



The Association for  
Asian Studies

---

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Thomas Lamarre

Reviewed work(s):

Confluences: Postwar Japan and France by Doug Slaymaker

Source: *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 62, No. 4 (Nov., 2003), pp. 1250-1252

Published by: Association for Asian Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3591794>

Accessed: 13/07/2009 11:15

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=afas>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Association for Asian Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Asian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

tropical New Guinea prove particularly gripping. Schrijvers makes good use of travel guides on Asia and the Pacific basin published by the United States government. These sources expose contemporary American racial and cultural perceptions of the uncivilized "others." He also combs through American veterans' personal papers available at the Military History Institute at Carlisle Barracks in Pennsylvania and at the Center for the Study of War and Society at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

Some criticisms can also be made of Schrijvers's book. The author clearly shows that American forces faced a formidable enemy and a hostile environment. Indeed, the war's outcome was very much in question. Yet, the United States soundly defeated Japan. For this reviewer, Schrijvers, albeit unintentionally, contributes to the myth of American exceptionalism. With so many serious obstacles to overcome to achieve victory, what term other than exceptionalism could be used to distinguish this nation? Schrijvers, however, could have debunked this term. During the cold war, the United States did not enjoy decisive victories in Asia. Schrijvers hints that the seeds of American defeats in Asia had been sown in the victory against Japan. But, he never sufficiently develops his contention that Americans had awakened revolutionary, nationalist, and communist impulses among Asians during the Pacific War that would subsequently run out of control. An epilogue clearly linking these later cold war struggles to wartime struggles would have strengthened this argument.

Nevertheless, Schrijvers has made an important contribution to the existing literature. As a supplement to more traditional military histories, his book can increase the understanding of the Pacific War among students and scholars alike.

DAVID J. ULBRICH  
*Temple University*

*Confluences: Postwar Japan and France.* Edited by DOUG SLAYMAKER. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002. viii, 185 pp. \$60.00 (cloth).

The idea of looking at postwar France and Japan in terms of "confluences" rather than "influences" is an extremely good one. As Edward Said has noted, the problem with the study of influences is that it unthinkingly reinscribes the dynamics of empire versus nation in the form of imperial influence countered by national (anticolonial) resistance. The result is often acceptance or reification of imperial and national formations. Confluence, however, potentially offers something different from stories about Western (imperial) influence and Japanese (national) reaction. The paradigm of confluence implies a different kind of historical movement and power relation: there is no longer a unilateral developmental movement from the West to the rest but, rather, distinct yet coexistent movements.

The intellectual shift from influence to confluence is, however, not an easy one. Particularly difficult is the status of nation. The study of influence tends to see difference only between cultures and societies and almost invariably at the level of the nation. In this respect, most of the essays in this volume seem to follow the paradigm of influence—with an emphasis on the influence of French literature in postwar Japan. Yet the contributors do considerably complicate the workings of influence, which potentially opens a way to think about confluence. For instance, Kuroko Kazuo argues that, although Oe Kenzaburō's penchant for "imprisoned

situations” derives from Jean-Paul Sartre, Oe has an individual conception of the world and original imagery. Kuroko’s essay is a classic take on influence: forms are transformed in reception. More interesting is J. Thomas Rimer’s account of the postwar theater of Senda Koreya. He shows how Senda’s preference for staging older or classic French plays was not a simple time lag but a matter of aesthetic and political choices, which had an impact on later theater. What is interesting is that influence does not demand synchrony. In a different way, wheeling from poem to poem, Satō Hiroaki discovers all manner of strange movement between surrealist poems. In this respect, Satō discovers the nonlinear effects of influence, too. And in a fine essay on the Japanese reception of Sartre’s novels as erotic literature, Doug Slaymaker brings influence full circle. He submits that Japanese readings have something to teach Western scholars about Sartre’s interest in the body. In sum, these essays move beyond influence as a one-way, synchronous, or linear movement from a transmitter to a receiver.

The problem with the study of influences, however, is that it tends to explain away such apparently odd movements by recourse to the nation. Could something be at once Japanese and French and also neither—like the Tsukamoto Kunio poem that Satō calls “bizarre” (p. 160)? The problem is that the contributors almost invariably posit difference between national cultures or literatures. In fact, many of the essays treat Japanese writers and thinkers as national representatives, conflating individual and nation. The production of difference thus remains unexplored and likewise sites of resistance.

Katō Shūichi’s essay is paradigmatic. He suggests that the postwar French literature of resistance renewed a liberal tradition stamped out in Japan during the war, spurring postwar Japanese writers toward political engagement. Yet as Nishikawa Nagao pointed out as early as 1967 (in an essay translated in this collection), Katō and the *Matinée Poétique* group construct an imaginary France. Nishikawa expresses concern that the flip side of this imaginary other is the consolidation of self and nation, which might enable yet another “return to Japan” (p. 83). Indeed, Katō’s essay concludes with remarks about France and Japan now confronting a double crisis, of literature and of the nation-state, brought about by globalization. In response, he feels that each nation must seek cultural identity within its larger geopolitical region. His emphasis thus shifts from difference within Japan (political resistance in wartime Japan) to Japanese difference or national identity. This is a prime example of how the study of influence tends unthinkingly to conflate political resistance to empire and national identity. Of course, nation-states remain important political configurations that should not merely be swept aside as false ideologies. Yet without some sense of the contradictions and conflicts inherent in national formations, one has nothing more than a return to Japan via France—as Nishikawa warned.

Other essays focus more on difference within Japanese nationalism. Looking at the accounts of Japanese students in France in the postwar era, Watanabe Kazutani argues that, despite their evocation of Japan, their writings show a “collapse of myths both of the West and of Japan” (p. 124). Japan could no longer appear natural or organic. In a similar vein, Kevin Doak argues for democratic nationalism, which he associates with the French legacy of nationalism as a legal and political contract, centering on symbolic and literary cohesion rather than ethnic community (as in the Germanic model). Doak uses these different national models to map out some of the debates on nationalism in Japan. He himself wishes to champion the inclusive potential of nationalism that allows it to transcend ethnic difference (like a language or culture that anyone can learn) and to reject the exclusionary practices associated

with ethnic nationalism (race). Important questions remain, however. How do these different models interact? Are they different choices? Are they indeed so easy to hold apart? Can their interaction be imagined dialectically, resulting in a cosmopolitan overcoming of ethnic nationalism? What would happen if we called on the paradigm of confluence—a model of coexistence of different cultural and national formations? Slaymaker, in his introduction, hints at one way to think about the confluence of postwar nations—as distinct yet coexistent responses to a traumatic origin (national guilt and failure).

The paradigm of confluence might enable a productive encounter between area studies and French poststructuralist theory. Two essays in this collection take up the problem of what postwar Japan was (and maybe is) for French thinkers. With an emphasis on Alexandre Kojève and Roland Barthes, Matt Matsuda traces a *japoniste* tendency in French thought that approaches Japanese aesthetics with an eye to the possibilities for an alternate model of modernity, an alternative to the dialectical and developmental histories of the West. These thinkers imagined Japan as the site of an accelerated, nondialectical interaction of fragments and surfaces. Matsuda aptly asks whether this imagination of Japan simply constructs an Other to the West or whether it succeeds in moving beyond such dialectical structures. Looking at many of the same thinkers, Jean-Philippe Mathy's essay highlights their difficulties in situating Japan as an alternative site. Yet for Mathy, French thinking of Japanese difference seems inevitably to fail because Japanese things have too long borne the burden of Otherness; perhaps they are not so radically other. Does Japanese difference fail French thought, or does French thought fail Japanese difference? The interest of both essays is that they pose such questions about the status of actual empirical differences within theories of difference. This is precisely where area studies and critical theory or cultural studies might productively meet. And, that is the great contribution and promise of this collection. It points to new ways of imagining difference.

THOMAS LAMARRE  
*McGill University*

## KOREA

*Korea—A Religious History*. By JAMES HUNTLEY GRAYSON. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002. xvi, 288 pp. \$28.95 (paper).

The first edition of *Korea—A Religious History*, published in 1989, marked the first full-length English-language study of the topic since Charles Allen Clark's *The Religions of Old Korea*, published in 1932. James Huntley Grayson's revised second edition incorporates recent research with an updated bibliography, pursues the subject to the end of the twentieth century, and, most important, appears in paperback, thus making it accessible to a much wider readership. The book offers a chronologically thorough presentation of the religious and cultural history of this least known of all