

# Representing the Pacific:

South-Sea- and Nanyo-Orientalism

SUDO Naoto

## 南洋表象

— 西洋・日本型「南洋オリエンタリズム」の差異 —

須藤直人

Between the early Japanese castaway writings about the Pacific and the fully-fledged fictional romance writing of the 1930s there was a period of “Westernization” that exposed readers and potential writers to Euro-American literature. This was accompanied by a cultural nationalism hostile to Western influence, so literary modernization did not take place as a direct copy of Western models, even in formulaic colonial romances of the Pacific.

Depicting “realistically” has been most important to scientists, artists and writers who tried to describe the Pacific. This “reality” could be acquired through the modern “perspective drawing” and “unification of the written and spoken language” through the Renaissance, Classical, and Modern age, which in Japan took place at a stretch as a state undertaking at the end of the nineteenth century. This article will examine the relation between Japan’s modernization and Japanese colonialist representations of the Pacific by focusing on such representational systems developed in Western Europe and disseminated worldwide along with Orientalism.

In his *Orientalism*, Edward Said defines his concept of “Orientalism” as the sum of the West’s representations of the Orient that construct binary divisions between the Orient and the Occident and stereotypes of the “strange,” “degenerate,” and “timeless” Orient. It is a useful analytic framework within and against which we can also consider Japanese imperialist representations of the Pacific Other.

Whereas Said emphasizes the power of colonial representation as producing distinct categories of Self and Other, Homi Bhabha concentrates on its contradictions and crevices. According to him, both ambivalence and anxious repetition are intrinsic qualities of colonial representations – it is not possible to completely separate the subjectivities at either end of the Self/Other polarity. Bhabha’s “ambivalence” and threat of “mimicry” – “almost the same but not quite” (Bhabha 89) – can criticize and complement Said’s “Orientalism” effectively.

In this essay, Said's and Bhabha's concepts are applied to its analysis of Japanese colonial discourses on the Pacific. Japanese Orientalism vis-à-vis the Pacific is an important concept here called "Nanyo-Orientalism."

## Perspectival "colonial space": from Crusoe through Cook to Melville

The Confucian world-view, which was predominant in *samurais* (Japanese warriors), the ruling-class people, has a hierarchical system (as does the Christian world-view). In this world-view, space is not homogeneous: *iteki* (barbarians or foreign peoples outside the Chinese culture area) dwelt in each of their heterogeneous conceptualized spaces. Between an encyclopedic book by Confucian physician Ryoan Terashima, *Wakan Sansai Zue* (An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Japan and China, 1713) and a geography book by Dutch-studies scholar Churyo Morishima, *Bankoku Shinwa* (Hot News around the World, 1789), for example, the descriptions of *iteki* (except people in and around India, the center of Buddhism) as demonic and inhuman are unchanged. As natural historian Gennai Hiraga depicted in his illuminating story *Furyu Shidoken Den* (A Life of Shidoken the Vagabond, 1763), the foreign worlds and peoples were generally conceived as nearly dreams and phantasms: in the story the protagonist can travel about the world by dint of a fan given by a hsien (immortal).

In the early nineteenth century, through Dutch books, Chinese books by Western missionaries, and so on, Japanese intellectuals acquired some knowledge of the Pacific Islands as a result of Cook's voyages, together with the concept of "race" based on physical characteristics. Both from the conventional and the new world-views (of Confucian, Japanese classical, and Dutch scholars), Pacific peoples could be regarded as inferior and uncivilized Others. But in Japan in the Edo period, this racial discrimination did not have a premise of "homogeneous space" based on perspective as in modern Europe. Knowledge described in classical Chinese or Japanese by Japanese intellectuals, whether Confucian, Japanese classical, or Western learning scholars/writers, was under the influence of Chinese concepts and the constructive power of Chinese writing.

The "homogeneous space" was viable in Europe only through a construction to gain an empty, unobstructed view from a (vanishing) point. And this construction could be constituted only in Christian values (Karatani, 191-200).

The new perspective representation was invented in sixteenth-century Western Europe. The worldview as the gathering of heterogeneous spaces was depicted in the two-century world map of Ptolemy. In the margins of the map monsters were distributed. The monsters embodied whatever lay beyond the definitional boundaries of "the European," and were kept alive in the spheres unknown to the European people even in the mid-eighteenth century, at the height of the Enlightenment. (They also appear in Terashima's and Hiraga's works.) "Perspective," a mathematical construction, represented this worldview as the "medieval," "magical," and "savage," and rewrote and systematized the magical worlds (the non-European) into more "realistic" ones. (And the last remaining magical sphere was the Pacific.) Erwin Panofsky makes a point that:

the perspectival view ... rests on the will to construct pictorial space, in principle, out of the elements of, and according to the plan of, empirical visual space (although still abstracted considerably from the psychophysiological “givens”). Perspective mathematizes this visual space, and yet it is very much *visual* space that it mathematizes; it is an ordering, but an ordering of the visual phenomenon. ...

... But then it [perspective] opens it [religious art] to something entirely new: the realm of the visionary, where the miraculous becomes a direct experience of the beholder, in that the supernatural events in a sense erupt into his own, apparently natural, visual space and so permit him really to “internalize” their supernaturalness. (71-72)

In the Enlightenment upheld by such a mathematical absorptive perspective, people believed that all the peoples were the members of one human family and at the same time that Europeans reached a higher state of human perfection. The peoples in “inarticulate” worlds were no longer “different in kind.” They were *similar but different* (inferior) – distant relatives – to the Europeans.

The “supernatural” worlds were “internalized,” preserved and reinstalled in the form of colonial romance. Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) is the progenitorial work of such romance. As Bill Pearson asserts, empirical knowledge on the Pacific compiled by explorers was based, sometimes in a dramatized or distorted way, on *Crusoe* (25). Science (a “horizontal” technology for expansion and division) and romance (a “vertical/centripetal” model of power and representation) were on complementary terms to support colonialism.

The novel form was established under the condition that literacy, printing and colonialism had made remarkable progress. In *Crusoe*,

voyage, self-discovery, domination, expropriation, and accumulation equally occupy its narrative space. The voyager from England’s lower middle class sailed into an “empty” space and became its governor and its ruler, just as a novelist charts a story on blank pages, with no agreed-on rules guiding the advance. *Crusoe*’s island is a colonialist’s utopia, just as the novel as a printed narrative form is a colonial utopian space in which the subject meets the objects in a struggle for mastery. (Miyoshi 57)

The novel’s lengthy narrative space made up of “voyage, self-discovery, domination, expropriation, and accumulation” – large-scale pilgrimages, confession, colonialism, and capitalism, all those based on European science and Protestantism – corresponds to modern measurable space (Galilean and Cartesian models) of the subject/object.

*Crusoe* is a confession as well as an adventure story. The narrating *Crusoe* repeatedly confesses the blasphemy of the narrated *Crusoe*, his past self, against God and shows his repentance. While the narrative of adventure (perspective) gives some outer extent to the narrative space, the confession (perspective) creates the inner world in it: the form of confession produces *Crusoe*’s interiority in the text.

So adventure/confession (facing savages/God; using guns/the Bible) are of great importance for *Crusoe* not only to narrate his story but also to dominate Friday, a native Carib. They are indispensable to colonial dominance. The adventure leads *Crusoe* to encounter Friday; the interiority created by confession in *Crusoe* and Friday makes them “ideal” subjects as the colonizer and

colonized.

Yet *Crusoe* is not such a fully-fledged South-Sea romance as usually seen. On an isolated island in the Caribbean, he constructs a comfortable residence enclosed with a palisade through his sustained labor. He records in his diary what has happened on the island, tracing back to the day he was cast ashore to the island. The narrating *Crusoe* relates the labor of the narrated *Crusoe* in detail and shows the record by the latter although it repeats what the former has narrated. *Crusoe's* island and narrative space, both “colonial utopian space[s],” are artificial, not very romantic, utopias.

It was Captain Cook's voyage in the Pacific that made it possible to subsume the Pacific and its islanders under the Crusonian “colonial space” – perspective and novel. Cook's voyages to the Pacific occurred immediately before the full onset of the Industrial Revolution in Britain. With the increase of the importance of science – natural history, which Linnaeus's work revolutionized – the status of drawing as a vehicle to inform the actual world was raised, which had been made light of as compared with drawing as a means to create the exotic world since the sixteenth century. With this change, “empirical naturalism” began to supersede “classical naturalism,” the academic tradition with humanism at heart (Smith ix).

Empirical naturalism focused on plants and animals, depicting the human figure as subject to natural laws, instead of the master of nature and the measure of all things. Bernard Smith points out that the artists of Cook's voyages played a key role in forming an artistic compositional mode fitted for empirical naturalism (65).

Before John Webber (Cook's official artist on his third voyage in 1777-1780), artists had not still achieved a way of drawing man as a type just as in depicting plants and animals. (This does not mean, of course, that Europeans did not see people as “types.” As in Shakespeare's plays, for example, people were viewed as generic cultural or regional types.) John Webber portrayed the ethnic varieties of Pacific peoples with empirical naturalism by using a book on anatomy (Smith 181).

Anatomy premised an “empty body” (through perspective representation) for separating human body (human cranium) from its mind. For classifying human beings on the basis of such measurable body, it was necessary to erase from Linnaeus's classified table *Homo monstrosus* that was put in the same category as *Homo sapiens*. In this sense, Cook's voyage was an event of great significance. Cook's voyages also negated the symmetrical worldview by denying the existence of Ptolemy's *Terra Australis Incognita* balanced with the north landmass. From the nineteenth-century perspective set up after Cook's voyages, the world no longer needed to be symmetry: the European subject was no longer set in the “center” of the symmetrical world but at the “top” of temporal and spatial strata. <sup>[1]</sup>

As a result of Cook's voyages, the Pacific or the “South Seas” and its peoples were taken into a homogeneous space seen through from a vanishing point in perspective. This space formed the bases for comparative anatomy to classify human beings into “races” on the one hand, and for geography to classify the “South Seas” into Polynesia, Micronesia, and Melanesia on the other. These geographical categories – a “nineteenth-century colonial construct” – were “heavily implicated

in the hierarchies of race produced by Pacific colonial discourse” (Edmond 15). These categorical terms were common knowledge in the Western world after the mid-nineteenth century (and, as Tongan writer Epeli Hau’ofa points out, even are “already part of the cultural consciousness of the peoples of Oceania” [38]). Like this geographical categorization, the racial taxonomy was fundamentally a drawing, using empirical knowledge but predicated on superempirical one or mathematics, and developed in step with the extension of colonial expansionism.<sup>[2]</sup>

The early accounts on the Pacific by seamen, sailors, scientists, and missionaries such as Bougainville, Cook, the Forsters, James Wilson, William Ellis, and Charles Wilkes, and their popularity in Europe and North America fostered “South Sea” discourses of primitivism, adventurism, and racism. Narratives of good Polynesians and evil Melanesians, impermanent transracial love, and the need for Christian conversion of heathen savages were stereotyped. Only after the period of eager “scientific” explorations in the Pacific of sailors and missionaries – after the Enlightenment or the “flat” realism of modern scientific consciousness domesticated non-Europeans on a world-wide scale – was Defoe’s semi-romance more romanticized. With ambiguity of reaction to such “realism” and a desire to conquer the fearful “unknowns,” colonial romance functioned as an experimental theatre to re-present “unscientific” discourse, imposing “unrealistic” settings on overseas colonies. In the mid-nineteenth century, preparing for the period of the full-scale competition for Pacific colonies in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, two most renowned, archetypal Pacific romances were written: Herman Melville’s *Typee* (1846) and Robert Michael Ballantyne’s *The Coral Island* (1858).

As the first work based on the author’s first-hand experiences in the Pacific, *Typee* was to stimulate writers of future generations such as Mark Twain, Robert Louis Stevenson, Pierre Loti, and Jack London – although it contains fiction: *Typee* also depends on existing texts written by missionaries and sailors or dictated by beachcombers (Charles Anderson). Melville made only a four-week stay with the natives in their valley – too short a time to write a long piece (Rennie, 186). *Typee*, however, has skepticism about European civilization, enlightenment, and evangelism, which caused public censure while it was widely read. Melville depicts both satirical criticism of modernity’s self-righteousness and inevitable nationalism and Christian values, which were both to be inherited by the succeeding “South Sea writers.”

Although *Typee* and *The Coral Island* – novels in the form of “confession” – can be both regarded as representative Pacific romance, the former contradictorily looks anti-imperialist, and the latter, canonically pro-imperialist. However, the normative colonialist text by Ballantyne could come into existence only after the successful emergence of *Typee*, which seemingly opposes such discourses.

US increasing concerns about non-European worlds at Melville’s time find their expression in the establishment of the American Oriental Society in 1842. By way of the heyday of natural history, such an “artificial” paradise as Crusoe constructs on his islet has no longer appeal to *Typee*’s protagonist-narrator, an American whaler, Tom (Tommo). Instead, the story depicts an immaculate “natural” paradise like the Judeo-Christian Edenic Paradise in the *Typee* Valley where he stays for about four months.

*Typee* depicts the natives as *similar but different*. In the narrative, Tom's escape from the whaler that he joined as a crewmember at the beginning of the story obviously corresponds to his flight from the native village at its end. For him, the oppressive discipline in the ship and the enigmatic taboo in the village are both horrible fetters that suppress and regulate his "self" and transform it into other subjects qualified for a member of each community. In the text the term "cannibal" is used as a signifier indicating both the identity and alterity both to Euro-Americans and Pacific native people: in terms of fear of "cannibalism," both parties are identical. In the end, however, Tom returns to a crewmember of an Australian vessel, unable to bear the misgivings of being sacrificed for cannibalism. Tom rejects assimilation to the people through the indigenous arts of medicine and tattoo, let alone cannibalism.

In the text Tom's magical body functions both as supporting an enigmatic (romantic) colonial space and as resisting perspectival (scientific) colonial space. Tom's injury in his leg is "mysterious" (142): its repeated recovery and aggravation are inexplicable from the modern medical viewpoint. The "incomprehensibility" of the South Seas that he repeats in the narration affects his body. In the text, "body" is depicted as diverse. Tom's feeling changes according to his physical condition: although the natives' emotion is enigmatic for Tom, in the text what is really "enigmatic" is Tom himself. It seems that Melville undertakes dismantling the modern European common sense of "consistent self" through Tom in the Pacific. Nevertheless, the "mysterious" body of Tom is seen as unnatural and unrealistic in the text (as the narrator's word "mysterious" shows). Such a rebellious, anti-modernistic attempt is quite artificial for the author who has the subject as a Euro-American deeply influenced by Christian worldviews. However, the "enigmatic" body depicted out of perspective was natural for the Japanese before the 1890s.

## **Japan's modernization of representation and *monogatari* as Japanese "colonial space"**

Such a concept of "empty space," although perspective representation was imported since the closing days of the Tokugawa regime, would be almost inconceivable for the Japanese in the Edo period. For the Japanese to achieve "homogeneous time and space" which was needed to denounce feudalism and accept modernism (to escape and resist the Western colonialist powers) modernization of literary Japanese – denial of *kanji* (Chinese characters in the Japanese written language) and modification of the conventional literary style – was necessary. Denial of *kanji* was grounded on the intention to simplify the Japanese writing system by unifying the written and spoken language after the model of Western languages. <sup>[3]</sup>

European languages subjugated their written languages under their spoken languages. Written words were believed to copy colloquial speech (despite the fact that the latter was transformed in accordance with printed words with type). The written language was regarded as a transparent medium reproducing "voices" from the interior of people as they are. Just as perspective drawing, such writing suppressed the conventional concepts or figures of things (multifaceted bodies) and produced a "homogeneous," "isotropic," "deep" space and body on a flat surface.

*Kanji* was, as it were, a conceptualized picture or image out of perspective originally. It has continued to exist up to now. Nevertheless, under the idea of its denial, it was reduced to a more transparent tool to transcribe phonetic sounds (inner voice), like *kana* (a Japanese system of syllabic writing). The movement for modification of the former literary style, or creation of a new literary style in which people felt as if the written and spoken language were unified, was promoted by writers through translating and adapting Western writings. The movement was also a national undertaking: the government established the “national literature” course at the Empire University of Tokyo to study Japanese and Chinese “classics” – it institutionalized “literature” and divided it into “pre-modern (classics)” and “modern.” “Modern Japanese literature” was shouldered mainly by prose writers who denied *gesaku*, popular fiction in the Edo period, and used the new writing system, which was put on a firm footing in the late 1890s.

Importantly, most of these writers came from the former ruling-class families (*samurai*), now no longer people of high rank but “commoners” as a result of the collapse of the feudal society. It was Christianity that helped such people with resentment set up a “subjectivity” and “interiority” by subjecting themselves to an absolute God (whether they were Christians or not). The “confession” produced the conceptual structures of “self/other,” “subject/object,” and “inner/outer worlds.” And the new written language enabled them to describe their inner and outer worlds “naturally” and “realistically” (Karatani, 108-126).

The establishment of the new literary style, or modern Japanese literature, was deeply concerned in that of modern social political institutions (imported from and modeled on the West) by the Meiji State. Around 1890, the Meiji State finished formulating a basic system of modern nation-state, and writers – descendants of *samurais* – began the campaign for “unification of the written and spoken language.” The realization of the Meiji State as a “modern state” around 1890 by the leaders of the Meiji Restoration meant the breakdown of the democratic movement through which descendants of *samurais* claimed their participation in political power. At the same time, it brought decline of *seiji shosetsu* (political novels), which had been popular in the 1880s. In *seiji shosetsu* writers made up spectacular fictional worlds and idealized heroes by laying their settings in deeply conceptualized, non-everyday places such as the Pacific (after the model of Western adventure stories such as *Robinson Crusoe* and *Gulliver’s Travels*). It was written in conventional literary style. On the other hand, the kind of *shosetsu* (novels) which had their settings in meaningless-seeming, everyday places and had only mediocre characters, began to be written in the late 1880s, modeled on nineteenth-century Western “naturalistic” novels. The writers of such *shosetsu* were to be regarded as pioneers in modern Japanese literature, and promoted the movement for “unification of the written and spoken language.” Thus, the anti-establishment intellectuals culminated in complementing the Establishment.

The renovation of the literary style spelled a change of its model from the Chinese writing into the modern Western writing. Ever since ancient times (the eighth century or so), under the expansion and arrangement of the Tenno system, *monogatari* (“myths,” folktales, *Noh* songs, etc.) described chaos in spatial and social peripheries or colonies, which was produced necessarily through centralization of power. *Monogatari* depicted mediations, from view points of the “center,”

between the “center” and the “periphery,” the “order” and the “disorder,” and “everyday” and “non-everyday” spheres, all these dichotomies constructed in imitation of Chinese political, social, and cultural systems under the Tenno system that was set up as the anti-Chinese Empire power. So *monogatari* functioned (like Western colonial romance) as a technology to cope with chaos in the Empire. “Histories” and *monogatari* were complementary to one another, and they, written in Chinese or Japanese, could be produced only by borrowing the constructive disposition in Chinese classics.

Nanyo was depicted as chaos to be reclaimed in *seiji shosetsu*. *Seiji shosetsu* was, it may be said, an extension of *monogatari*, which “modern literature” attempted to replace. In Ryuhei Yano’s *Ukishiro Monogatari* (The Story of the Floating-castle, 1890), the protagonist Seitaro Kamii joins a battleship, the *Ukishiro*, for Madagascar, together with the captain with great charisma and his men. (The protagonist’s first name indicates “pure Japanese man,” and his surname is related to the first “Emperor” of legend, now called Jinmu.) Through his contact with the captain, the protagonist, a poor young man, comes to life again as a *samurai*-like hero. They annihilate cannibals, drive away a Dutch fleet, and domesticate meek islanders in Nanyo. On the other hand, *nanshin ron* (the discourse of southward advance) was also like *monogatari*.<sup>[4]</sup> Such books were written around 1890 in the conventional written language by *samurai* descendants out of power such as Shigetaka Shiga, Ukichi Taguchi, Teifu Sukanuma, and Tsunenori Suzuki. They highlighted uninhabited or “uncivilized” islands in Micronesia and Southeast Asia as places remaining to be opened by the Japanese. Emigration to Nanyo, in succession to Ezo (Hokkaido), was regarded as an important way out of financial trouble of *samurai* descendants and the Japanese population problem. Writers of both *seiji shosetsu* and *nanshin ron* adopted social Darwinism, and some of them made a point of a blood relation of the Japanese and the islanders and asserted the islanders’ liberation from the Western colonizers by the Japanese. The natives in Nanyo depicted in them were much the same as those in geography books by Dutch studies scholars or records of castaways in the Edo period. Nanyo in those works was nearly a mere copy of the “South Seas” written in Western geography books. *Seiji shosetsu* and *nanshin ron* around 1890, long romantic prose/essays written in traditional style under the influence of Crusoe, functioned as ethnocentric “technologies” to reclaim peripheries of the epigonic empire.

“Modern Japanese literature,” as well as *nanshin ron*, came to play a real nationalistic role of *monogatari* in an official way as the Japanese imperial power further advanced into South East Asia in the 1940s. Since the late 1930s and especially in the early 1940s, “modern Japanese literature” was, by and large, in line with national policy and the state encouraged and forced writers to visit and write about colonized Nanyo (Micronesia and South East Asia) under the war regime. But before that, Nanyo was described mainly in “adventure stories” (as the South Seas in the West). After “modern Japanese literature” had pushed its way by distinguishing itself from *monogatari*, adventure stories (written first in the 1900s in the new written language by Shunro Oshikawa and raising the morale of the *samurais*) took over the role of *monogatari* which *seiji shosetsu* had once played.

Those adventure stories (new popular version of *monogatari*) were main sites for describing

Japanese heroes' contacts – conquest, management, and friendship – with the Pacific through modern scientific technologies and traditional chivalrous ethics. Tales of Japanese heroic exploits were eagerly accepted among the common people in Japan's victory over China in 1895 and Russia in 1905 – the period that Japan had joined in the Western imperial powers.

When two long-cherished desires of Japan were accomplished in the early 1910s – its colonization of the Korean Peninsula and complete abolition of unequal treaties with Western powers concluded in the last days of the Tokugawa shogunate – popular versions of colonialist *monogatari* declined. On the other hand, more realistic- or scientific- as well as more romantic-looking *monogatari* appeared. *Nanshin ron* was handed down, written especially in the 1910s (by Yosaburo Takekoshi, Kiyoshi Inoue, Yasoroku Soejima, and so on). Especially after the Japanese Navy's occupation of Micronesia in 1914, *nanshin ron* became more realistic and practical, on the whole.

Nanyo *monogatari* functioned as a truly “modern” device to reclaim the colonized immediately after the League of Nations had approved of Japan's mandatory rule over Micronesia. The scholar of Japanese literature Ichinosuke Takagi's influential piece, “Torakku-to Dayori (A Letter from Truk),” written in a 1920 State geography textbook, is such a “modern” *monogatari*.<sup>[5]</sup> It is a romantic trope, depicting not heroically but courteously a beautiful and favorable tropical environment and such a native girl singing Japan's national anthem. The text pressed on Micronesia and its peoples a new, standardized “body” of “Nanyo gunto” (the South Sea Islands) as “kodo” (Tenno's territory) and that of “Nanyo dojin” (South Sea natives) as “komin” (Tenno's subjects). The natives were seen, and thought of themselves, as “others,” beings that attempted to identify with the Japanese and never could (Higuchi, 19). Here Japan's colonial power had transformed “remote others” as a “different race” in a “different space” (since in the early nineteenth-century geography books and castaways' records) into the colonized as *different but similar* subjects (of Tenno) in a *different but continuous* space (with Japan) – “close others.” This view was to be projected into Japan's colonial policy. The native children experienced the “corporal reform” through “standard Japanese,” Japan's national anthem, and marching at school just as those of the native Japanese underwent, although separated from Japanese children (Peattie, 91-95).

Such similarity discourse was linked with the concept of “race.” While people lost interest in Nanyo after the Washington Conference, the naval officer Shizuo Matsuoka kept his zeal for it. As his powerful elder brother Kunio Yanagita, a literary man and colonial agricultural administration officer in Korea, founded Japanese folklore after his political failure, so Matsuoka played an important role in Micronesian ethnology after the transition of military rule into civil administration in Micronesia.<sup>[6]</sup> Both of these brothers, as Minato Kawamura points out, attempted to differentiate their studies from Western ethnology and discover the “home” of the “Japanese race” differently, through Okinawa and Micronesia (165). The concept of “race” was transformed in Japanese political, historical and cultural contexts when it was translated as *minzoku*. Yanagita and Matsuoka were also not interested in Okinawans or Micronesians themselves but in those peoples and their cultures as the “origin” of the Japanese. For them, however, this “origin” now consisted in unidentifiable, absolute Others (but Japanized in some degree), not in the

“homogeneous space/time.” The classification of “race” was, as we have seen, on the assumption of such a “space/time,” while *minzoku* aimed at assimilation on the assumption of diversity.

Colonial romance, in English or Japanese, is equipped both with modern scientific devices (perspective, “transparent” written language, idea of “race,” anthropological knowledge) and traditional views (religious values, “magic”) – realism and romanticism, or reason and emotion. Yet the latter was required to reappear only after the former conquered the latter. The West’s *Robinson Crusoe* and Japan’s *The Story of the Floating-castle*, not yet complete with those modern devices, criticize traditional values, though having their roots deep in the values. To the contrary, Melville’s and Takagi’s texts can be seen as unscientific “romances,” but they are based on modern scientific consciousness acquired through Cook’s voyages and Japan’s colonial rule of Micronesia respectively. In these texts written before Western powers’ South Sea struggles from the 1870s / Japan’s enthusiastic Nanyo boom in the 1930s, the characters are unheroic, filled with anxieties in unfamiliar colonial spaces.

Perspective representation produced the view of foreigners as *same but different*, which was congenial to the Christian view of them (the sons of men, offspring of Adam). In Japanese contexts, such modern consciousness did not derive from traditional views but was one instantly borrowed from the outside and appropriated under the menace of Western expansionism. Neither perspective nor Christianity could erase the Japanese conventional view of foreigners. The subtle but decisive difference (of *identical but different* and *different but identical*) became evident as differences of representations in colonial texts only when Japan came to regard itself as an autonomous empire, no longer as an inferior imitator of the Western powers. <sup>[7]</sup>

## Notes

- [1] The Linnaean project of nomenclature was a project that put the observer out of sight (Pratt 32). This corresponded to the method of a vanishing point in perspective. By 1758, Linnaeus divided *Homo sapiens* into five varieties: a. Wild Man. / b. American. / c. European. / d. Asiatic. / e. African (Pratt 32). This centralizing mode of arrangement indicates that Linnaeus had not obtained a vertical high-and-low perspective seen in the nineteenth-century Europe (Hegelian dialectic, Darwinian evolutionism): his eighteenth-century perspective only had a horizontal “depth,” needing the symmetrical construction. The hierarchical concept of “race” with the white at the top and the black at the bottom was formed in the nineteenth century (“Wild Man” was no longer necessary for making symmetry). At the end of the eighteenth century, “science” – perspective representation – homogenized and made empty (“natural”), and then, divided and stratified time as well as space. The new perspective connected time and space – through the French Revolution or the realization of an “imagined community” – under the umbrella of a transparent land and unified written language and history (Benedict Anderson). It led to the ideology of maturity, development, and progress and made possible the association of “ancient people,” “non-Europeans,” “children,” “the uncivilized” and “savages” with one another.
- [2] “Race” was constructed on a “geometric” composition, that is, a perspective, which flouted conventional methods of depicting native peoples and suppressed patterns of their bodies in the depictions (Smith 187). In 1805, Cuvier established three major “races”: the white, the yellow, and the black.
- [3] On denial of *kanji* and modification of the conventional literary style, see Karatani, 53-82.
- [4] On *nanshin ron*, see Toru Yano.
- [5] This educative function, using the Pacific as a lesson in “natural history,” was an established literary trope dating to Frederick Marryat’s *Masterman Ready* (1841) (and beyond to *Robinson Crusoe*) (Pearson 50).
- [6] Osamu Murai points out that there was a political context behind the originating of Japanese folklore by

Yanagita; Yanagita was involved in Japanese colonial policy in Korea just before getting absorbed in research on Japanese folklore. Yanagita attempted to obliterate his involvement in an agricultural policy in Korea by attending to Okinawan ethnic customs. This political function of “southern islands” (Murai calls it “southern island ideology”) can be regarded as a type of Nanyo-Orientalism (25).

- [7] The differences are more evident between empire boys in *The Coral Island* and Keizo Shimada’s cartoon story *Boken Dankichi* (Dankichi the Adventurous, 1933-1939).

## Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Anderson, Charles Roberts. *Melville in the South Seas*. New York and London: Columbia UP, 1939.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Defoe, Daniel. *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. Ed. J. Donald Crowley. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972.
- Edmond, Rod. *Representing the South Pacific: Colonial Discourse from Cook to Gauguin*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Hau’ofa, Epeli. “Our Sea of Islands.” *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*. Ed. Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999. 27-38.
- Higuchi, Wakako. “Islander’s Japanese Assimilation and Their Sense of Discrimination.” Unpublished presentation, 14 Oct. 1993.
- Hiraga, Gennai. *Furai Sanjin Shu* [The Collected Works of Furai Sanjin]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1961.
- Karatani, Kojin. *Nihon Kindai Bungaku no Kigen* [Origins of Modern Japanese Literature]. Tokyo: Kodan Sha, [1980] 1988.
- Kawamura, Minato. “*Dai Toa Minzoku Gaku*” no Kyojitsu [The Truthfulness of “the Great East Asian Folkloristics”]. Tokyo: Kodan Sha, 1996.
- Melville, Herman. “Typee: A Peep at Polynesian Life.” *Typee, Omoo, Mardi*. New York: Literary Classics of the United States, 1982. 1-315.
- Miyoshi, Masao. *Off Center: Power and Culture Relations between Japan and the United States*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991.
- Morishima, Churyo. *Bankoku Shinwa* [Hot News around the World]. Osaka, 1789. 5 vols.
- Murai, Osamu. *Nanto Ideologi no Hassei: Yanagita Kunio to Shokuminchi Shugi* [The Birth of Southern Island Ideology: Kunio Yanagita and Colonialism]. Revised and enlarged edition. Tokyo: Ota Shuppan, 1995.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Perspective as Symbolic Form*. Trans. Christopher S. Wood. New York: Zone Books, 1991.
- Pearson, Bill. *Rifled Sanctuaries: Some Views of the Pacific Islands in Western Literature to 1900*. Auckland: Auckland UP, 1984.
- Peattie, Mark R. *Nan’yō: The Rise and Fall of the Japanese in Micronesia, 1885-1945*. Honolulu: U of Hawai’i P, 1988.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Rennie, Neil. *Far-Fetched Facts: The Literature of Travel and the Idea of the South Seas*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1995.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Penguin, [1978] 1995.
- Smith, Bernard. *Imagining the Pacific: In the Wake of the Cook Voyages*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1992.
- Takagi, Ichinosuke. *Jinjo Shogaku Kokugo Tokuhon* [Government-designated Japanese-textbook for Schoolchildren]. Tokyo: Chuo Koron Sha, 1976.
- Terashima, Ryoan (ed). *Wakan Sansai Zue* [An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Japan and China]. Tokyo: Tokyo Bijutsu, 1970. 2 vols.
- Yano, Ryukei. *Yano Ryukei Shu* [The Collected Works of Ryukei Yano]. Ed. Haruo Ochi. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1970.
- Yano, Toru. “*Nanshin*” no Keifu [The Genealogy of “Southward Advance”]. Tokyo: Chuo Koron Sha, 1975.