoko. Yoko comes over and speaking next to Yasuko continues, “What did your body feel? It's been two hours already and nothing has changed.” The film then cuts to an extreme close-up of a hand rubbing an indiscernible part of Yasuko's body, pans up her body to Koichi's face resting on her chest and back to her face. It then cuts again to a shot from near her hip as her two male friends work to stimulate her. She continues to gaze away into a void as a despondent-sounding female voice in a voice-over recites one of Nagasawa's poems, “When the girl who had just turned seventeen bid farewell to this world, there was no sign of emotion, no dream in her ugly face nor in the depths of her heart. People will perhaps not believe the undeniable truth with which I have experimented. Seventeen year-old girl. Suicide by poison.” As the voice over continues, the camera, in an extreme close-up, moves over the bodies of the three on the floor, capturing the movement of their flesh, hair, and glistening sweat (still 3-4).

In this opening scene, the close-ups of Yasuko and her friends' bodies along with the melancholic music creates a subdued yet quasi-euphoric atmosphere in which time is compressed onto the space of the characters' bodies. The slow guitar music produces a despondent mood while the extreme close-ups produce a loss of visual coherence, rendering the actors' bodies two-dimensional textural surfaces. The shifting ground between discernible parts – faces, hands, and nipples – and the abstract form of black, white, and grey shapes represents the body as a surface, something lacking depth, emotion, or a soul. The camera's treatment of the body visually presents the very content of the poem: a girl, drained of emotions and dreams in the process of becoming a lifeless body. The images and music in this sequence thus work together to create for the spectator an aesthetic atmosphere mirroring Yasuko's own state.

The following shot then establishes a critical distance on this affective condition. When the voice-over ends, the film cuts to a smaller-sized frame and the very poem recited in the voice-over appears superimposed on the screen over the actors performing (still 3-5). This use of printed language distances spectators from the previous experience of hearing the female voice recite the poem. Whereas the recitation of the poem produces an affective experience through aural perception of the tone and rhythm of the woman's voice, the poem printed on screen engages spectators' interpretive faculties. The words on screen self-reflexively indicate that media like language and the cinematic image signify affective states. This opening sequence thus reveals the film's mode of spectatorial address: it engages spectators' affective and intellectual responses. The film then uses this dual address to represent the experience of the urban spaces that late-1960s capitalism has produced.
The second scene of the film maps, onto late-1960s Tokyo, the “waning of affect” and the experience of spatio-temporal disorientation symptomatic of late capitalism. In this scene, Yasuko and her four friends revisit the site where Yasuko lost her capacity to feel. She and her friends walk through a mist-filled Yoyogi park – the very site of Japan’s re-entry into the global capitalist arena with the 1964 Olympics - as Yasuko guides her friends to where she and her teacher met and had sex. The same slow guitar music from the opening scene continues as Yasuko walks her friends over to the spot where she waited for her teacher. The mist filling the background of the scene flattens the image, all one sees are the characters in the foreground (still 3-6). Yasuko recounts to her friends that she told her teacher she was four-months pregnant, but did not know who the father was because she had been promiscuous. She then says, “we started to walk” and the film cuts to Yasuko and her three friends lined up walking in the mist. They appear as dark grey silhouettes moving within a light grey atmosphere as Yasuko continues to narrate (still 3-7). Here time becomes two-dimensional space, a surface of abstract grey shapes attempting to locate the past within a visually occluded landscape.

The film punctuates this incoherence with instances of visual and emotional intensity when, at moments of extreme physical and emotional sensation, it suddenly cuts to color. The first and most salient example of this use of color comes halfway through the film when Koichi takes his three friends to his apartment where they peer in on his mother having sex with her lover. Here, Koichi tells Yasuko to watch closely how the two lovers “thoroughly feel sex with their bodies” and asks if what she felt was the same as what his mother is feeling. The film then cuts to a color shot of the male lover's back and slowly pans to the right over Koichi's mother's breast and to her face, expressing intense sexual pleasure (still 3-8; 3-9). The same female voice-over from the first scene begins to recite Nagasawa's poetry as the camera pans over the lovers' bodies. She says, “If only I could bring back that perfect evening in June when, for the first time, we held hands. Please drink the Suntory Red [whiskey] that I have brought, 300 Brovarin sleeping pills. Suicide by poison.” When the voice-over ends, the sound of Koichi's mother's moaning increases. The film cuts a close up of her hand which grabs her lover's back and slides down his arm as the camera pans left over her breast and then back to an extreme close-up of her face. This use of color distinguishes the euphoria experienced in this scene from the rest of the film. It visually displays a moment of pure sensuous intensity different from Yasuko's state of affectlessness. In the first scene, the black-and-white pans over the bodies of Yasuko, Koichi and Bill presented a pure surface and a loss of self to a lack of feeling. In contrast to that scene, the color pans over the surfaces of the lovers' intertwined bodies here represents the loss of self to a sensuous affective intensity, a moment of sublime sensation. This use of color at once signifies and creates a moment of affective intensity for the spectator as well. It indicates to the spectator a shift in the emotional register of the film as the colors of Koichi's mother's body – her red lipstick, eye shadow, and the color of her skin - produce a heightened visually sensuous experience and an awareness of that experience itself.

Through such techniques, Gushing Prayer maps the affective experience, or the “waning of affect” of late-1960s capitalism. It produces in spectators the very experience of diminished individual feelings punctuated with instances of intense euphoric moments. At the same time, it alienates spectators from that experience. Through self-reflexive aesthetic techniques, like the use of printed language on screen and cuts to color, the film indicates to spectators the constructedness of the experience represented on screen. As such, the film aims to produce active spectators who can, potentially, interpret and gain knowledge of their own historical situation. This positioning of spectators in a critical relation to their contemporary moment
became a key aesthetic tactic in *Red Army/PFLP* for harnessing both history and spectators for actual global revolution.

**Towards a “Movement Cinema”**

In September of 1970, only a few months before shooting *Gushing Prayer*, Adachi had begun to actively theorize a form of filmmaking that not only represented but intervened in the struggles against global capitalism in the late-1960s and early-1970s. With a number of other politically-minded filmmakers and critics, Adachi revived the journal *Film Criticism* (*Eiga hihyō*) that Yoshida and other New Wave filmmakers had founded in the late 1950s but had only lasted a few years. In the December 1970 issue, Adachi and a number of critics and independent filmmakers began to serialize an ongoing discussion, “What is Necessary for Film Now?,” on the social and political uses of cinema at this historical juncture.28

In these discussion, Adachi and the other participants drew on and distinguished themselves from a number of ideas circulating throughout debates in film and the arts at the time. Adachi himself began the discussion arguing that contemporary cinema required a theory and an aesthetic practice that responded to the specificities of the present historical moment. In response to Adachi's call, one of the discussants Tawara Katsuhirō proposed a form of filmmaking that resembled the critic Yoshimoto Taka'aki's notion of the “expression of the image” (*eizō hyōgen*).29 For Yoshimoto as for Tawara, filmmaking was a four-step process that involved uniting empirical reality, phenomenological experience, and cinematic production. Adachi rejected such notions on the basis that they did not account for the economic and social formations, or the “situation” (*jōkyō*) to use Adachi's terms, structuring the global order.

Instead, Adachi proposed a notion of filmmaking that represented a tripartite relationship between subjectivity, the contemporary “situation,” and the cinematic image. This notion was an elaboration on the previous “theory of landscape” that informed his approach to shooting *A.K.A Serial Killer*. Whereas Adachi and Matsuda's approach to landscape in *A.K.A Serial Killer* involved mapping the power structures in the external world, in these discussions Adachi sought to re-introduce the internal or subjective aspect of these power relations. This involved theorizing a relationship between “subjective consciousness” (*shutai ishiki*) and the current “situation” (*jōkyō*) as well as the relationship between “subjective consciousness” and the “image” (*eizō*). Adachi called the former relationship – between “subjectivity” and the “situation” - a “theory of movement” (*undōron*). This direct relationship between subjectivity and the current historical moment formed the basis for active political engagement, which required for Adachi “negating the self” (*jiko hitei*), or denying one's habituated perceptions of society and the empirical world, in order to properly understand and respond to the current situation. He called the latter relationship – between “subjectivity” and the “image” - the “theory of expression” (*hyōgenron*). The production of the cinematic image, Adachi recognized always involved subjective mediation. That which was represented in the image, then, was not simply the individuality of the filmmaker or the world “as it is,” but how the filmmaker actively and subjectively intervened in the present moment. Adachi was thus not solely interested in the aesthetics of cinema itself nor in creating an aesthetic movement. Rather, films and filmmakers, for Adachi, had to mediate the formation of a political movement and mobilize subjects who
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would work to realize its ends.\footnote{Cited in Willemen, 9.} For Adachi, a film form that could instigate actual social change had to produce a revolutionary consciousness in spectators and compel them to act against the powers shaping the global order of the late-1960s and early 1970s.

Although Adachi was not a committed Marxist, his aspirations to transform subjectivity and incite action reflected those of numerous Marxist-based revolutionary and liberation movements throughout the world at the time. Adachi sought to create a filmic praxis, akin to revolutionary praxis, that integrated theory and practice. He penned manifestoes and examined the possible political and social uses of cinema within a revolutionary movement. After shooting \textit{Red Army/PFLP}, he created a “screening movement” (jōeitaiundō) in which he, members of Wakamatsu’s production team, activists, revolutionaries, and left-leaning thinkers toured Japan in a “red bus” and screened the film at universities, film circles, and radical organizations. Adachi called this activity of integrating film production, theorization, and screening, “movement cinema” (undō eiga).

In this sense, Adachi’s “movement cinema” mirrored trends in global cinema that used film for explicitly political goals at the end of the 1960s. Adachi’s “movement cinema” particularly resembled what Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino called “Third Cinema,” a concept and practice of filmmaking on which a number of politically-oriented filmmakers elaborated.\footnote{On Third Cinema see: Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, “Towards a Third Cinema: Notes and Experiences for the Development of a Cinema of Liberation in the Third World,” \textit{New Latin American Cinema, Theory, Practices, and Transcontinental Articulations, Volume One}, ed. M.T. Martin (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997), 33-58; Jim Pines and Paul Willemen eds., \textit{Questions of Third Cinema} (London: British Film Institute, 1989); Mike Wayne, \textit{Political Film: The Dialectics of Third Cinema} (London: Pluto Press, 2001). Although Adachi did not use the term “Third Cinema” when writing about \textit{Red Army/PFLP}, in his 1974 article, “The Demise of Movement Cinema: An Analysis of the Situation of Japanese Film in 1974” (Undō eiga no shūen – 1974nen nihon eiga jōkyō no bunseki), Adachi compared his theorization and production of “movement cinema” to the notion of Third Cinema. He writes: “By creating \textit{The Hour of the Furnaces} as an offering to the people who fell with Che Guevara in the Latin American liberation struggle,’ they [Solanas and Getino] surely developed an illegal guerilla screening movement. They called American Hollywood and its copies in the representative films of Soviet filmmaking First Cinema. They called the auteurist films of the ‘New Wave’ and ‘underground cinema’ Second Cinema. They determined that these were the enemy’s films in that they were all commodities/surplus value that people watched as consumers of ideology, not as creators of ideology. In a similar fashion, I learned how they mobilized Third Cinema through my screening activities of \textit{Red Army/PFLP}. In their foci and forms of mobilization, the realities of our movements shared a number of similar points and purposes. Moreover, Matsuda Masao definitively theorized...the course that the ‘subject of film liberation’ (eiga kaihō shutai) took within Japanese film as the progression from ‘studio film to auteur film to movement film (kaisha no eiga → sakka no eiga → undō no eiga)’ from the 1950s to the 1960s. Adachi Masao, “Undō eiga no shūen,” in \textit{Eiga e no senryaku} (Tokyo: Shōbunsha, 1974), 177. See also: Matsuda Masao, “Undō eiga no tame ni,” \textit{Eiga hihyō}, December, 1971.} Second Cinema, he maintains, “expresses the aspirations of the middle stratum, the petit bourgeoisie...It runs in circles. It is cut off from reality.”\footnote{Cited in Willemen, 9.} By contrast, Third Cinema, Solanas writes, “is the expression of a new culture and of social changes. Generally speaking Third Cinema gives an account of reality and history.”\footnote{Cited in Willemen, 9.} Third Cinema aims to make spectators aware of their relation to the socio-historical power relations of the present moment. It does not simply oppose imperialist rule or speak for the “people,” but aims to...
produce “social intelligibility,” to use Paul Willemen's term, of current historical realities. This form of cinema, Willemen thus writes, “addresses the issue of social power from a critical-but-committed position, articulating the joining of 'the intelligence, the emotions, the powers of intuition'...so as to help achieve socialist ideals.”

In the production, theorization, and screening of Red Army/PFLP, Adachi sought to achieve similar goals through similar forms of address. His writings and the film itself clearly aim to evoke emotion while appealing to spectators' critical faculties. They are committed to combating imperialism through criticism that makes intelligible the historically specific social relations of the contemporary moment. However, this film and Adachi's movement contrasts with Third Cinema on a key point. Whereas the films that one might categorize within Third Cinema often stopped short of expressing the dogma of propaganda, Adachi, towing the line of the PFLP, made propaganda a central element of this film and his writings, particularly, his manifesto on it. As he represented the struggles of the Red Army and the PFLP against imperialism and the forms of power necessitating this struggle, he also used language and film to compel spectators to identify with the movement. Red Army/PFLP and Adachi's writings on it thus combine the critical aspirations of Third Cinema with the persuasive authority of propaganda. Rhetorically, Adachi draws this propagandistic authority from the manifesto form, a genre of writing and filmmaking that seeks to authorize itself to speak for a social movement and the future which that very movement will produce.

Authorizing the Future of the Movement

In the writings that Adachi published in conjunction with Red Army/PFLP, he drew on a genealogy of manifesto writing indebted to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels's The Communist Manifesto. Most political and aesthetic manifestos of the 20th Century, according to the critic Martin Puchner, can be traced back to Marx's Manifesto, particularly in how they claim the authority to speak for a revolutionary or aesthetic movement. Marx’s Manifesto, Puchner argues, differs from previous manifesto-like writing – or writing that couched its authority in an external power, like a monarch or god - in that it “exposes its speech acts as self-authorizing and openly ‘agonistic’ manifestations.” Through their polemical rhetoric manifestos invest themselves with the authority to produce the changes – in consciousness and the material world - necessary for radical social transformation.

The language of the manifesto is thus oriented toward the future, projecting and attempting to fashion an anticipated outcome through the authority that they confer on themselves. Drawing on J.L Austin's How to Do Things With Words, Puchner argues that manifestos produce this authority through a tension between two speech acts: a performative speech act aimed at changing the world through language invested with authority (“I do,” for example) and a theatrical speech act, a mimed articulation of a performative speech act devoid of authority (“I do” spoken on stage). For Puchner, the theatrical element in the manifesto works both negatively and positively. On the one hand, it indicates that the manifesto does not at its moment of articulation actually possess the authority with which it speaks. Consequently,
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Puchner writes, “Theatricality seems to be something of a specter haunting the manifesto, the threat that its speech acts might turn out to be nothing but stage acts.” One the other hand, however, this theatricality invests the manifesto with potential. Puchner continues, “one may say that theatricality is what enabled the manifesto to speak in the first place, in the absence of proper authority... Without theatricality, in other words, there would be no pose, no presumption, no projection, no futurity; without theatricality, there would be no manifesto.”

In the 19th and 20th Centuries, this claim to self-authority traversed the globe across linguistic, national, and aesthetic boundaries in the manifestos of numerous political and art movements. The mobility of the manifesto and its authors has made it, to use Puchner’s term, a “displaced” genre: a genre penned by authors living abroad, printed in trans-national journals, and transformed by changing historical contexts, philosophical breaks, and ideological imperatives. Adachi’s writings from the late-1960s and early-1970s retained the very same aspirations, formal qualities, and tensions of its progenitors while incorporating them into the domestic and global specificities of its time.

Throughout his writings on Red Army/PFLP, Adachi drew on elements of the manifesto to polemically position himself within and against the history of cinema in order to stake out new ground on which to articulate his own notion of revolutionary “movement cinema.” In his opening remarks to the first part of the previously mentioned, “What is Necessary for Film Now,” for example, Adachi simultaneously linked his film theory to the past while breaking from it. He said he wanted to create a theory for a revolutionary film form like Sergei Eisenstein’s, but one that was suited to the current historical situation. In his essay, “Filmmaker’s Films and Practices,” he distinguished his cinematic practice from that of his contemporaries, like Iimura Takahiko and Matsumoto Toshio. Borrowing language from the dogma of the Japanese Red Army, he contended that these independent filmmakers “need to recognize the conservatism within their own creative subjectivities” and “start from a self-criticism (jiko hihan) of their implication in crimes.” In his piece, “What must be done,” a riff on Jean-Luc Godard’s “Que faire?” (What is to Be Done?), which took its title from Lenin’s text, Adachi rewrote Godard’s 39 points, replacing them with his own theory of a movement cinema. Where Godard wrote, “Must we make political films?,” Adachi followed in parentheses, “Must we make movement films?” In such pieces, Adachi drew on elements of the manifesto to advance his theory of film; but in his manifesto for Red Army/PFLP, “A Theoretical Strategy for A Film Movement – The Manifesto of Red Army/ PFLP: Declaration of World War,” Adachi most explicitly deployed the manifesto form in articulating his political and aesthetic program.

Adachi opened this manifesto speaking for the groups involved in forming a global revolution while declaring the film movement necessary to its future realization. Adachi writes, “We, the Red Army Faction of the Japanese Communist Party and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, have begun the screening movement of the ‘news film,’ Red Army/PFLP – Declaration of World War, which is enacting the process of a theoretical strategic battle, to
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build the front of the world revolution.”44 With this opening line, Adachi writes into existence the political-filmic struggle of the Japanese Red Army and the PFLP. He creates the birth of the movement; he creates its history. Adachi’s declaration here performatively produces these two parties as a joint front. It aims to create a revolutionary collectivity that did not previously exist, a central aspiration of the manifesto form. As Puchner explains, “Any manifesto worth the title cannot be comfortably 'ontologically grounded' in an actually existing activity of an actually existing multitude; it must produce this multitude as a subject in itself and for itself, must create the ground on which to stand.”45 The aesthetic form of Red Army/PFLP, as Adachi then pronounces, was integral to the formation of this multitude.

Adachi declares that the film itself unites the aesthetics of documentary filmmaking with the goals of the revolutionaries it represents. He proclaims that he and the other crew members of Wakamatsu Puro were delegated the task of creating the film, but have sought to realize a “global red army” through uniting their activities as filmmakers with the struggles of the Japanese Red Army and the PFLP. The filmic form that can accomplish this unification, he declares is “News Film.” Drawing on the ideas of the leader of the PFLP at the time, Ghassan Kanafani, Adachi defines news film as a form of propaganda aimed at representing the “reality” of the current global order: armed struggle against imperialism. The function of the news film, for Adachi, is to deliver through “language” the reality of that struggle. He writes:

We must embody the theoretical strategy of the manifesto of the global revolutionary front that states, “news film” = propaganda = armed conflict. Can our “news film” acquire the “language” of truth? OK, how and from where does this language, as the “language of truth,” speak? In what way must the manifesto perform this task? “Language” itself asks this fundamental question of this film movement.46

He then explains how, in shooting Red Army/PFLP, the film attains this “language of truth.” Adachi briefly recounts an episode when, in shooting eight guerillas, they performed for the camera. As they were preparing and drinking the juice they directly addressed the camera, declaring, “We are now battling the Israeli military! Take your positions at once!” Although Adachi himself wanted to document these soldiers without them “fictitiously” performing for the camera, he realized that for these soldiers the mundane activity of making juice and their performance for the camera were, in fact, part of the same activity: armed revolt. This subversion of his own expectations and approach to documentary filmmaking, he then states, produces the “language” of “news film.” He continues:

When I shot those guerilla soldiers, the spirit of documentarism compelled me to record, to continue shooting the entire process of the breakdown of my position as the one recording. It becomes possible to transmit “language” as propaganda by making into “information” the reality of these guerilla soldiers' battle strategy and tactics for guerilla war, i.e. war as armed conflict. “News film” acquires its “language” not when the
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In other words, “news film” speaks the language of the revolution when the filmmaker shoots a scene according to his own subjective intentions and aesthetic choices, but ultimately has those intentions undermined by the very subject he is shooting. This point succinctly illustrates Adachi’s notion of unifying a “theory of movement” with a “theory of expression” explained above. A film is produced through an interaction between his own subjectivity and the image as well as his subjectivity and the “situation” of the present moment.

This method, placed within the context of this manifesto, became a means for Adachi to claim authority for the proper approach to revolutionary filmmaking. That is, he rhetorically produced the aesthetic approach necessary for a revolutionary movement. In this sense, Adachi used the speech acts – performative and theatrical – central to the manifesto form to theorize a method for filmmaking. His approach to shooting the guerilla soldiers produced the necessary “language” of the revolution which, in turn, could produce the revolution itself.

The end of the manifesto then displays most clearly Adachi's performative and theatrical authorization of his “movement cinema.” He closes the piece with a rallying cry to get on the red bus screening Red Army/PFLP, punctuating it with an exclamation point. He writes, “Who will ride?” “Who is riding?” The “Revolution Bus” rides! The exclamation point here is not just a mark accenting Adachi’s pronouncement, but a theatrical act garnering support and projecting toward the future. As Puchner explains, it “is one more seam between manifesto and revolution, one more mediation, more of an act than a text...but not act enough.” With this mark, Adachi’s manifesto, like the manifesto genre, “imagines itself to be on the verge of action, anticipating, preparing, organizing this action, and perhaps participating in it already, if only in a preliminary manner.” The very preliminary nature of the exclamation mark is at once an authorizing act and an indication of powerlessness. It seeks to speak for the movement while also signaling that we are not at the future moment that will invest Adachi’s call with authority. Adachi thus employs a speech act that gestures at its own lack of authority in the present moment in order to speak with authority for a possible future.

Adachi structures this mode of theatrical self-authorization into Red Army/ PFLP itself. He uses inter-titles and voice-over narration to unify rhetorically the Red Army and PFLP. The film proclaims their revolutionary tactics and goals while appealing to the emotions of spectators through song and polemical statements. He combines manifesto-like oratory with a number of cinematic techniques – shots of “landscapes,” news clips from recent struggles, and images representing the “enemy,” or capitalist imperialism - that produce for spectators a “social intelligibility” of the current historical moment. Red Army/PFLP shuttles between the self-authority of the manifesto and the production of a critical consciousness in an attempt to produce the future, the revolution to come.
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Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War

Red Army/PFLP beings with an act of aesthetic appropriation and re-contextualization to lay claim to recent historical events. After a shot of the editorial and production credits, it opens with the Internationale playing to black-and-white newsreel footage of the hijacking of Japan Airlines flight 351 on March 31, 1970. The footage shows the airplane taking off, cuts to newspaper headlines announcing the hijacking and then back to the plane landing at Fukuoka airport, releasing hostages (still 4-1; 4-2). The title of the film then appears in inter-titles: Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War in large white bloc characters on a black background. A voice-over narrator announces the purpose of the film, “This is a news film for the construction of the global Red Army.” As the Internationale continues over the footage of the hijacking, the narrator explains the event occurring on screen: “In March 1970, the Red Army Faction of the Communist League hijacked a Japan Airline’s plane and flew it to The People’s Democratic Republic of Korea in order to build an international base of operation.”

The film then cuts to color footage of the Dawson’s Field Hijackings, when PFLP members hijacked five airplanes bound for New York from various European cities and had them diverted to Dawson’s Field, a British landing strip in the middle of the Jordanian desert. A close-up pan on one of the airplanes shows a message spray-painted on the side of the airplane: “Down With Imperialism, Zionism, and Israel.” A long shot shows the airplane and two others lined up on the tarmac. The airplane on the left then explodes (still 4-3). The Internationale fades out as the narrator continues, “In September of the same year, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine hijacked a Pan-American Airlines plane and three others and blew it up at Revolutionary Airport.” A cut back to the inter-titles displays a quote from Ghassan Kanafani, one of the early leaders of the PFLP, “The best form of propaganda is armed struggle.” The narrator continues, “International guerillas have begun a new armed struggle.” The footage shows all three planes burning. “Breaching international boundaries with armed force, is it a heroic strategy of war or propaganda?” As if answering the narrator’s question, the inter-titles display, “It is armed struggle.”

In this opening sequence, the film defines the contemporary moment as an historical conflict against neocolonial imperialism. By combining newsreel footage of these current hijackings with the Internationale, the film places these images and these events within a long history of collective revolt against state power and capitalist imperialism. The song calls forth past revolutionary movements while situating the events portrayed on screen as the continuation of their aspirations. The narrator and the footage then juxtapose the activities of disparate revolutionary groups in Japan and the Middle East in order to rhetorically produce a united front across both time and space. The film’s form here thus mirror's its historical goals: it seize the newsreel footage, just as it aims to seize history, and channel them into a political program that will determine the future.

Moreover, the narration here serves a didactic purpose. It instructs spectators in how to perceive the contemporary moment while announcing the tactics - propaganda, or armed struggle - for how the film itself (i.e. the struggle that the film endorses) will transform the contemporary world order. The second sequence of the film literally defines and explicates the necessity for propaganda at this moment in history. This sequence consists of a few long takes shot out of the windshield of car moving through the streets of Beirut. As the camera moves through a commercial district, a beach-side area, and suburban neighborhoods, a voice-over
recording espouses the necessity of propaganda (still 4-4). First, the narrator from the opening sequence introduces this issue. He says, “What is propaganda? Now it can be defined as people in struggle speaking the true meaning of the struggle in their own words. But, how and for whom can it be narrated?” He then introduces a PFLP soldier explaining their propaganda strategy. The soldier says:

Propaganda is in fact information and information communicates the truth. And, the supreme form of truth is armed struggle. Therefore, we believe that armed struggle is the best form of propaganda. It may be true that the worldwide system of discursive propaganda is greatly influencing international public opinion, but it is by the people who fight to liberate themselves through armed struggle that things are ultimately decided.

Here, the soldier introduces two stakes in the Red Army/PFLP movement and the film itself. He first declares “truth” as a site of struggle and then rather tautologically defines that truth and the means to attain it. Armed struggle, or propaganda, are truth and the means to establish truth. He then explains why propaganda/armed struggle is necessary at this historical juncture. He says:

Of course, everyone of us is fully aware that the propaganda system of American imperialism is the largest one in human history. They dominate the world's TV networks and newspapers and provide people with false education and movies by maliciously saying whatever they want. They believe they can do anything. The people of South Vietnam have only feeble power without TV and newspapers of their own, but they fight with a firm will as their only weapon against the imperialist system. And what is happening now? The gigantic propaganda system of the United States is failing to convince people that “this war” is right.

He then defines the PFLP's approach to combating American propaganda, “This is propaganda, our propaganda. Propaganda is action and struggle. That is the only supreme form of propaganda. However, that action has to be supported by firm solidarity with various leftist parties, factions, and by the revolutionary propaganda system (still 4-5; 4-6; 4-7).” The PFLP soldier, here, defines armed struggle as the only possible form of resistance, the only possible form of propaganda, that can combat the American media's representations of the world. Leftist struggles, like the PFLP's, have few outlets through which to represent themselves against the reach and domination of the American media. This statement at once announces the tactics of the PFLP – armed struggle-as-propaganda - while also declaring the role of the film itself. Red Army/PFLP is a form of propaganda-struggle against global powers, like the United States, and their news outlets.

The juxtaposition of this polemical statement with images shot from the car moving through neighborhoods situate spectators within the socio-historical struggles defining the moment of the late-1960s and early-1970s. The voice-over narration delineates the conditions and the stakes of resistance against neocolonialism while the images on screen place spectators within the spaces that this struggle has produced. With these images Adachi extends the practice of diagramming the power relations embedded in landscape, which he began in A.K.A. Serial Killer, to a global space.

The following sequence accentuates this approach through both the voice-over and the landscapes that it portrays. The film cuts to a shot of an airplane as the narrator introduces the
next speaker. He says, “Similarly, a soldier of the Japanese Communist League Red Army Faction, which based its strategy for armed struggle in the 1960s on the objective to create a “Preliminary Stage of Armed Uprising,” now recognizes the situation of the 1970s as the “Stage of Armed Confrontation.” Then, a young man begins to speak:

What we can say based on our ongoing struggle is that direct attacks on enemy power - such as the Osaka-Tokyo War, Daibosatsu struggle, the bomb-attack movement against American military bases, hijacks, attacks on police boxes, seizures of arms, and ongoing struggles to finance resistance - are armed struggles and in and of themselves propaganda. The substance of military gain lies in concrete damage inflicted upon the enemy and fundamental blows to the ruling structure. And what appropriates this truth is nothing but popular struggle based on numerous guerilla wars.

During this monologue the film displays images of a Palestinian camp in Lebanon: clothes hanging to dry on rooftops, children playing in the streets between the cracked concrete buildings, and the interior of one building with the PFLP's manifestoes and posters pinned to the walls.

With this voice-over and these shots of the Palestinian camp, Adachi creates a sense of simultaneity, or what the critic Christopher Connery has called “co-presence,” between the Red Army and the PFLP. For Connery, revolutionary movements throughout the world during the 1960s shared a "homologous cultural logic" across the first and third worlds. Connery writes, the “co-presence – of Vietnam in Calcutta and Oakland; the versions of the Chinese Cultural Revolution in Havana and Paris – not only worked to break up the global system of separation, it was a claim for a new time.”51 That is, co-presence was a claim for future possibility and, Connery continues, “a politics of temporality, a politics visible in multiple locations, multiple political projects, and explicitly posed against a variety of dominant temporal structures.”52 The voice-over of the Japanese Red Army soldier combined with the images of the Palestinian refugee camp creates precisely this co-presence and claim to a future time in Red Army/PFLP. It aurally and visually unites two movements that began in two different “worlds” - the “First World” of Japan and the “Third World” of Palestine - but now revolt in common against capitalist imperialism and its claims to the time and spaces of the present moment.

Red Army/PFLP identifies the dominant organizing logic of capitalism and simultaneous events around the world to resist it. The film shows, through Japanese commercials for suits, cars, and Coca-Cola the very system against which the film and its subjects revolt (still 4-8). It portrays the Sanrizuka struggles when farmers and students in Japan united to prevent the Japanese government from taking the people's land to build Narita airport (still 4-9). In Lebanon, the film follows revolutionaries as they train for battle and documents their commitment to the struggle (still 4-10). The PFLP revolutionaries themselves claim the co-presence that Connery indicates was central to radical movements at the time when one revolutionary claims,” Such strategies and tactics as ours, much like our Cuban and Vietnam comrades, are the products of our thought and the positions immediate to our struggle.”

The film then ends with an aural representation of this co-presence through the soundtrack. It simultaneously runs the various tracks and voices – the Internationale, the
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narrator, PFLP soldiers, and Red Army members – which have played and spoken throughout the film. At the same time, the film cuts between shots from a vehicle moving down a road in the Lebanese desert and intertitles displaying various phrases and words central to the movement: “the formation of a revolutionary front is armed struggle,” “revolution is world war,” “world war,” “revolution,” “revolution=world war,” “armed struggle!” “take up your weapons!” “gun,” “bullet,” “weapon,” “muzzle,” “trigger (still 4-11; 4-12).” This cacophony of voices and rousing terms renders the landscape of the Lebanese desert a battle ground in a movement that crossed the space of the globe. Japanese, Vietnamese, and Cuban struggles, this final moment suggests, occur in Lebanon as they do in other locales.

Moreover, this final scene addresses spectators both intellectually and emotionally. Running the soundtrack over the shots of the landscape asks spectators themselves to draw the connections between the voices, song, and history represented in the soundtrack with the space projected on screen. At the same time, the rousing words aim to emotionally provoke spectators to take up arms within this revolution, to recognize themselves as part of this global identity and its aspirations for the future. The film thus attempts to transform spectators' subjectivities, or to produce in them a revolutionary consciousness committed to violent revolt.

Conclusion

The shift between Gushing Prayer and Red Army/PFLP reflected a shift in the representation and construction of subjectivity in late-1960s cinema. In Gushing Prayer, Adachi mapped the affective symptoms of late 1960s capitalism through Yasuko's inability to feel physical sensation and by creating an atmosphere paralleling that state. The film's aesthetics evoked in spectators the vacillating condition of affectlessness and affective intensity that defined this moment in history while situating spectators at a critical distance from that very condition. This technique provided spectators with a sense of knowledge or an intelligibility about their current socio-historical moment. Red Army/PFLP, I then argued, mobilized this positioning of spectators for revolutionary ends. It displayed through the coupling of voice-over narration and images of landscapes the “co-present” global struggle against capitalist imperialism in the late-1960s and early-1970. The film and the writings that Adachi produced in conjunction with it claimed the authority to not only speak for this movement but to produce this movement and its future. Through their rhetorical and representational techniques – exclamation points, claims to creating a united front, documenting the breakdown of the filmmaker's intentions - Adachi's writings and film sought to instruct spectators in the tactics for armed revolt while persuading them to identify emotionally with its use of violence.

Red Army/PFLP film thus reflects the violent extreme of the representation and production of subjectivity in 1960s Japan. As it creates an awareness, or “intelligibility” of the power relations defining its present historical moment, it aims to persuade its viewers to identify with terrorist activity and take up arms in violent revolt. The film claims that the only possible means of resistance is armed insurrection, which itself becomes a form of self-representation, or a kind of “language” that the film represents. Cinematic representation and consumption, here, become unto themselves political acts within a struggle for collective consciousness and violent collective action.
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