

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LATE SUN AT MID-CENTURY:
EMPIRE, MODERNIST AESTHETICS, FORMS OF WAR

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

BY
SOPHIA IKEGAMI SHERRY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2021

The man who finds his homeland sweet is still a tender beginner; he to whom every soil is as his native one is already strong; but he is perfect to whom the entire world is as a foreign land.

—Hugo of St. Victor, 12th c.

(pace Edward Said)

With utmost thanks to my advisors, friends, and family

for my mother, Hiroko Kimura
& my father,
Vincent Bernard Sherry, Jr.

Table of Contents

1) Introduction	1
2) Aestheticisms at War	28
3) Imperial Women	83
4) The Enemy Within	145
5) Conclusion, or Uneven Modernity—Minor Nations, States, Persons	190
6) Bibliography	196

Introduction

This project is about four cosmopolitan writers, foreigners to one another, who lived through and wrote about the long mid-twentieth century. Metropolitans apart, they are Evelyn Waugh, Marguerite Duras (Donnadieu), Samuel Beckett, and Hayashi Fumiko. Each writer was born to modern British, French, Irish, and Japanese nation-state formations. But, as global writers, each also traveled—both imaginatively and in embodied ventures—beyond native spaces. Collectively, though at a distance from one another, they used the resources of non-native materials to craft historical fiction of their time.

The first part of my title is meant to conjure an ambient quality of light as the expression of globally differential historical time. I take this phrase from two sources. First, Ernest Fenollosa's 1890s orientalist adaptation of Hegel—the dialectic, in a reversal of presumptive Eurocentric models, of history moving from the East to the West.¹ And, second, Deleuze's characterization of Japanese modernist cinema in the terms of *l'image-temps*: in a cinematic gesture reminiscent of European impressionism, itself globally hybridized, time, in this case, ceases to be a *means* of narrative expression and becomes instead the *object* of narrative expression.² Broadly, the historical scope of "Late Sun at Mid-Century," spanning Euro-America and the East across the transnational *fin-de-*

¹ Haun Saussy, *The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry*, ed. Haun Saussy, Jonathan Stalling, and Lucas Klein (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008), 24-29; Grace E. Lavery, *Quaint, Exquisite: Victorian Aesthetics and the Idea of Japan* (New York: Princeton University Press, 2018), 29-30.

² Gilles Deleuze, *Cinéma 2 - L'image-temps* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1985), 23-8, 321-2, 348.

siècle period of Fenollosa and into the postwar moment of global New Wave cinema, articulates the overarching chronological dimension of this dissertation. The second part of my title names the themes that have preoccupied me over the course of my project as it has developed through the years.

These European and Asian modernists shared a moment of world history—the middle decades of the twentieth century. As such, they were fellow travelers in a synchronous moment that involved global war, late empire, and established as well as evolving circuits of transnational aesthetic practice. But each writer also experienced—and documented—these collective conditions in a particular manner, inflecting global modernity through individual expressions of modern subjecthood. This project explores the globally enmeshed terms under which these modern subjects of a collectively modernist twentieth century at once fictionalized and aestheticized, in varieties of prose form, their contemporary times.

The inspiration for this internally diverse project comes from my own bicultural background. I am biracial, the product of a first-generation (*issei*) Japanese mother—born just after 1945—and an American father whose “pure” Irish ancestry traces back to early twentieth-century migrations from that motherland. But, for me, it was only as a graduate student at the University of Chicago that I began to reflect critically on the strange affordances and impoverishments of my personal history. Growing up, I studied the languages and canons of the West under the benevolent scrutiny of parents, educators both, who zealously prioritized education; for years, nominally white affiliations

eclipsed my Asian connections. This Western education came at the cost of learning Japanese in the formative years of childhood and adolescence, when the brain is plastic enough to commit intricate scriptural systems to long-term memory. Japan, for me, was in these green years not a formally educational domain. A trove of late-capitalist mass culture and gorgeous tradition, it was, rather, a space of sensuous holiday. There, hosted by my mother's beloved family, I delighted in easy cognitive release after each successive year of school. And I learned, through low-intensity anthropological adventures, how to adapt a lexicon of quotidian and (semi-)honorific vernacular language to diverse social situations.

While I have worked on my Japanese language skills in passionate fits and starts over the last twenty or so years, my hold on this linguistic system remains partial. I may sound like a native speaker in certain contexts, and appear Asian, but strong varieties of ignorance haunt the margins of this gossamer presentation.³ In this, there is a kind of sadness that I have come to terms with, over the course of graduate school, as a measure of personal authenticity. At the same time, fortitude comes out of recognizing that these last years have tasked me with the difficult project of laying claim to my own biracial identification, an identification that I share with many others who make their way across their

³ Reading—not entirely contemporary with our own times—that has informed my recent thoughts on race, racialization, and ethnicity as discourse include Rey Chow, *Not Like a Native Speaker: On Language as Postcolonial Experience* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014); Stuart Hall, *The Fateful Triangle: Race, Ethnicity, Nation*, ed. Kobena Mercer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994/2017); Henry Louis Gates, Jr., “Figures of Signification,” in *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African American Literary Criticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); *The Invention of Ethnicity*, ed. Werner Sollors (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

own unique cultural configurations. For this reason, a project, such as this one, that tracks global diversity at the intersection of modern subjecthood, culture, and race is not only an intellectual endeavor but an affective one as well.

The cosmopolitan modernists I study, in this project's three chapters, are in the generational cohort of my grandparents, who experienced the global conflicts of the mid-century in different ways, from different vantage points. These divergences have been a powerful inspiration for me. After 1945, history says that family on my father's side were the victors and family on my mother's side the victims, each an historical enemy to the other. My paternal grandfather was a decorated war hero of the Pacific. He wasn't drafted—right after Pearl Harbor, he volunteered to fight. Early in 1945, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* published a glamorous photo of him polishing a Japanese foe's sword (*katana*), in Okinawa, altogether wild and heroic in the candid poise of his military outfit. Distanced from the battlefields and home-fronts of contemporary Europe and Asia, my paternal grandmother, resilient in her Catholic faith, awaited the return of her soldier. She wrote to him most every day and sent him winningly misguided gifts, such as scarves, which were useless in the tropics of the Pacific South. Their efforts, both military and civilian, were earnest expressions of patriotic commitments.

By way of contrast, my maternal grandfather remained always skeptical of war and its stated aims. At a geographic and temperamental remove from my paternal grandfather's military spirit—his play on the Irish stereotype of colonially residual and politically dominant anti-hegemonic resistance—my

maternal grandfather, a studious biologist, was conscripted into the army only in the last, desperate years of imperial Japan's protracted Asia-Pacific War.⁴ One man fought righteously, the other with resolute cynicism. Luckily, my maternal grandfather was able to avoid a good deal of the fighting in the Pacific by working as an engineer and non-combatant drill sergeant. Returning from the Manchurian border and Tokyo's metropolitan enclaves of war after 1945, he met his future wife when the two worked together as teachers in a local public school; in the haste of a renewed appreciation for life, they married quickly. With at turns muted and vociferous resentment of postwar U.S. power, my maternal grandmother mourned the deaths of her friends who did not live to see the other side of the U.S.-led Allied air raids and atomic bombs.

These are some broad and simultaneously personal aspects of this project. Its scholarly contours follow.

My first chapter, "Aestheticisms at War," studies a cluster of war-era novels by the British late-modernist writer Evelyn Waugh. This chapter investigates the

⁴ For Japan's military-imperial campaigns in the Pacific in the period 1931-1945, I adopt Lisa Yoneyama's nomenclature—"Asia-Pacific War"—as rendered from a 1980s' Japanese-language coinage that resisted the universalist implications of what anglophone discourse conventionally calls "World War II" or the "Second World War." Yoneyama expands her critique to other titles for these protracted hostilities, all of which she reads as falling victim to a binarist logic that flat-footedly pits the "West" against the "Rest." These include "The Greater East Asia War," "The U.S.-Japan War," "The Pacific War," "The Second Sino-Japanese War," and "The Fifteen Year War." Working from an historiographical and juridical archive of the Asia-Pacific War, "[Yoneyama] advances what might be called a conjunctive cultural critique of the transpacific in order to elucidate the still-present Cold War frame of knowledge that, despite some adjustments and transvaluations, continues to stabilize international protocols, cultural assumptions, and normalized categories associated with our identities, histories, and boundaries. At a minimum," she continues, "such a methodology [as mine] points to the limits of our political and positivist certitude and urges us to consider why we need to unlearn some of the familiar terms with which we make demands for a just world"; *Cold War Ruins: Transpacific Critique of American Justice and Japanese War Crimes* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016), x-xi.

figurative representativeness of queer aesthetes who populate, as persecuted outsiders, the margins of Waugh's war-era novels. In this chapter my primary texts are *Brideshead Revisited* (1945), *Put Out More Flags* (1942), and the *Sword of Honour* trilogy (1952-1961). Here, I use a theoretical rubric of melancholic historicism to make legible the bittersweet tones of Waugh's sardonic, late-imperial comedies of war. As an expression of inconsolable loss in the modalities of psychoanalytic affect and historical epistemology, melancholic historicism intersects with theoretical investments in contemporary queer theory, critical race studies, and the recent archival turn. Waugh, in his own melancholy turn, adapts this historicism of grief to anglophone, late-modernist ends. Narrowing historical methods to considerations of transnational aestheticism, then, this chapter traces how Waugh uses reverse anachronism—a prolepsis of past into contemporary historical time—to revive, on the scene of world war, ostensibly defunct nineteenth-century cultures of aestheticism. In this case, Waugh's twentieth-century aestheticism is a composite of British, Sino-Japanese, and French cultural and historical reference. I argue ultimately that Waugh's morbid revival of fin-de-siècle aestheticism acts as a minor but searing literary commentary on contemporary tragedies of mass war, genocide, and xenophobia.

“Imperial Women,” my second chapter, reads historical figurations of imperial-era female subjecthood in three primary texts. The setting is a broadly post-feudal Japanese modernity. In historical sequence, these primary texts are Futabatei Shimei's *Floating Clouds* (1887-9) and Hayashi Fumiko's *Diary of a Vagabond* (1930) and *Floating Clouds* (1951). Here, I begin with an analysis of

converging realist and modernist modalities in Hayashi's depiction of itinerant urban women in *Diary of a Vagabond*. I then develop this claim about convergent realism and modernism in the next section, which tracks a genealogical narrative development across the global nineteenth and twentieth centuries: it moves out of Futabatei's pioneering vernacular novel, *Floating Clouds*, and into Hayashi's postwar adaptation of Futabatei's work—a modernist, “women's-literary” instantiation of the first *Floating Clouds*. A century before Hayashi's time, Futabatei had been a keen student of Russian in the modern Meiji-era's famed Tokyo Foreign Language school; these global influences—altogether linguistic, literary, and socio-political—had a significant impact on his work as a novelist and translator. While attending to important differences between Futabatei and Hayashi, this section bends both writers, as a curiously diachronic literary dyad, back into a transnational ferment of late-nineteenth century Russian anarchism, realism, and anti-statist vernacular culture. The late-imperial horizon of time, therefore, returns Hayashi's nuclear-age novel back into a globally enmeshed antecedent of modernity in a revolutionary moment of historical time. Here, ultimately, the symbolism of Japanese imperial-era female subjecthood is my lens onto the non-teleological eccentricities of Japanese modernity. As with my first chapter, nineteenth-century prehistories make legible twentieth-century configurations of minor, peripheral subjecthood. The latter, my focus throughout this project, articulates literary and sensory pleasure—subject(s) of aesthetic fiction—only and always against a global-historical canvas of transnational encounter, mass violence, and shifting logics of empire.

My third and final chapter, “The Enemy Within,” considers the mid-century French and Irish cosmopolitans Marguerite Duras and Samuel Beckett in the terms of polyglot modernism, bourgeois resistance, and discursive encryptions of alterity. Here, as in the other chapters, the negotiation of difference and distance, altogether historical, linguistic, and existential, is the crux of my inquiry. Where preceding chapters centered global Britain and modern Japan, this chapter locates itself in realist approximations of late-imperial French Indochina, colonial Ireland, and Occupation-era Paris. Here, I have four primary texts: Duras’ *Moderato cantabile* (1958), *Hiroshima mon amour* (1960), and *The War* (1944/85), the last of which I suggest may be read provocatively, for reasons of general contemporaneity, alongside Samuel Beckett’s *Watt* (1953). Beginning with *Moderato cantabile* and *Hiroshima mon amour*, each a story of epistemological impasse and frustrated sexuality, I first review Duras’ generic proximity to the thin mystery narratives of the French nouveau roman tradition. In Duras’ case, however, I particularize this association by tracking how Duras adapts the nouveau roman’s anti-humanist vision to her own discursive ends, centered in the crisis moment of the global mid-century. I argue that Duras encrypts perversity, crime, and nuclear apocalypse as the big lacuna of transnationalism’s fantasy of universal legibility, localized at once intimately and expansively across the terrains of late-imperial France and atomic-age Japan. Next, and finally, I counterpose Duras’ war-era memoir, *The War*, alongside Beckett’s postwar novel *Watt*. In this final section I read these European writers’ recursive modernist fictions of the globally disorienting war- and post-war period as common

expressions of collective trauma, epistemological oblivion, and anti-positivist historical memory.

Common in their world-citizenship at mid-century, this diverse group of modernist cosmopolitans negotiates the problem of modernity through complex descriptive representations of historical contemporaneity. The scope of their collective literary project—the prompt for my own study of global convergences and divergences—captures both the shallow-instantaneous and deep-mnemonic historical structures of communal globality. And they were altogether savage and beatific in their literatures of modernist modernity at mid-century. If this was their expressive modality, however aesthetically variegated, I argue throughout this project that the conditioning factor for such an historical aesthetics derives from a shared affective orientation to history. In my view, these global modernists traveled through the shifting uncertainties of a climactic historical present by archiving, in their fictions of lived experience, the bracketed certainties of the historical past. As such, they relied on tenuous but persistent global-historical paradigms of discursive knowledge and knowability. It was in this way that they managed to survive in constant, yet localized, states of biopolitical exception.⁵ As one contribution to our own contemporary present, their turn to the past persists into a collective future.

Two sections follow in this introduction. First, “Some Terms for World Modernism.” Second, “East-West Aesthetics and Melancholy Historicism.”

⁵ See Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France—1978-9*, trans. Graham Burchell (New York: Picador/Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

Some Terms for World Modernism:

In a chapter on the Dark Nights of Paris during the First World War, Céleste Albaret—housemaid and amanuensis of the French modernist Marcel Proust—recalls, in the genre of memoir, one of her employer’s nocturnal visits to the “provincial” Parisian poet Francis Jammes. As antiaircraft guns stutter at German zeppelins and Gothas, circling the night air like shades of death, Proust ventures out to see his friend, near the place des Invalides. Returning from Jammes’s, Albaret recalls Proust having told her, an unknown man had approached him, in the place de la Concorde, thought to attack and rob him, and then decided that a “monsieur” of Proust’s delicate type required escort—not the thieving indignation of a poor man in crisis. “He was very proud of that,” Albaret observes, of her unscathed employer. Proust returns to a fretting Albaret with the “brim [of his hat] full of bits of shrapnel”; like the child of his own extensive memoir, in awe of a gothic lantern at bedtime, “monsieur Proust” had been enchanted in these twilight hours by the macabre “searchlights and the shellbursts in the sky.” This night of war occurs around the years 1914-1915, Albaret remembers. And two of Proust’s close friends, Comte Bertrand de Fénélon and Gaston de Caillavet, both models for Proust’s combatant, in his series, Chevalier de Saint-Loup, have been killed, about this time, at the European front (*MP* 92-4).

Dictated to the Franco-American translator Georges Belmont a half-century

after the history it tells, Albaret's memoir—*Monsieur Proust*—is in some ways the groundlevel subtext of Proust's imbricated, temporally artful high modernism. As her own loving testimonial of her service to "Monsieur Proust" makes clear, Albaret's *ménage* with the fussy writer, through the years 1913-1922, was the material precondition for the writer's *writing* of his epic, and beautifully narcissistic, autobiography. Moreover, in this dialectic of modernist class, Albaret's indispensable labor participates in a kind of Lukácsian-socialist logic of the historical aesthetic of the historical novel, of which Proust's tomes can be seen as one exemplar. On Lukács's account, history is historicized and necessitated *as novelistic narrative* only when it is captured first from the material and psychological groundswell of popular life, the life of broadly post-Enlightenment mass culture, and mass war; from this basis, "world-historical" individuals get novelized as our ordinary heroes—anti-romantic individuals who are ordinary in general but extraordinary in particular because they have a finger on the pulse of social and historical change (*THN* 30-63). It falls to the historical novel, and the historical novelist as an exemplary writer of lives lived, then, to novelize such "world-historical" figures in a literary act that can be seen as just as "world-historical" as the historical figure herself.⁶ The "historical" author and the "historical" subject implicate one another, in other words, within a literary-historical situation of ambient "world-historical"-ness, or worldliness.

⁶ In one account of canonical Euro-American modernism—however *anti*-canonical our working definitions of "modernism" may be, as standard period or common style—we could say that Gertrude Stein demonstrates an instance of this diegetic fungibility between author and subject: in displacing herself onto Alice B. Toklas, as her subject's/lover's fictitious "autobiographer" (1933), Stein shows that, in fiction (of whatever time and place), one's own life blends readily into the figurations of another.

“Worldliness,” which Said once coined, via and yet against Paul Ricoeur, is the ineluctable “circumstantial reality” of all spoken and textual discourse (WTC 34-5).

In *Nets of Modernism: Henry James, Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, and Sigmund Freud*, Maud Ellmann engages this larger framework of understanding as she unpacks the problem of Stein’s modernist destabilizations of time, genre, and perspective, which are Stein’s own contribution to the exilic “nets” of Euro-American modernism. “In autobiography,” Ellmann summarizes of the general mode of modernist life-writing, “memory constructs the past in order to determine how the past constructed memory” (NM 137). Via Stein and Ellmann, then, Lukács’s thirties-era socialist aesthetic provides a template for picturing the textual forms through which the marbled historical past—both collective and individual, imperial and subaltern, national and transnational—survives, as popular artifact, into diversely contemporary times. Blinkered as it may be, in part, by traces of orientalist thinking, Lukács’s lens onto the cardinal points of the modern historical novel, with its philosophy of modern historical time, sets some terms for the cosmopolitan modernisms and asynchronous modernities my project assembles through several literary case studies—global British, Japanese, and French—at mid-century. And if, with its enduring mass appeal, its endless time-seeking search after the intersections of profound interiority and public history, Proust’s famous modernism *snobiste* remarks rather idiosyncratically some important elements of a socially progressive vision of modern historical time, then Albaret’s memoir of Proust’s own memoir is germinal within the

world modernism to which Proust's modernism contributes. A priori, Albaret makes Proust's high-modernist aesthetic possible—she makes his modernism, in a word, historical.

To foreground Albaret as the subaltern engineer of Proust's life within a Euro-American canon makes a descriptive introductory claim, on my part, for the attitudinally postcolonial and otherwise transnational slant of the globally modernist case studies I bring together in this project. Broadly, as Marxian or Marxian-adjacent, queer, and transnational, these investments of mine are Left-of-Center in a literary subfield that can sit, for perfectly sound yet unsavory historical reasons, in awkward proximity to forms of twentieth-century totalitarianism. Within the populist contexts of European social-democratic reformism and Russian communism, Hardt and Negri, in *Empire*, have signaled the various ways in which parochially nationalist projects, over the long “modernist” twentieth century, have tended to sneak into ostensibly collectivist agendas, readily mobilizing diverse subjects *en masse* toward fascist-imperialist ends—which is the suppression of “organic” social life as such (E 109-113).⁷

Indeed, Euro-American modernism and Western imperialism share historical

⁷ On global imperialism, see Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of our Times* (New York: Verso, 1994); Quinn Slobodian, *The End of Empire and the Birth of Neoliberalism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2018); Christopher Taylor, *Empire of Neglect: The West Indies in the Wake of British Liberalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018), Adom Getachew, *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019). On Japanese imperialism, see: *Reading Colonial Japan: Text, Context, and Critique*, ed. Michele M. Mason and Helen J.S. Lee (Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 2012); *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945*, ed. Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984); Sidney Xu Lu, *The Making of Japanese Settler Colonialism: Malthusianism and Trans-Pacific Migration, 1868-1961* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019); Kuan-Hsing Chen, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010); Tessa Morris-Suzuki, *On the Frontiers of History: Rethinking East Asian Borders* (Acton: Australian National University, 2020); *Borderline Japan: Foreigners and Frontier Controls in the Postwar Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

ground even as their substantive overlap, through the first half of the twentieth century, has often been sidestepped as a critical issue—at least in anglophone literary circles. As near-recently as 2000, Howard J. Booth and Nigel Rigby write that the “postcolonial” collection of essays they have edited, *Modernism and empire*, stands as “the first book-length study that seeks to explore the pervasive but complex interrelations between British colonialism and the modern movement” (1). Blind spots in reception histories of anglophone modernisms, the editors surmise, track across Hobsbawn’s dating of the end of the “age of empire” at 1914, when Western imperialism was at its height. At its apogee, Western imperialism was also incipiently in decline, and ready to give way to an “early” modern(ist) globality that had sublimated empire into generalized—or generalizable—postimperial *politesse*, all of which coincided with modernism’s New Critical (formalist) avoidance of unruly politics in favor of an aesthetics of democratic legibility (2-3).

In this précis of modernism’s allergy to empire, Anglo-America simply repressed its prehistory in the imperialist expropriations of Victorian England and Gilded Age America over the first half (and more) of the twentieth century. And besides, as I touch upon below, budding canonizations of Euro-American modernism in the post-45 moment had more than enough material, across critical theory, aesthetics, and problems of ideology, to think about; pre-modernist imperialisms might well seem archaic in a cultural modality that likes to regenerate newness. To the intervening Booth and Nigel, wanting to expand our account of (imperialist) modernist politics, even certain kinds of liberally

Marxian critique could well be insufficient: Fredric Jameson's "Modernism and imperialism" (Field Day—1988), they twitt, performs a typical "Jameson Raid" on the question of modernism and empire, "vitiat[ing]" the benefits that come out of reading literature from an economic vantage by its "knowing, simplifying framework" (5-6). On Jameson's account, which, again, Booth and Rigby see as wanting, modernist formalisms and subtleties simply cannot accommodate the empirical—alternatively realist—matter of empire; at the dawn of the twentieth century, global economic relations may have spawned modernist writers and works, but, on Jameson's view, those writers and works should not be read as a direct historical consequence of the imperialist nineteenth century.⁸ Where modernism excludes empire, that is, in a manner dissonant with Booth and Nigel's critical narrative and consonant with Jameson's particular brand of historicist futurity, history moves in only one direction—toward new contemporary times, post-modernist or otherwise. One logical, albeit exceedingly simple, consequence of this formulation is that a modernism that *includes* empire should gesture in the *opposite* direction—recursively backwards. As it pertains to the critical methods and attitudes of "melancholic" historicism, imbricated richly altogether as queer, affective, and psychoanalytic, I pick up on this thread in the next section of this introduction.

Recent volumes of essays on modernism have underscored its "bad" and "global" declensions, qualities which have been of indispensable help to me in

⁸ See Terry Eagleton, Fredric Jameson, and Edward W. Said [with an introduction by Seamus Deane], *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1990).

thinking through my own project. In their 2006 introduction to a collection of essays on “bad modernism,” Douglas Mao and Rebecca L. Walkowitz insist coyly upon badness as a perennial modernist aesthetic. As such, the “modernist affront” pertains across obscenity trials and avant-garde manifestos of the first half of the twentieth century, dalliances with fascism and myth around the middle third of the century, high-modernist formalist miscegenations of lyric and prose, writ large, translations and mistranslations, atonal dissonances (3). “To this day, no other name for a field of cultural production evokes quite the constellation of negativity, risk of aesthetic failure, and bad behavior that ‘modernism’ does,” Mao and Walkowitz write (4). Historicizing a mainly anglophone field, Mao and Walkowitz chronicle the rapid rise of transatlantic Cold War-era modernist studies—Harry Levin, Clement Greenberg, Lionel Trilling, and beyond—across a span of critical perspectives that grapple over modernism’s relationship to institutional and ideological sanction, but which can be unified generally on a consensus about modernist innovation and contrariness.

In addition to Mao and Walkowitz, whose work on British and transnational modernism helps me shape aspects of my project, other contributors to this volume of essays—Heather K. Love (on queer modernism) and Sianne Ngai (on modernist aesthetics of racial parody)—stake diverse social imperatives in modernist studies, ones which ever and again have helped to motivate my exploration of the imperialist (pre-)conditions and consequences of the global mid-century. Further, my own project’s modernists refract, in many ways, the

transnational vocabulary-bound logic of a recent collection of essays on “global modernism,” out in 2016. Here, Eric Hayot and Rebecca L. Walkowitz serve as editors. Where geographical latitude is taken as a given in new modernist studies, the idea is that a shared *vocabulary* of global diversity can precipitate lexical centers from which to crystallize, first, and interrogate, second, some problematic commonplaces of transnational modernity. Taking postcolonial critique of Eurocentrism (the West as History’s origin), diffusion (modernism spreads from the West to the Rest), and parity (all nations are intrinsically equivalent) as a given, Hayot and Walkowitz define “global” as a term with neither absolute referent nor universal value. They write, “[t]he ‘global’ [is] . . . a shifting concept of fixity and centrality, a set of claims made about the world . . . and how it works, whose force depends in every case on the situation and context of its elaboration” (3).⁹ As with recent essays on “bad modernism,”

⁹ See also Emily Apter, *Against World Literature*, pp. 71-2: “Oneworldedness [an Untranslatable], in contradistinction to these paradigms of world-systems, planetarity and transnationalism, envisages the planet as an extension of paranoid subjectivity vulnerable to persecutory fantasy, catastrophism, and monomania. Like globalization, oneworldedness traduces territorial sovereignty and often masks its identity as another name for ‘America.’ But where globalization is an amorphous term applied to economic neo-imperialism; to projections of the world as an ideologically bicameral yet fatally integrated single community; to the centrifugal pressure of dominant world languages and literatures (English, Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, Russian, Arabic); to the homogeneity of culture produced under capitalism; and to an essentially *non-comparative* model of comparative literature, oneworldedness, as I am defining it, refers more narrowly to a delirious aesthetics of systematicity; to the match between cognition and globalism that is held in place by the paranoid premise that ‘everything is connected.’” Through the problem of globalized translation and translatability, therefore, Apter offers some paradigms for thinking through the benefits and drawbacks of “non-comparatist” globality and synthetically “comparatist” literary studies. From another angle, Eric Hayot, in *On Literary Worlds*, p. 37, argues that the presumed globalism of the “world” writer “acts as a totem of responsibility to the historical present”: the larger the ontic and ontological ground of the imagined literary world, the closer this gambit of human life should be to affording its reading constituents (and critics) with an impossibly *total* awareness of what emerges *everywhere*. Such a logic is simply additive. While Hayot is skeptical of the extent to which the social sciences—world-systems thinking in descent from Immanuel Wallerstein—or the humanities—the non-periodized sub-field of ‘world literature,’ for instance—can ever adequately perform these functions, which are idealist to say the least, he is of course joining in a timely conversation among critics about the mandates of world-literary studies, of which global modernism is one iteration.

essays on “global modernism” provide an archetype for critical approaches, and perspectives, for thinking through modernist globality at mid-century. In Hayot and Walkowitz’s volume, Martin Puchner on East-West networks of intercultural exchange, Christopher Reed on queer domestications of modernist *japonisme*, and Tsitsi Jaji on transnational vernacular culture are each and all catalysts for this project, for whose work I am grateful.¹⁰

Finally, a new volume of essays, out in 2020, *New Oceania: Modernisms and Modernities in the Pacific*, provides one broad, critical backdrop for the problem of historical and literary-historical comparability that my project explores across global-modernist case studies. While useful for this project generally, it is most relevant to my chapter on an historically capacious Japanese modernism, which extends from the Meiji (1868-1912) through to the Showa (1926-1989) period. In their introduction, the editors Matthew Hayward and Maebh Long draw their reader’s attention to a polemic, of a kind, between Susan Stanford Friedman and Sudesh Mishra; the editors resolve the disagreement through the loose overarching claim that “all [their contributors] agree that Pacific artists are

¹⁰ Regarding modernist temporality in/as both innovation- and tradition-bound, around the global Cold War era, see also Mark Goble’s article, in *A New Vocabulary*, on “Obsolescence,” p. 148: “While words and things had been described as obsolete in English since the Renaissance, it is not until the nineteenth century that ‘obsolescence’ is used to characterize a quality of objects and the processes that render them outmoded as a result of technological development. The nominalization that makes for ‘obsolescence’—apart from any instance of the obsolete—suggests a more pervasive sense of being somehow too soon outside of or behind the times” (e.g., “productive consumption” in Marx’s *Grundrisse* [1857]); p. 165: “the term ‘planned obsolescence’ does not enter the language of design and marketing until 1954 [circa mid-century modernism], when it was coined by the industrial engineer Brookes Stevens at the very moment when modernism itself was becoming widely codified and taught by figures such as Clement Greenberg, who tracked each season’s trends with a ferocious dedication to whatever seemed most pure in its commitment to innovation . . . [yet] what Greenberg celebrated as truly “Modernist”—here [in “Modernist Painting”], for the first time, he capitalized the term—was the much less newsworthy proposition that ‘Art is continuity, and unthinkable without it.’”

engaged in the writing of a Pacific modernity” (10-11). But the antagonistic particulars of this disagreement are pertinent to a project, such as mine, which attends to local instantiations of literary-historical modernism/modernity and at the same time generalizes, against the backdrop of a shared “world-historical” moment, common aspects of a minor aesthetics at play within new and old modernist canons. Mishra’s argument is with Friedman’s broadly “planetary” approach to reading modernity, and modernism. “It would be anachronistic,” Mishra writes, “to concur with Susan Stanford Friedman’s claim that modernity (and modernism) flourished in non-European contexts (Kabir’s India and Du Fu’s China, for instance) during periods predating the emergence of the object-forming category” (20). History *is* contextual, in other words. Here, Mishra takes an historically indexed idea of the “object-forming category” from Foucault’s *Archaeology of Knowledge*—notions of discourse and epistemology which I draw from, too, in parts of this project—and uses it to foreground a powerful study of discrepant Samoan modernism. For her part, Friedman, in turn, draws from her feminist training to argue that, then as now, her work seeks to identify and work within apparent “paradigm shifts”; she wants to advance “the new” modernist studies by reconstituting *how* we think rather than just *adding* new material to the pot. To ground her claims of a univocal spatial logic of modernity, Friedman draws heavily from Edouard Glissant’s use of “planetary” (also “worldness,” “archipelagic”), in *Poetics of Relation* (Gallimard: 1990), to write that “modernities” are “synchronous” (253-4). To state it bluntly, in my own study of global modernism, I tend to sympathize with Mishra’s worldview.

Before proceeding to some important elements of melancholic historicism, especially as they intersect with a global Japanese aesthetics, I gloss just a few more nodal points in this project—critical frameworks for thinking through globally divergent forms of the modernist novel. They relate to, first, stranger sociality and, second, the British New Left. In the first instance, literary scholars of modernity Barry McCrea and Thomas Pavel emphasize the localist social dimensions of stranger sociality; for them, the European novel is best read in the light of liberal interpretive investments, respectively queering of genealogical logic and aesthetically socialist. For McCrea, the modernist novel, as seen emblematically in Proust and Joyce, ought to be reinterpreted in the terms of queer narrative: narrative, that is, which focalizes non-metropolitan “village” sociality, non-familial relations of intimacy, and reorganizations writ large of genealogical logics of kinship (CS 14-21). To McCrea’s literary turn on sociological parameters over the long nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Pavel, for his part, schematizes and hierarchizes a set of approaches to reading the history of the Western novel. Ultimately, for Pavel, Lukács’s socialist aesthetics represents a preferable way of historicizing the genre of the novel, both modern and premodern. After natural histories of the novel (indebted to Darwinian methods and attitudes), social or intellectual histories of the novel (largely anglocentric), and formalist narrative-technical histories of the novel (Viktor Shklovsky, some Mikhail Bakhtin), Pavel lands on a fourth option that is, for him, the optimal one, the one-to-be-emulated—*the reflective history of the novel*. Where Lukács’s attention to the “links between human beings *as individuals* and

the society in which they live” gives Pavel some critical leverage for his own story of the endurance of the novel through historical time and through diverse social contexts—its “secret pact with permanence” across non-ideal worlds—I take from both Lukács and Pavel a spirit of comparative interpretation. In this way, I foreground diversity of context, and the multiple materialisms of history, as the foundation from which to read particular instantiations of the modern, modernist novel across a late-imperialist terrain of global modernism (TN 10-16).¹¹

Finally, via the British New Left, as canvased from Franco Moretti—Moretti reading Perry Anderson—and Raymond Williams, there are general and persistent thoughts on modernist heterogeneity. In a section on “Joyce /Kafka,” in *Modern Epic: The World System from Goethe to García Márquez*, Moretti advances the idea of a synchronic “polarization *within* modernism itself,” a polarization which says that modernist aesthetics as such name a “non-existent unity” (200-1). While Moretti’s European modernist examples are taken from the early twentieth century, his message can readily extend to a project, such as mine, that studies global modernism in a later phase of cultural articulation. Here, then, Moretti draws on an essay by Perry Anderson in the *New Left Review*, “Modernity and Revolution” (1984), to develop the claim that really all that diverse inflections of

¹¹ See also Earl Miner’s notion of a globally—or non-West-centrally—predominant “affective-expressive” lyricism in the modality of aesthetic narrative, pp. 23-4, in *Comparative Poetics: An Intercultural Essay on Theories of Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); as well as Miner, *The Japanese Tradition in British and American Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958, 1966). On the history of the (globally) Western novel, see Georg Lukács’ canonical *Theory of the Novel* (orig. pub. 1916); Ian Watt, *Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957; 2001); *Theory of the Novel*, ed. Michael McKeon (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).

global modernism hold in common is an “adversarial” stance against “‘ancien-régime’ . . . academicism”; tradition, on this account, prompts a reactive explosion of incommensurate modernist experiments (*ME* 200-1). Where modernist diversity is Moretti’s British New Left-inspired premise, Raymond Williams at once historicizes and nuances this attitudinal formula in a well known lecture given in 1987, “When Was Modernism?”. In this lecture, Williams problematizes the imperialist omniverousness of modernism as a cultural field that can tend to assimilate both “anti-bourgeois” and “bourgeois” (aesthetic) ideologies; consequently, modernism, in this view, inhabits an historical period that denies the reality of *other* cultural movements, whether contemporaneously real or as imagined in speculative pasts and futures. “Modernism being the terminus,” Williams writes, “everything afterwards is counted out of development. It is *after*; stuck in the post.” Against the “non-historical” mainstreaming of modernism in late-capitalist mass culture—the “non-historical fixity of *post*-modernism”—Williams wishes, in a stridently declamatory mode, to return historicist specificity to the problem of modernist cultural production, and with this, to cleanse culture of ideological taint. How possible are such ambitious visions? It is not my intent to offer a pat answer to this question, but rather to navigate, in this project, some of these terms that the British New Left make available to literary case studies of global modernism. They follow upon what I’ve outlined thus far regarding modernist globality and historicity, and develop below as we narrow our sights to the particulars of my own localized case studies. For its part, two components of Williams’s lecture are especially

orienting: his insistence on bounded socio-historical contextuality and his engagement, attendant upon this brand of historicism, with the metropolitan conventions of modernist estrangement (*PM* 34-5).

East-West (Global) Aesthetics and Melancholic Historicism:

This section begins as the first one did, with a literary anecdote about Proust, and Proust's radiating intersection with global modernisms. Dying as he did in 1922, the year that scholars of Euro-American modernism have tended to agree was a remarkable year for literary-cultural production—publication of T.S. Eliot's *The Wasteland*, Virginia Woolf's *Jacob's Room*, and James Joyce's *Ulysses*¹²—Proust's death adds yet another literary event to a full historical year and, in so doing, anticipates the easternizing way in which Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has read his work, and which I outline here.

Sedgwick's essay "Making Things, Practicing Emptiness" meditates on the convergences between Japanese art materials and Proust's orientalist metaphors

¹² See Saint-Amour 35—Harry Levin, Michael North. On transnational convergences for Joyce's modernism, see Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 196-7: after (Martin Robison) Delany and against the danger of single-mindedness—non-double consciousness—in Africentricity, Gilroy, problematizing the interface of tradition and modernity in black modernity [sic], writes: "It is worth emphasising that part of the overall argument of this book is that much of the material discussed here does not fit unambiguously into a time-consciousness derived from and punctuated exclusively by changes in the public, urban worlds of London, Berlin, and Paris. Writers, particularly those closest to the slave experience, repudiated the heroic narrative of western civilization and used a philosophically informed approach to slavery in order to undermine the monumental time that supports it. Whatever their disagreements about the teleology of black emancipation, Du Bois, Douglass, Wright, and the rest shared a sense that the modern world was fragmented along axes constituted by racial conflict and could accommodate non-synchronous, hetero-cultural model of social life in close proximity . . . Perhaps, one day, theories of black literary modernism will have to reckon with the issues of urban synchronicity, memory, and identity transcoded from Joyce's Dublin to Wright's Chicago in the novel *Lawd Today*."

in *In Search of Lost Time*. As such, it extends some of the observations of a related essay, "The Weather in Proust," in an explicitly *japoniste* direction. Across these pieces, Sedgwick mobilizes the work, in object-relations psychoanalysis, of Melanie Klein and others to speculate on the loose reparative efficacy of affect as a psychic energy: "Using the leverage of more recent theories of affect, you could say that there is a gain in distinguishing, as Freud does not, between affect and drive" (WP 12). In this reading, such psychic energies populate Proust's benevolently orientalist landscape with what Sedgwick elsewhere calls "little gods," *génies*, who make atmospheric magic in the terms of affective "family resemblance"—the "little gods" enable both temporal and locational "transmigration" across persons and objects, subjects and environments, things and the weather (7). Proust, on this account, fills his sentimental books, which render dense networks of family and community, with queer and aestheticizing torques on rigid Oedipal laws. As with Barry McCrea's queering of Victorian- and modernist-era novels, Sedgwick's queering of Proust's orientalist modernism is, for my project's global cluster of intimately enmeshed modern writers and works, a helpful resource. Here, then, Sedgwick uses the morphemic slippage between the French for "time" and the French for "weather" (*le temps/les temps*) in order to make a general claim about modernism's orientalist *zeitgeist*. While W. B. Yeats, in Sedgwick's view, draws from the global East in an "esoteric" manner, Proust evidences a merely "quotidian, unspecial, reality-grounded" orientalist mode; Proust, she writes, "is unusual among French modernists, not in the frequency or suavity with which he invokes Christian and

classical ontologies of death and the soul's survival and transfer, but in also explicitly bringing in dozens of Celtic, Persian, Egyptian, Northern European, and Asian citations among others on the same subjects" (4-6).

Proust's modernist "citations" of pagan, exotic, and non-secular cultural temporalities underwrite, in other words, his high-modernist craft. In the context of transcultural China, Haun Saussy has excavated the new kinds of familiarity that arise when semiotic zones interact across millennia of historical time and broad configurations of foreignness—the global composite of "translation-as-citation." Here, an act of citational (diachronic) and translational (synchronic) inscription can both import difference and concede to the limitations of native epistemologies (*geyi*) (TC 71-82). Proust's Franco-centric vision of a Chinese imaginary is not the particular subject of this project, but Saussy's lens onto cultural hybridization is indispensable. In this project, I venture instead to take Proust in the direction of a transnational Japanese aesthetic that Sedgwick and others investigate in broadly British and French settings of global modernism. Thus, in "Making Things, Practicing Emptiness," Sedgwick reflects on the Japanese artistic practice of *suminagashi* (floating ink), connecting its free-form method with Melanie Klein's phenomenology of affect. Klein, Sedgwick rejoices—reiterating and nuancing the contrast she draws between Kleinian affect and Freudian drive—"argues that it can be a relief and relaxation, rather than a big tragedy the way it is in Freud, when one manages to get disabused of the fantasy of omnipotence, together with the reflex fantasy of utter impotence" (WP 83). Such is Sedgwick's liberated practice of *suminagashi*, a practice whose

European analogue, paper marbling, instantiates quite a different philosophy of nature. Whereas, on this account, the Japanese art form “play[s] on the immemorial Taoist and Zen fascination with the potent but unwilling behaviors of water,” European paper marbling has its artists harness water, congeal it into a thick viscous substance that ink then passes through in controlled ways. In one cultural practice, water is free; in another, it is managed. Performing aesthetic hybridization in her own life, Sedgwick uses some of Proust’s language in a free-form expression of *suminagashi*: in the collection of essays from which I draw this material, *The Weather in Proust*, she provides photographs of this art form, one which in her rendition integrates diverse citational and material forms. Here, Sedgwick quotes from Proust’s second novel in his *In Search of Lost Time* series, *In The Shadow of Young Girls in Flower* (also translated as *Within a Budding Grove*)—“For beauty is a series of hypotheses” (WP 84-8; *ILT* 2: 399).

Where Sedgwick constellates a Franco-Japanese aesthetic in the terms of affective *temps* and concrete material practice, Grace E. Lavery has recently identified Anglo-Japanese intimacies of “quaint, exquisite” beauty and violence. Lavery’s *Quaint, Exquisite: Victorian Aesthetics and the Idea of Japan* draws its picturesque title from orientalist—specifically Japanese—strains in I.A. Richards’s *Practical Criticism* (1929). To foreground the titular keywords of her monograph, Lavery signposts how, in Richards’s modernist New Critical pedagogy, Christina Rossetti’s poetry had prompted a Cambridge undergraduate to remark that a specific poem was “in its own rather tiny way . . . quite *exquisite* (emphasis mine)”; to this impression, Richards added his own

impression that the poem, in being “exquisite,” evoked “a reminiscence of the principles of Japanese gardening.” In the Victorian-era lexical imaginary (as evidenced in Oscar Wilde, A.C. Swinburne, for instance), Lavery continues, “an exquisite object is *extremely* beautiful; it is also *weirdly* incomplete.” (Lavery cites Wilde: “a cigarette is the perfect type of perfect pleasure . . . it is exquisite, and leaves one unsatisfied.”) Out of the conjuncture, through an anglophone semantics of the “exquisite,” of what Lavery calls a split aesthetics of “conceptual disfiguration” (6-7), there is born then a “melancholy” transcendentalism that tracks through queer archives of Anglo-Japanese male homosociality across the global nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Projected out of Kant’s aesthetics in the *Critique of Judgement* (1790), Lavery’s affective melancholia—an expression of the simultaneously possible and impossible potentialities of queer transnational intimacy in the non-universal modalities of aesthetic beauty—articulates itself in the unbridgeable space between self and other, the world of subjects and the world of objects. “This is the melancholic condition of the ‘subjective universal’,” Lavery writes, glossing Kant; “we demand that everybody feel the same way about a beautiful object as we do, even as we know that not everybody will (10).”¹³

¹³ On a broadly contemporary “turn toward melancholy” in critical discourses of natal racialization-as-alienation, anti-collectivist queerness, and indigeneity, all cast in an anti-teleological historicist frame of historical recursivity, see also—Stephen Best, *None Like Us: Blackness, Belonging, Aesthetic Life* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018), esp. 13-17, 63-73; re: ethnicity and melancholy, cf. Lavery 1-18, esp. p. 9: “[via Kant’s *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*, 1764] In place of ‘origins,’ then, Kant had developed an extraordinary geographical analogy, which connects European national differences to counterparts in Asia: Arabs are the ‘Spaniards of the orient’; the Persians are like the French . . . and ‘the Japanese could in a way be regarded as the Englishmen of this part of the world, but hardly in any other quality than their resoluteness—which degenerates into the utmost stubbornness—their valor, and disdain of death.’” Lavery continues, “The Japanese and the British: death cultists. Versions of this

Chapter 1—*Aestheticisms at War*

“We stopped on the way at Oxford and bought a waistcoat and some books,” reads Evelyn Waugh’s diary entry from 11 January 1926, written at Barford House, Warwick. The entry chronicles a motoring trip, taken with Waugh’s chum and sometime lover, Alastair Hugh Graham, from Barford House in Warwickshire to Graham’s rented estate in Berkshire.¹ The books purchased on that trip include, Waugh remarks, some of “T. S. Eliot’s poems which seem to me marvellously good but very hard to understand.” He adds, “[t]here is a most impressive flavour of the major prophets about them.”² Waugh is at this time a youthful twenty-two years of age, an emerging writer and critic who, having left Oxford two years prior with a sturdy third-class degree (“[f]rom the first I regarded Oxford as a place to be inhabited and enjoyed for itself, not as the preparation for anywhere else,” the writer reflects, some forty years later),³ has been engaged in the intervening years in various writerly pursuits, including an

analogy will recur throughout this book—to take two examples: in the association between the death penalty in Japan and domestic British satire in *The Mikado*, and in the poet Yone Noguchi’s melancholic relation to a Victorian poem about death in his own haiku—but Kant’s analogy entails the bold claim that aesthetic taste [is] an index of racial essence.” To extend this convergence of aesthetics with nation-state formations and race, or ethnicity, further, I add here that, following Stephen Best, I am interested in Adorno’s aesthetic proposition—as a kind of grounding logic for thinking through problems of collectivity, historicism, and race—that every artwork is both an archival record of its social and historical time *and* a disavowal of empirical “truth content” (Best 145; Theodor W. Adorno, “Toward a Theory of the Artwork,” in *Aesthetic Theory*, ed. Gretel Adorno and Rolf Tiedemann, trans. Robert Hullot-Kentor [London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013], 180, 241).

¹ For a description of Barford House and speculation about its impact on Waugh’s developing literary imagination, especially as regards his later novelistic renderings of the English estate, see Hastings, p. 109.

² *Diaries* 242

³ *A Little Learning* 171

aborted first novel, *The Temple at Thatch*, and a privately published study of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. To Waugh's emerging sensibility, the vatic sophistication of Eliot's high-modernist prosody must seem estimable, while a bit remote. Still, only a good half-generation (fifteen years) separates the two men.

Sharing substantive historical and geographical overlap if not, evidently, aesthetic taste, both Eliot and Waugh belong to a newly expanded literary-historical period of modernist cultural production. My juxtaposition of the young Evelyn Waugh to the established T.S. Eliot is one way of marking the problem—equally a revisionist opportunity—of modernist periodization. In her illuminating study of “late” or “second-wave” modernism, *Modernism and World War II* (Cambridge University Press: 2007), Marina Mackay reminds her readers that, as a literary-cultural movement, Euro-American “high” modernism (here, “early” or “first-wave” modernism would be more appropriate) is distinct among other literary-cultural movements for the rapidity with which it was made canonical in academic institutions and among reading publics at large. The conventional narrative, which Mackay works to revise in her book, goes something like this: a generation of Euro-American writers came of age in the 1910s and produced conspicuously “high-modernist” works in the 1920s. The exponents of “high-modernist” experiment in stream-of-consciousness narration, mythic structure, psychologized perspective (new forms of play with free indirect discourse), and what Bakhtin would call the panoply of voice inherent to

the modern genre of the novel, or *heteroglossia*,⁴ included, signally, famous elements from London's Bloomsbury salon (Virginia Woolf, E. M. Forster, Lytton Strachey), the Irish cosmopolitan James Joyce, and an American-born expatriate community of radical innovators—Ezra Pound, Gertrude Stein, and T.S. Eliot chief among them. For a generation of modernist scholars crystallizing around the middle of the twentieth century, 1922—the year of the publication of Joyce's *Ulysses* in Paris and Eliot's *The Waste Land* in Britain and the United States—was christened modernism's *annus mirabilis*.⁵

As such, it is worthy of notice that a scant two decades after these golden twenties, Erich Auerbach famously enumerated some defining features of the modernist movement. Writing from the vantage of political exile in Turkey during World War II, Auerbach sees the great master of stream-of-consciousness narration and luminous detail, Virginia Woolf, as the literary paragon of modernism—the liberalism of modernist temporality and vantage offering a possible avenue for humanistic reconciliation made desperately necessary by the psychic and material damage done in World War II.⁶ Similarly Raymond Williams: as class-conscious lexicographer in *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society* (Fontana Press: 1976), Williams's "modern" rings true to this understanding of a rapid historical precipitation of the modernist movement. He stresses the derivation of "modern" from *modo* in Latin, meaning *now* or *just now*. To Williams's Thatcher-era reader, "modern" denotes the (contemporary) sense

⁴ Bakhtin 67, 263, 324

⁵ Saint-Amour 35

⁶ *Mimesis*, "The Brown Stocking," 525-553

of “contemporary,” while also holding within it the sociological history of its other denigrating and comparative uses.⁷ As early as 1940, then, Mackay observes, a “reasonably perceptive critic like John Lehmann” (editor of *Penguin New Writing*, 1936-1950) could fix in print and in at least one important setting canonize the modernist writers of his historical day. From the convenience of historical hindsight, it becomes apparent for scholars of the era, including Mackay, that this roster remained more or less intact through subsequent decades, organizing a consensus understanding in universities and among more general readerships. Mackay paraphrases Lehmann, at once confirming and respectfully dilating the shape of the narrative I offered above: “the major novelists were Joyce, Woolf, Lawrence, Stein and Hemingway; Eliot was the major poet, with honourable mention of the older Yeats.” Even as, in Lehmann’s words, it is arguable that these modernists “fell out of fashion with the vanguard of the intellectuals in the next decade,” their works had entered the annals of literary history by the year 1940.⁸

As critical method, Mackay’s study models a technique of literary historicism whose attunement to local politics of national culture—in her case, twentieth-century British—allows for a sensitive reading of literary-cultural production conditioned in and through a particular historical setting. Importantly, the governing context is, for Mackay, the British experience of World War II—its tense lead-up, its intermittent Blitzes on the “home front,” and

⁷ *Keywords* 208-9

⁸ Mackay 15

its evidently liberalizing political effects in Britain's postwar welfare state. Mackay's critical aperture for British modernism is, therefore, an historically and culturally enlarged one: the prestige culture of Bloomsbury intelligentsia—such as it thrives until Virginia Woolf's suicide in 1941—may be read alongside anti-Bloomsbury intellectualism (Rebecca West), and, too, the wartime writing of an apolitical Henry Green alongside that of his friend and peer, the irrepressibly political Evelyn Waugh who forms the subject of this chapter. Mackay cites Lehmann's summational remarks of the year 1940 not in order to affirm and leverage his critical worldview but in order to mark her critical distance from it. Against Lehmann's placement of Euro-American modernism in the high-cultural moment of the 1920s, a decade whose less ominous portion antedates the global market crash of 1929, Mackay's study of "late" modernism takes off in the immediate historical context out of which Lehmann is *himself* writing, and with a view toward a substantially different kind of historically situated literary culture that may likewise be called, in a word, modernist.

In extending modernism to the turbulent thirties and a more generalized World War II period, Mackay's re-periodization of modernist study shares a refreshed historical context with other scholarly work on the period, including Tyrus Miller's *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction, and the Arts Between the World Wars* (University of California Press: 1999), Paul K. Saint-Amour's *Tense Future: Modernism, Total War, Encyclopedic Form* (Oxford University Press: 2015), and Jed Esty's *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England* (Princeton University Press: 2004), a book whose literary-critical engagement with the

decline of the British empire may be read as precursor to and interlocutor with his more recent monograph, *Unseasonable Youth: Modernism, Colonialism, and the Fiction of Development* (Oxford University Press: 2012). Along with Mackay's scholarship, this is some of the recent work on Euro-American modernism that I will be engaging with in this chapter which seeks to read Evelyn Waugh in a mid-century global context of critical relevance.

I wish to add a critical supplement, here, to the Euro-American modernist scholarship of the "late"-modernist period that has helped me to situate Waugh's prolific career as a 20th-century British writer and critic. The topographical expansion that is implicit in these modernist scholars' loosening of the chronological bounds of modernist study finds an alliance with a globalist and comparatist scholarship that is often inflected by the legacy of postcolonial critique. To this sensibility I bring some contemporary Euro-American modernist scholarship in dialogue with selective readings of current scholars of cosmopolitanism (a contentious syntagmatic unit often giving the lie to its universalist assumptions), the global periphery in descent from Wallerstein's pioneering work in world-systems analysis, and the long history of European empire. These transnational accounts of 20th-century history and literary culture have helped me to continually revise my understanding of "modernity" as it inscribes itself in a literary-cultural movement—*modernism*, whether Euro-American or of a different national and cultural inflection—that bears so capacious a name, so heavy a set of historical precedents and so rich a responsibility toward historical time as it unfolds in the present. The globalist

scholars who have reframed my understanding of Euro-American modernism include Leela Gandhi, Pascale Casanova, Bruce Robbins, Wai-Chee Dimock, and G.C. Spivak, and I incorporate their scholarship where relevant to my reading of Evelyn Waugh during World War II. Additionally, it goes without saying, perhaps, that in the enlightening work they have done in “cosmopolitan-stylistic” and “planetary” excavations of modernist literary-cultural production, Rebecca Walkowitz and Susan Stanford-Friedman have been paradigmatic for me. Finally, it is to Maud Ellmann that I owe a special gratitude for being the very first to show me new frontiers for modernism, altogether historical, socio-economic, and psychoanalytic; these are frontiers which she continues to keep lively and expansive for the project in global modernism of which this chapter marks the first.⁹

Benefiting from the joint influence of contemporary Euro-American modernist scholarship and comparatist strategies of critical reading often sympathetically indebted to postcolonial lines of critique, the cumulative effect of my reading in these resources is to build toward the “global” Waugh’s critical relevance to the philological and philosophical work done by Giorgio Agamben in recent decades. My engagement with Agamben is rooted in the theoretical principle of “bare life” as it is embodied in the transhistorical figure of the “homo sacer,” a theoretical personage whose embodiment of a political idea Agamben brings to life (and death) across Western millennia—from Pindar’s first

⁹ Ref to Susan Stanford Friedman and Rebecca Walkowitz here

fragments on the “paradox of sovereignty” through to Carl Schmitt’s conservative jurisprudence during Weimar and beyond, into the Nazi camps. Agamben first develops a theory of the “homo sacer” in the first installment of his *Homo Sacer* series, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen; Stanford University Press: 1998), and it is to this first formalization of the idea that I attempt a turn in my globalist reading of Evelyn Waugh’s war fiction.

Driven by the promise of conversancy with contemporary modernist and globalist scholars, this chapter involves a close reading of the designs and implications of European aestheticism—alternatively, symbolism—such as it is imaged through a recurrent character-type in two signal pieces of Evelyn Waugh’s war fiction, *Put Out More Flags* (1942) and the *Sword of Honour* trilogy (1952-61). As evidently realist literature, this fiction relies for much of its critical meaning upon the immediate context of the genocidal world war which prompted it into being, but it mines with force, too, the reserves of literary-cultural history in the century that immediately preceded it. Bridging the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Waugh, in this fiction of war, tests the canonical limits of historical time as he opens new space for international encounters inflected powerfully by the ideological and material conditions of late (equally new) imperialism in the years 1930-1960.

As such, Waugh fits snugly into the new period of “late” modernism, extending a generational logic that Valentine Cunningham made available and compelling in *British Writers of the Thirties* (Oxford University Press: 1988) to the

larger political and international scope of more recent modernist scholarship. In the biographical account Cunningham first modeled for “late” modernism, a constellation of British and Irish male writers—novelists, poets, journalists—active in the inter- and post-war periods coalesced under the colloquial banner heading of “The Auden Generation.” Together with Evelyn Waugh (1903-1966), this motley generation included and exceeded this representative sampling: the eponymous W.H. Auden (1907-1973), Christopher Isherwood (1904-1986), Louis MacNeice (1907-1963), George Orwell (1903-1950), Aldous Huxley (1894-1963), Cecil Day-Lewis (1904-1972), and Stephen Spender (1909-1995). At a half-generational remove, Philip Larkin (1922-1985) and T.E. Lawrence (1888-1935) are fellow travelers. Here I offer Cunningham’s vivid present-tense description of the deflationary bearing and ironic manner of the group as a foretaste of Waugh’s own “late”-modernist tenor and style: “the British authors at the heart of the Auden generation are, in practice, mere lookers-on at the period’s heroics. They’re a troupe of middle-class voyeurs of the big, the tough, the butch, the airborne, able to achieve heroic stature for themselves only by pretence, by proxy, in metaphor and other literary figures. Such loftiness as they attain is mainly in the head.”¹⁰

From the antics of the “late”-modernist sensibility Cunningham sketches, I first retreat, in this chapter, in order to re-engage Waugh’s social-realist technique with new critical visibility gleaned from a vertical engagement with

¹⁰ Cunningham 170

historical time. To offer a turn on Jed Esty's spatializing formulation, in *A Shrinking Island*, that "late" British modernism inverts imperialism's anthropological omniscience of the periphery and ignorance of the metropolitan center (England) to a model of robust anthropological knowledge of *home* (Englishness) and ignorance of an emergently post-colonial periphery, I would say that historical time might work in much the same way as the global space of geography does in Esty's account of the devolution of British imperial power.¹¹ The literary-cultural "home" space of Euro-American "late" modernism may be illuminated out of semi-obscurity, that is, by the temporal periphery of a European aestheticism of the *fin de siècle*. I am suggesting here, then, not an opposition to Esty's account, but a merging with it: both geographical and temporal-historical vectors may be used to locate and interpret Waugh's brand of "late" British modernism at empire's end.

To that end, a first section, "*Symbolisme of Asia, Orient, and Silk in Put Out More Flags*," reads the literary-cultural implications of reverse anachronism (put simply: past time shuttled into the present) through Waugh's figuration of an ostracized Jewish homosexual who wears features of both persecuted sex/gender and "Eastern" identity. This character, "Ambrose Silk," belongs in effect to an earlier school of *fin-de-siècle* aestheticism, one whose literary-cultural origins are rooted in a history contemporaneous with the development of post-Enlightenment Orientalism in Europe. The historical convergence of late 19th-

¹¹ *A Shrinking Island* 7, 21

century aestheticism with the institutionalization of a Western Orientalist epistemology à la Said makes itself felt in the composite outsiderism of Ambrose Silk, a figure whose very name conjures not just the mannered dandyism of *fin-de-siècle* Europe but, likewise, the rich imperialist history of East-West commerce in the fine Asiatic material denoted by his family name. A victim of the manifold abuses of political power during World War II, Silk is a tragic figure consigned, in Waugh's rendering, to political exile during Britain's defensive preamble to World War II, the year of the "Phoney War" (1939-1940) which falls between Germany's invasion of Poland and its occupation of France.

A second and final section, "Writing Big Margins of Global War in the *Sword of Honour* Trilogy," applies the literary-critical hermeneutics of my first reading to the figuration of an analogous type of character in Waugh's war trilogy. Throughout the trilogy, this character is identified through his florid military rank—lacking the intimacy of a first (Christian) name, he is referred to as "Ludovic," most often "Corporal-Major Ludovic." Structurally, Ludovic appears *in medias res* of the war trilogy, and is one of the many secondary military and civilian characters who skirt the novels' protagonist, Guy Crouchback, helping to enliven the global military escapades of the series. Distinguishable from the other characters in the trilogy, who are in many ways *all too* contemporary with the years 1939-1951 that the series charts, Ludovic, like Silk, represents a reverse-anachronistic engagement with historical time. In Ludovic's case, however, *fin-de-siècle* articulations of cosmopolitan style and exoticization are translated and expanded into antiquated forms of military—

essentially male and often homosocial—heroism and non-contemporary, archaic literary ambition. In Ludovic, peripheral and minor expression of what Stuart Hall, in his 1990s lectures, would have called discursively-constituted cultural “identification,” at once mirror and render thematic, for Waugh, the queer features of his literary antecedent, Ambrose Silk.¹² Taken together, Waugh’s war-time historically disjunctive aesthetes offer a commentary about politics of exclusion and suffering in the immediate historical time of World War II.

I) *Symbolisme of Asia, Orient, and Silk in Put Out More Flags*

Arthur Symons’s account of 19th-century French symbolist innovations in poetic verse, published in 1899 as *The Symbolist Movement in Literature*, offers one small yet decisive history of a literary movement that has come to be synonymous with *fin-de-siècle* aestheticism writ large. From the early invocation of *l’art pour l’art* (“art for art’s sake”), which Théophile Gautier makes in the preface to his *Mademoiselle de Maupin* (1835), through to Walter Pater’s famously decadent Conclusion to his *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (1873) and beyond, 19th-century aestheticism may be seen not just as the display of “aesthetic” indulgence in fleeting pleasure but also quixotic intelligence on the model of Oscar Wilde (1854-1900). Symons contributes to this consolidating of

¹² Hall 127-130

Anglo-French aestheticist principles at the turn of the twentieth century. In *The Symbolist Movement*, lapidary, descriptive chapters assemble a roster of French poets who share an aesthetic range with the great poet of Louis-Napoléon III's Second Empire in France (1852-1870), Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867). As is commonly acknowledged among scholars of the Western literary tradition, Baudelaire is one of the archetypes of 19th-century French post-romanticism; his *Fleurs du mal* (1857) pioneered an aesthetic of urban squalor and radical neo-classical style. In the 1899 version of Symons's book, there appear, among others, Paul Verlaine (1844-1896), Arthur Rimbaud (1854-1891), Stéphane Mallarmé (1842-1898), Jules Laforgue (1860-1887), Joris-Karl Huysmans (1848-1907), and Gérard de Nerval (1808-1855). Pointedly, it is to Nerval in particular (the most senior of the group) that Symons credits the origins of the symbolist movement:

[F]or the first time in French, words are used as the ingredients of an evocation, as themselves not merely colour and sound, but symbol

Persuaded, as Gérard was, of the sensitive unity of all nature, he was able to trace resemblances where others saw only divergences; and the setting together of unfamiliar and apparently alien things, which comes so strangely upon us in his verse, was perhaps an actual sight of what it is our misfortune not to see [N]o one before Gérard realized that such things as these might be the basis of almost a new aesthetics.¹³

In Symons's appreciation—he had never met “Gérard” but sees him as an

¹³ Symons 19

intimate—French symbolist poetry, in descent from Nerval, goes one further than even the radicality of synesthetic delight (“words are . . . not merely colour and sound”) to the uncanny mergers made palpable by “symbolist” visions of an invisible world. Here, then, is “almost a new aesthetics” that is nevertheless unprecedented. Yet Nerval, too, was human: it is to “the fortunate accident of madness” (recurrent nervous breakdowns and ultimate suicide), Symons writes, that “we owe . . . one of the foundations of what may be called the practical aesthetics of Symbolism.”¹⁴ A revised edition of *The Symbolist Movement*, published in 1919, expands to include writers (novelists as well as poets) of variously “realist” and “naturalist” persuasion—among others, Théophile Gautier (1811-1872), Gustave Flaubert (1821-1880), Émile Zola (1840-1902), and, finally, in a coda that belatedly returns the study to one of its literary-cultural nodes of origin, Charles Baudelaire himself. An intermediate version of the study is published in 1908, mainly to update the chapter on Joris-Karl Huysmans, who had died in 1907.¹⁵

In wresting *fin-de-siècle* French poetry from a semantics of “decadence,” whose varieties of purulence he explicitly moralizes in his introduction to the study,¹⁶ Symons prefaces his chapters with a reverential nod to the Scottish satirist and philosopher Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) and he ends, for a reader invested in the 19th-century prehistory of 20th-century modernism, in an

¹⁴ Idem 9-20

¹⁵ Idem xiv

¹⁶ Idem 4; Max Nordau’s *Entartung* [*Degeneration*] (1892) was seminal in the socio-historical period of *fin-de-siècle* Europe, but I am not able to engage it in this given time constraints.

anticipatory relation to the French Anglicist and modernist translator Valery Larbaud (1881-1957). "It is in and through Symbols that man, consciously or unconsciously, lives, works, and has his being: those ages, moreover, are accounted the noblest which can the best recognise symbolical worth, and prize it highest" So reads Symons's epigraph to the 1899 edition of his book, an explicit homage to the third chapter of Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* (1836), which Carlyle titled, simply, following the logic of the book's sartorialist title ("tailor re-tailored"), "Symbols." Undoubtedly, a strain of Victorian-era moralism—wedded to 19th-century imperialism—runs from Carlyle to Symons even as Carlyle's half-credulous parody, in *Sartor Resartus*, of German Idealist philosophies of life seems to ground itself ever more sincerely in Symons's symbolist manifesto, his imperative, that is, to read for the magical spirit animating French *fin-de-siècle* verse.

From the contemporary critical angle of what Bruce Robbins has offered as a globalist hermeneutic of "*comparative cosmopolitanisms*," or more crisply (following James Clifford), *discrepant cosmopolitanisms*, we might say that Carlyle and Symons belong to a school of 19th-century cultural criticism on the model of Matthew Arnold and Max Weber. The Arnoldian-Weberian "disinterested" approach to scripting a hierarchy of culture and a teleology of progress is in and of itself a manifestation of "*unworldliness*," Robbins reminds us, one whose Eurocentrist orthodoxy still does not find itself rectified by "pietizing" ethnographic accounts of subaltern history or "agency"-conferring rewritings of

cross-cultural encounter and violence.¹⁷ Instead, Robbins argues, globalist scholars of literature and culture may find better ideological, ethical, and institutional orientation by espousing an idea of critical “situatedness-in-displacement”: “By suggesting that there is no right place to stand, it can take some of the moralism out of our politics.”¹⁸ This is the “politics” which inevitably underwrites any globalist account of literary-cultural production and reception. Robbins’s essay, “Comparative Cosmopolitanisms,” and the important collection of criticism to which it belongs, which Pheng Cheah and Robbins himself co-edited, *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation* (University of Minnesota Press: 1998), is indexed to emergent forms of academic and non-academic “political correctness” in the 1990s, yet its force is no less powerful today, at global scale, amidst increasingly reactionary forms of retrenchment into nationalism and parochial localism.

Here, still, in French *vers libre* and prose-poetry of the late nineteenth century, which, Symons claims, emanates from Nerval, “[d]escription is banished that beautiful things may be evoked, magically; the regular beat of verse is broken in order that words may fly, upon subtler wings.” Literature of this time and place, Symons continues, “speak[s] to us so intimately, so solemnly, as only religion had hitherto spoken to us . . . with all the duties and responsibilities of the sacred ritual.”¹⁹ While sanctimonious, surely, Symons’s lexicon of sanctity—the invocation of the “sacred” with which he concludes his introduction to the

¹⁷ Robbins 246, 250-1

¹⁸ *Idem* 250, 261

¹⁹ Symons 5

study—pulls Giorgio Agamben’s transhistorical analysis of the juridical politics of sacredness (the *homo sacer* of the Western political tradition) into the foreground of this symbolist prelude to Waugh in the global *cosmopolis* of World War II. I suspend that important connection for the moment, however, in order to bookmark it as a critical site to which I will return in my readings of persecution and genocide in Waugh’s war fiction. Suffice it to say that two joined pillars buttress Symons’s account of French *symbolisme*, each of which is grounded in a kind of enlightened magical thinking: the “sacred” quality of symbolist “ritualist” language and the Eastern mysticism from which that “sacred ritual,” Symons imagines, is originally sourced. Where Nerval may be seen as the inspirational germ of symbolist experiment in language, Villiers de L’Isle-Adam (1838-1889) is the poet who returns the mysticism implicit in (French) symbolist language to its imagined geographical origin—the East. “The belief of Villiers is the belief common to all Eastern mystics,” Symons writes, with a knowingness Said might classify as falling somewhere between imperialist “sympathetic identification” with the “Orient” and imperialist appropriative taxonomies of “Oriental” lands, peoples, and institutions of knowledge.²⁰ To demonstrate what he means by “Eastern mysticism,” Symons continues with a list of sophistic platitudes.²¹ Nested between the “aristocratic” bearing of the East and the “democratic” bearing of the West, Villiers tended ever asymptotically toward the East, as Symons alleges: Villiers “turned the

²⁰ *Orientalism* 118-120

²¹ Symons 22-4.

world to stone, but saw, beyond the world, only a pause from misery in a Nirvana never subtilized to the Eastern ecstasy.”²²

Among literary historians of Euro-American modernism, Symons’s friendship with W.B. Yeats—the Anglo-Irish poet of whom “honourable mention” was made in Lehmann’s 1940 account—has become legendary, as the two reinforced in one another, over the course of the 1890s, a literary appreciation for mysticism, then not very much in vogue among the Rhymers’ Club members who assembled at London’s Cheshire Cheese.²³ The Rhymers’ Club’s more commonly acknowledged members include Ernest Dowson (1867-1900) and Lionel Johnson (1867-1902), along with Lord Alfred Douglas (1870-1945)—also known as “Bosie,” the ephebic young poet for whom Oscar Wilde went to trial, on accusation of the criminal offense of sodomy, in 1895, and for whom he wrote the famous *De Profundis* (1897) out of Reading Gaol. These are the “men of ‘the nineties’” to whom Ezra Pound makes reference in an essay he titles “The Hard and Soft in French Poetry,” published in *Poetry* magazine in February of 1918. Writing at the intersection of English and French poetics, and often dwelling on their deep and interlacing histories, Pound identifies in Gautier’s proto-*imagiste* collection of poetry, *Emaux et Camées* (*Enamels and Cameos*; 1852), the aesthetic seed of the later Rhymers’ Club movement. In *Emaux et Camées*, Gautier “exhorts us,” Pound writes, “to cut in hard substance, the shell and the Parian [marble]”; and he concludes, “[Gautier’s] earlier work did in France very much

²² Symons 3

²³ *Eminent Domain* 25-6

what remained for the men of ‘the nineties’ to accomplish in England.”²⁴ Gautier, we may recall, had offered the credo of *l’art pour l’art* in the preface to his *Mademoiselle de Maupin* as early as 1835, thus fructifying, it seems, a post-Enlightenment French aesthetics of self-reflexive aestheticism that crossed the channel into London and had a robust after-life on the scene of late-Victorian London.

Frequenting London’s Cheshire Cheese and its Café Royal, both home to the members of the Rhymers’ Club, Symons finishes *The Symbolist Movement* in June 1899. Yeats, together with Ernest Rhys, had founded the literary collective in 1890. As a fellow sympathetic believer in mystical possibilities, it comes as little surprise, then, that Symons dedicates his book to Yeats: it is “both as an expression of a deep personal friendship and because you [Yeats], more than anyone else, will sympathise with what I say in [this book]” that he does so, seeing Yeats as his most “perfectly sympathetic reader.”²⁵ Following recent Euro-American modernist scholarship, it seems reasonable to assign Symons and Yeats to a rearguard of modernist literary-cultural production, one which sits flexibly on the cusp of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and one which “affiliates,” according to the non-reproductive logic of Said’s secularist criticism, the variously “high” and “late” modernist generations that are to come.²⁶ Further to the point of Symons’s and Yeats’s strong proto-modernism, it is notable that they were born in the same year (1865) and that they share a semi-

²⁴ *Literary Essays* 285

²⁵ Symons xix-xx

²⁶ *The World the Text and the Critic* 16-24

peripheral relation to the London metropole. Symons is originally from Milford Haven, in Wales, and Yeats, one of the prime movers behind Irish Revivalism at the turn of the nineteenth century, is descended from the historically Protestant-English class of landed aristocracy that had for centuries made its home in Ireland.

Where Symons's *Symbolist Movement* brings Paris, in one version, to *fin-de-siècle* London, Valery Larbaud brings "high"-modernist Euro-America to Paris in the first decades of the twentieth century. Proficient in half-a-dozen languages, Larbaud famously oversaw translations of James Joyce (*Ulysses* and *Finnegan's Wake*) and William Faulkner into French, and was a crucial agent in helping to ensure these writers' popularity in contemporary French reading circles. Larbaud also moved across the centuries: he introduced and promoted, in France, the works of the iconoclastic British satirist Samuel Butler (1835-1902) and select Euro-American romanticist writings. In addition to Henry James, whose short story *The Figure in the Carpet* (1896) serves as her template for a distanced reading practice at global scale, Pascale Casanova names Valery Larbaud an inspirational "patron"—taken together, James and Larbaud comprise a "dual patronage"—for the grand *République mondiale* she pens out of Éditions du Seuil in 1999.²⁷ Suggesting convergences among the social sciences, a then incipient Digital Humanities, and more traditional "humanist" approaches to close reading, Casanova's book is often acknowledged as something of a

²⁷ Casanova 6

watershed event for globalist literary study. For Casanova, Larbaud—a self-appointed member of the “cosmopolitan clergy” of the twentieth century and a Renaissance Man who fashioned himself rather boldly in descent from the ecumenicism of Saint Jerome (translator of the Hebrew Bible into the Latin of the Vulgate)—is one of the “true architects of the universal.”²⁸ By this Casanova means that he is an intermediary figure, a translator who mediates between and among national cultures and languages and therefore unifies, *universalizes*, in the iterative globalist process through which a literary world republic is made: *littérisation*. For Casanova, Larbaud is a crucial agent in the international space of literary history which her book organizes according to the temporal metric of a “literary Greenwich meridian” that is keyed, however myopically, to a European (most often Parisian) center and non-European periphery.²⁹ Further, while Casanova, in *The World Republic of Letters*, does not engage the Global East with the comprehensiveness she brings to bear on the Global West, her work indicates continuity with Edward Said’s evaluation of the West’s “Orient” in the preceding decades. It is perhaps rather idolizing yet ultimately appropriate, I think, to say that Said lives ever forward in the role he served as Casanova’s general editor for the English-language edition of the book. This monograph came out of Harvard University Press in 2004, with M. B. Debevoise acting as translator.

Inspired by an idea of cosmopolitan worldliness, the *fin-de-siècle* mysticism that Symons and Yeats share is one which is, in fact, I am proposing, recovered

²⁸ Idem 142

²⁹ Idem 87-103

and resituated in the context of what Jed Esty has called the “anthropological turn” of “late” Euro-American modernism. Esty periodizes “late” Euro-American modernism in an historical bracket that has been illuminating for me, and which I have adopted for my own project in global modernism—namely, the years 1930-1960. With Mackay, Esty reads the “late” Euro-American modernism of the later careers of the “high” modernists T.S. Eliot and Virginia Woolf along with an assortment of writers belonging to Cunningham’s Auden Generation. (It is worth noting that MacKay’s book is published three years after Esty’s first, and while she very much appreciates his work in the common literary-critical ground they share, she chides him for giving short shrift to the British political experience of World War II.³⁰) Let us give Esty the space to elaborate his claim:

[T]he anthropological turn of 1930-1960 consolidates a second-order universalism based on English cultural integrity. If the primary universalism of the metropolitan era turned on the sovereign subject of a border-crossing, myth-making imperial humanism, then this new second-order humanism turns on the representative status of a bounded culture. The afterlife of British hegemony is written into this new language of cultural exemplarity, so that Englishness represents not just a type, but the very archetype, of modern nationalism, of deep and integral shared traditions emanating from within the prototypical industrial class society. Within this trajectory, the late modernists of the contracting English center, with their self-conscious and balky

³⁰ Mackay 17

reintegration into insular culture, stands as a kind of paradigm of the historical fate of European universalism in its classic form.³¹

Although 20th-century England's "archetypal" relation to "modern nationalism" is no doubt up for debate, I take Esty's "second-order universalism" as an indispensable tool with which to read both the insularity and the cosmopolitan internationalism of Evelyn Waugh in the context of World War II. By "second-order universalism," Esty means a secondary or minor version of the universalist ethics and politics governing the first expropriations of European empire in the centuries preceding the twentieth. As Esty acknowledges in both the introductory and concluding remarks of his book, *A Shrinking Island* is conceptually indebted to David Lloyd's scholarship on the life and afterlife of 19th-century aesthetics and politics, which crystallizes in his *Anomalous States: Irish States and the Post-Colonial Moment* (Duke University Press: 1993).³² That which Lloyd (following Sartre) had inspired in Esty was the crux of the interrelation between the devolution of "high" aesthetics (as idealized in, for example, Goethe, Schiller, and Arnold) and the demise of global imperial power. What happens in this helpful literary-political graph, then, is that the famously difficult articulations of "high"-modernist literary culture (recall Waugh's diary: Eliot is "marvellously good but very hard to understand") will mark the "high" point—more precisely, the *highest* point—of a progress model of cultural history. This is a *ne-plus-ultra* moment of artistic sophistication and abstraction which

³¹ *A Shrinking Island* 14

³² *Idem* 11-13, 224

coincides, importantly, with the beginning of the end of European colonialism. And when both culture and empire peak, there is nowhere to go but down. Enter Euro-American “late” modernism and, for British writers at mid-century, the *English* nativist “anthropological turn.” And enter, as broad context, the global postcolonial era.

Esty’s book title is a self-conscious allusion to Hugh Kenner’s earlier work on the same period of British literary history, *A Sinking Island: The Modern English Writers* (1987; Alfred A. Knopf: 1988). Yet where Lloyd serves as positive inspiration, Kenner—for whom Great Britain, at mid-century, had *sunk* rather than *shrunk*—serves as a negative provocation. In the opening pages of *A Shrinking Island*, Esty makes clear that he is not invested in what he calls the “one-directional humanist schema of [Britain’s] exalted devolving into the petty-banal” that Kenner had authorized. Rather, he is writing a “mixed history of contraction and consolidation.”³³ While Kenner’s account of British “devolution” is, in an important sense, the downward-facing end of the parabolic curve which Esty mobilizes in his own account of the same years of British literary and cultural history, the difference would fall in the critical sense made of the negative slope line of British “late” modernism: this literature may be read not as “aesthetic decline,” Esty argues, but as “cultural revival.”³⁴ In Esty’s retelling of Kenner’s tale, British culture does not, as his predecessor would have constructed it, enter obsolence under the pressure of dying empire and

³³ *Idem* 8

³⁴ *Ibid.*

insurgent mass politics. Instead, Britain comes home to roost in the “anthropological” self-reflexivity of a culture which begins to study itself as its own object, and to begin, consequently, to write an English-speaking “modernism” in new ways. Hence the rise of British Cultural Studies à la Stuart Hall and Raymond Williams, themselves “new” types of English men as respectively Jamaica-born and Welsh. Esty explains: “Cultural Studies emerges in the fifties with a historical vocation to translate the language of British universalism into the language of English particularism.”³⁵ The binocular vision of empire has been reversed, therefore, from what one might call a “presbyopic view of cultural totality (i.e., fuzzy at home, vivid overseas)” to one in which the “particular” and *minor* status of English culture gets read up close while leaving opaque the subjects and the cultures of Britain’s former empire.³⁶

Whither *fin-de-siècle* cosmopolitanism-cum-aestheticism in this story of “late” modernist England’s ethnographic self-fashioning? How does the language of symbolist mysticism inhabit the same global space as World War II? These historical literary-cultural currents are recovered in Waugh’s war fiction, I am arguing, in the figure of an archetypal queer character, an aesthete who lives history forward into the present time of a Great Britain at war both with and in the world. For those familiar with Evelyn Waugh’s corpus, it is worth noting here that in this chapter I do not offer an analysis of Waugh’s *Brideshead Revisited* (1945). Written between October 1943 and June 1944 while Waugh moves in and

³⁵ *Idem* 21

³⁶ *Ibid.* Across global history / narrative: Connection with Alex Woloch, *The One vs. the Many* (Princeton UP: 2003).

out of active service in the British military, and published in its trade edition after Germany's surrender to the Allied powers (spring 1945) and before Japan's (summer 1945), *Brideshead Revisited* certainly does share an immediate context of global war with the novels that I am reading in this chapter.³⁷ What's more, the novel writes up a robust version of the queer aesthete "type" who forms the subject of my analysis. But Waugh's account of the war in *Brideshead Revisited*—first titled *The Household of the Faith* for the novel's romantic preoccupation with the Anglo-Catholic Marchmain family—is relegated to the marginal space of a frame story which, while serving a crucial function as the prompt for the novel's concatenation of memories stemming from 1920s Oxford and the interwar period, does not, however, situate Waugh in the mid-century modernist context in which I am engaged in reading him. The mid-century modernist context, that is, which reads Waugh in a critical moment of globalist "late" modernism. Here, in Waugh's relevant war fiction, the literary-cultural precedents of *fin-de-siècle* Orientalist Europe are the instrument through which a particular brand of mid-century English domestic culture gets written. The articulations of "late" modernist social realism in which I am invested, and which Waugh models in his British war fiction, are *local* refractions of distanced ethnography and distant war-bound suffering.

In a letter dated 18 April 1958, Waugh writes to his friend and fellow novelist, Arthur Baldwin ("Frisky"), the *Earl* Baldwin, "There is an aesthetic

³⁷ Patey 208-12; 221; ref. to Anthony Blanche TK.

bugger who sometimes turns up in my novels under various names—that was 2/3 Brian 1/3 Harold Acton.”³⁸ “Brian” is Brian Howard (1905-1958) and “Harold Acton” (1904-1994) is as Waugh calls him in full reference. Howard had died the year of the letter, 1958, and Waugh’s letter to Baldwin remembers him well. All part of the “aesthete” set at Oxford in the 1920s, Howard, Acton, and Waugh were pals as undergraduates. Waugh had arrived at Oxford in January 1922 with a promising History Scholarship to Hertford College; but, to the detriment of actually reading the histories of the past, he socialized his academic tendencies in such drinking societies as the Hysteron-Proteron Club, which performed “reverse” days of waking to evening dress and breakfasting before bed, and the Hypocrites’ Club, which took its dipsomaniacal motto from Pindar’s *Olympian Odes*—“Water is Best.” Himself an “aesthetic bugger” among aesthetes, Waugh, one of his biographers tells us, “defied convention in polo-neck jumpers and Oxford bags.”³⁹ And, in true Wildean *fin-de-siècle* fashion, Waugh had love affairs not only with Richard Pares (Waugh’s first boyfriend, Pares was later to become the next-generation historian in a family of eminent historians⁴⁰), but Alastair Hugh Graham (1904-1982) and Harold Acton as well. Saluting the Victorian-era aesthetic which they had shared in youth, Acton scribbled, to Waugh, a personalized note in the first volume of his *Memoirs of an Aesthete* (Methuen: 1948). For Waugh, Acton wrote, with a nod to one of the fathers of

³⁸ *Letters* 506

³⁹ *Hastings* 81

⁴⁰ Richard Pares (1902-1958) is the son of the English historian of Russia, Bernard Pares (1867-1949).

French symbolism, "*Le faune d'un après-midi ou de plusieurs.*"⁴¹

Let us flash forward here to a London in the throes of "phoney war," that tragi-comic interlude in 20th-century British history, we may recall, that obtains between Neville Chamberlain's declaration of war on 3 September 1939 and the fall of France in June of 1940. For the historian of the Global West Eric Hobsbawm, international strategies of diplomatic appeasement and "unpragmatic" measures of national protectionism amount to a period of "black tragicomedy" that extends back several months earlier, to Germany's occupation of Czechoslovakia in March 1939.⁴² It is spring 1940 in *Put Out More Flags*, and, assembled at the Café Royal, one of London's gathering places for the aesthetes of a rough half-century earlier (when British painters made tableaux of "knights in armor; ladies in wimples and distress . . . 'nocturnes'"⁴³), sit Geoffrey Bentley, who is Waugh's fictional publisher in the novel, Basil Seal, who is the novel's anti-heroic protagonist, and Ambrose Silk. Having "left his persecution mania downstairs with his hat and umbrella," Ambrose Silk makes an entrance. Beaming from his "pale Semitic face,"⁴⁴ "[Silk] wore a dark, smooth suit that fitted perhaps a little closely at waist and wrists" and a "dark, white spotted bow tie"; his "shirt" is made, of course, "of plain, cream-colored silk." Posturing alongside Bentley and Seal, Silk "sat, upright and poised, with one hand on the

⁴¹ Stéphane Mallarmé, *L'après-midi d'un faune* (1876); Hastings 94; this paragraph is mostly informed by Hastings's chapter on Waugh's experience at Oxford—"An enclosed an enchanted garden," 81-112

⁴² Hobsbawm 154; here, as throughout, when naming nations, states, nation-states, or any kind of geopolitical unit, I use vocabulary that is contemporary with Waugh's mid-century writing.

⁴³ POMF 31

⁴⁴ *A Little Learning* 194; John Sutro (1903-1985), later to become a noteworthy film producer, is the only member of Waugh's "aesthete" set at Oxford whom Waugh recalls as being Jewish.

stem of his glass and one resting stylishly on the balustrade.” “Ambrose like this,” Waugh writes, “caused time to slip back to an earlier age than his own youth . . . when amid a more splendid décor of red plush and gilt caryatides *fin-de-siècle* young worshippers crowded to the tables of Oscar and Aubrey.”⁴⁵ Oscar Wilde and Aubrey Beardsley (a *japoniste* aesthete fellow-traveler with Wilde, Beardsley died young, as with many of the symbolist generation, of tuberculosis, at the age of twenty-five) we are presumed to know. Were I to be doing a literal application of Esty’s argument, in *A Shrinking Island*, that English “home” anthropology becomes the subject *du jour* for “late” British modernism, this would be an exemplary descriptive moment; when all the world has shrunk to England, one may omit surnames, in this case, for these Anglophone aesthetes, because on this small island everybody knows everybody else. However, my turn on Esty is one which works to build a cosmopolitan pre-history for 20th-century “late” Euro-American modernism, such that the retraction of England from (global) empire into (particular) island inflects Waugh’s Euro-American “late” modernism with an international slant at once historically “deep” in the Dimockian sense and entirely contemporary with the historical time of World War II.

On the model of Sontag’s classic treatment of the genealogy of queer Camp, “Notes on ‘Camp’” (1964), Silk is effeminate, mannered, and poignantly comic. “Camp,” Sontag synthesizes in the 45th note to her essay, “is the answer to

⁴⁵ POMF 221-2

the problem: how to be a dandy in the age of mass culture.”⁴⁶ Whereas “[t]he old-style dandy hated vulgarity”—the expansively pan-European and transhistorical dandy, that is, who predates the “transitional figure” of Oscar Wilde— “[t]he new-style dandy, the lover of Camp, appreciates vulgarity.”⁴⁷ Sontag’s 1960s archetype for the “new” dandyism of Camp is Waugh’s generational fellow traveler in the Auden Generation, the British-American novelist Christopher Isherwood. “Apart from a lazy two-page sketch in Christopher Isherwood’s novel *The World in the Evening* (1954),” Sontag writes in her opening remarks to the essay, “[Camp] has barely broken into print.”⁴⁸ Following Sontag’s pioneering appreciation of latter-day dandyism, Ambrose Silk is, we may say, brought to life in *Put Out More Flags* as a hybrid figure dwelling somewhere between the snobbism of Victorian-era culture and the deflated pretenses of “late”-modernist literary-cultural production. Consequently, we may reasonably conclude that “late” (alternatively new) Euro-American modernism of a “late” (alternatively new) European imperial age sits comfortably among “vulgar” Camp artifacts of niched middle- and low-brow culture—cultural objects whose peculiar ordinariness encodes a certain version of local anthropological interest.

In *Put Out More Flags*, Waugh’s social-realist third-person narrative often pries loose Silk’s interiority to have him speak his own sense of “backward” shame, to borrow a powerful qualifier from the enlightening work of queer studies scholar, Heather Love. “Why can I not speak like a man? Mine is the

⁴⁶ “Notes on ‘Camp,’” in *Against Interpretation*, 288-9

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Idem* 275

brazen voice of Apuleius' ass, turning its own words to ridicule," thinks Silk to himself when effete conversing with his bohemian circle, in London's Charlotte Street, about the contemporary controversy surrounding Auden and Isherwood's flight to the US from wartime Britain (Waugh encrypts these "late" modernists as "Parsnip" and "Pimpernell" in his novel).⁴⁹ Much like the satirical writer of "late" modernism who created him, Silk evinces here aspects of satirical craft in the novelistic discourse of which he is made in the novel. Silk's self-mocking reference to "Apuleius' ass" calls up the 2nd-century satirical novel (Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*) which Northrop Frye has classed, in his *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton University Press: 1957), as approximately "satire of the high norm"; in Frye's extensive scheme, Waugh's own satirical writing is something of a "parody of tragic irony."⁵⁰ With possible intertextual significance for the modernist theme of what I'm calling reverse-anachronism, here is another revealing moment in the discursive universe of Silk's shame-ridden identification as a "cosmopolitan, Jewish pansy": "But Ambrose, thought Ambrose, what of him? Born after his time, in an age which made a type of him, a figure of farce; like mothers-in-law and kippers, the century's contribution to the national store of comic objects."⁵¹

Let us return to our scene in the Café Royal, turning our attention to the

⁴⁹ Rachel Galvin, *News of War: Civilian Poetry 1936-1945* (New York: Oxford UP, 2017) ref. TK.

⁵⁰ Frye 234-5, 48

⁵¹ *POMF* 86, 46; see Pound's "Hugh Selwyn Mauberley" (1920), "Siena Mi Fe', Disfecemi Maremma": "For two hours [Monsieur Verog] talked of Gallifet; / Of Dowson; of the Rhymers' Club; / Told me how Johnson (Lionel) died / By falling from a high stool in a pub . . . M. Verog, out of step with the decade, / Detached from his contemporaries, / Neglected by the young, / Because of these reveries."

aesthete's manifesto which Silk, however haltingly, declaims to his small audience. "The great catch in the throat of English lyric poetry is just *fog*, my dear, on the vocal cords. And out of the fog we could rule the world; we were a Voice, like the Voice of Sinai smiling through the clouds. Primitive peoples always choose a God who speaks from a cloud."⁵² So goes Silk's eulogy for British romantic poetry in the high age of British empire. Were it not for his "persecution mania," his alienation from heterosexist masculinity and contemporary British-Anglican society more generally, Silk might as well—for a critic invested in the imperial histories that agitate postcolonial critique—be an aesthetic footnote to the stalwart imperialism of Macaulay's *Minute Upon Indian Education* (1835). Silk's minoritized sex/gender finds its racialized counterpart, moreover, in Waugh's Orientalization of Silk's Camp persona—Silk wears "crêpe-de-Chine pajamas" and quotes from apocryphal "Chinese scholarship" in the course of his aesthete's manifesto at the Café Royal.⁵³ In addition, the fact that Waugh uses the contemporary Chinese writer, translator, and general polymath Lin Yutang (1895-1976) as the source for his epigraphs to *Put Out More Flags* makes Silk's queer and dated Sinophilia an expression of not only Anglo-French post-Enlightenment (*fin-de-siècle*) Orientalist epistemology but mid-20th-century "new"-imperialist/"late"-modernist literary culture—Waugh's own historical moment—as well.⁵⁴ In a deft rendering of his bathetic wit, Waugh concludes Silk's disquisition with Seal's mishearing of Silk's "fog" as "*frog*." "They're [the

⁵² POMF 222

⁵³ Idem 251, 224

⁵⁴ On Waugh's Chinese connection while he's writing *POMF*, see Patey 386 fn 19.

French] are eaten hollow with communism,” Seal starts up.⁵⁵ Seal’s bumbling intellectualism is stopped by Bentley, who acts as referee between Silk’s aesthetic nostalgia and the cosmopolitan experience which Seal alleges he’s had over the course of the novel.⁵⁶

This scene at the Café Royal falls in the third chapter of *Put Out More Flags*. In the novel, Waugh plots the historical interim of September 1939-June 1940 in four tidy chapters and four tidy seasons—fall, winter, spring, and summer. Between the German invasion of Poland and its occupation of France, an incredulity amongst British civilians, military personnel, and politicians, all of whom could not or would not believe that *world* war might be upon them for a *second* time, presides. One might say that Marx’s famous turn on Hegel, that “all world-historic facts and personages appear, so to speak, twice. . . the first time as tragedy, the second time as farce,” gains new relevance in Waugh’s British “late”-modernist spin on Marx.⁵⁷ For Waugh, then, something like farce is the “late”-modernist vehicle for not only Silk’s queer fate (recall Silk’s Waugh-mediated self-description: “[b]orn after his time . . . a figure of farce; like mothers-in-law and kippers”), but, too, for the tireless manipulative exploits of the novel’s anti-heroic protagonist, Basil Seal. It is, after all, Seal who consigns

⁵⁵ *POMF* 223

⁵⁶ *Idem* 55: “From time to time [Seal] disappeared from the civilized area and returned with tales to which no one attached much credence—of having worked for the secret police in Bolivia and advised the Emperor of Azania on the modernization of his country. Basil was in the habit, as it were, of conducting his own campaigns, issuing his own ultimatums, disseminating his own propaganda, erecting about himself his own blackout; he was an obstreperous minority of one in a world of otiose civilians. He was used, in his own life, to a system of push, appeasement, agitation and blackmail, which, except that it had no more distant aim than his own immediate amusement, ran parallel to Nazi diplomacy.”

⁵⁷ *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1852), ch. 1: Feb. 1848-Dec. 1851.

Silk to his ultimate fate of compulsory political exile, in neutral Ireland, toward the close of the novel. Seal manipulates the credulous Silk into expanding and publishing, in the *Ivory Tower* literary magazine which Silk, Bentley, and Bentley's senior publishing partner, co-found as "something like the Old Yellow Book" (an 1890s British periodical of aestheticist suasion), the homage he had written for his former lover in Munich, "Hans." Silk's homage, "Monument to a Spartan," must be chiseled into a "triumphant paean of Nazi youth," a veritable "apotheosis of Nazism," Seal tells his ostensible friend.⁵⁸ For Seal, Silk's susceptibility to the dulcet tones of an ever-elusive "pure Art,"⁵⁹ make him great prey in his own temporary war-effort employment at London's Ministry of Information. "I think, sir, you promised to make me a Captain of Marines if I caught a fascist," insists Seal to his supervisor at the Ministry's War Office, once he's sure he's trapped Silk; of course, the "fascist" Seal catches is one he has himself made sure to coax into existence.⁶⁰

In Waugh's corpus, Seal's fictional life begins with his travels in Azania

⁵⁸ POMF 244

⁵⁹ Idem 237

⁶⁰ Idem 245; for Waugh's own conservative views on the political semantics of "fascism" (which has its etymological origin in the Latin *fascēs*, meaning the bundled wooden rods to which an axe was attached, in ancient Rome, to signal the military and political authority of the lictors who carried them before their superior magistrates), see his op-ed in *The New Statesman*, 5 March 1938, which I excerpt from here. In the European chronology of the lead-up to war, one may recall that at this date, the *Anschluss* is one week away. "There was a time in the early twenties," Waugh writes, *EAR* p. 223, "when the word 'Bolshie' was current. It was used indiscriminately of refractory schoolchildren, employees who asked for a rise in wages, impertinent domestic servants, those who advocated an extension of the rights of property to the poor, and anything or anyone of who the speaker disapproved. The only result was to impede reasonable discussion and clear thought. I believe we are in danger of a similar, stultifying use of the word 'Fascist' . . . only once was there anything like a Fascist movement in England; that was in 1926 [the year of the Trades Union strike in the United Kingdom] when the middle class took over the public services; it now does not exist at all except as a form of anti-Semitism in the slums. Those of us who can afford to think without proclaiming ourselves 'intellectuals' do not want or expect a Fascist regime. But there is a highly nervous and highly vocal party who are busy creating a bogey; if they persist in throwing the epithet around it may begin to stick."

(an island off the Somali coast), in *Black Mischief* (1932), and ends in *Basil Seal Rides Again* (1963). Rather poignantly, *Basil Seal Rides Again* is Waugh's last work of fiction, and it is one whose publication the writer engineered to coincide with his own sixtieth birthday—only two years before his death.⁶¹ For the contemporary critic Alan Pryce-Jones, writing his literary review of *Put Out More Flags* in *The New Statesman* in April of 1942, Waugh, like Basil Seal, exhibits “a knowledge of the world which can traffic in the dodges of three iniquitous continents.”⁶² Indeed, we can certainly conjecture that behind Seal's international jaunts lives Waugh's own multifarious career as a “late” or mid-century modernist. Contemporary and future reading publics knew him primarily as a British novelist and critic (of the arts and politics) and, secondarily, in the 1930s, as a globe-trotting journalist. Noteworthy within this career of international reportage is Waugh's ongoing engagement with Abyssinia. Waugh travels to Abyssinia three times over the course of the 1930s: first, in the autumn of 1930 to report the coronation of Ras Tafari as “Haile [Emperor] Selassie”; and then again, in rapid succession, in 1935 and 1936 to report the escalation of hostilities between Italy and Abyssinia that resulted in the Second Italo-Abyssinian War (1935-1936). As Abyssinian correspondent for *The Times*, *The Daily Mail*, and *The Daily Express*, among other print-news outlets, Waugh's international travel in

⁶¹ Patey 359

⁶² CH 215; among other literary-cultural work as a biographer, librettist, and poet, Pryce-Jones served as editor of the *Times Literary Supplement* (1948-59), and as book critic for the *New York Herald Tribune* (1963-6). See also Patey, p. 58: “Thus was born the tenacious myth of Waugh's wholly playful ‘early novels’ which, as Alan Pryce-Jones claimed in 1964 [*Commonweal*, 4 Dec. 1964, 343], ‘do not assert any values at all, except those of the Lord of Misrule.’”

this decade feeds directly into much of his writing during the interwar period—*Remote People* (1931), *Black Mischief* (1932), *Waugh in Abyssinia* (1936), and *Scoop* (1938).⁶³ Before World War II, Waugh's global ventures writing in and of Abyssinia are matched and expanded through travel to British Guiana, Brazil, Morocco, Mexico, and Hungary.

Waugh joins the British Royal Marines in December of 1939, and, after serving with little military distinction in various sectors, including Commandos, is officially demobilized half-way through 1945. As such Waugh witnesses—and to a limited extent participates in—the Battle of Dakar (September 1940), the Battle of Bardia (January 1941), and the Battle of Crete (May-June 1941). Waugh writes *Put Out More Flags*, in fact, right after the Battle of Crete, in the brief span of a month aboard a troopship sailing from Crete to Liverpool.⁶⁴ Later, in 1944, after an extended interval spent on the English “home front,” Waugh is part of the British Military Mission to Yugoslavia in support of Tito's Partisans. These global military experiences are written directly into the *Sword of Honour* trilogy, which I turn to below, suggesting linkages at once literary-cultural and broadly political with *Put Out More Flags*. As with his work in international journalism during the interwar years, Waugh's experience as a combatant enlisted to various international fronts channels directly into his novelist's imagination; the net effect, in the war trilogy, is historical-realist literature informed by no less than testimonial experience. A “late”-modernist British writer working at

⁶³ Patey 87

⁶⁴ *Idem* 191

empire's end, Waugh's insular Englishness continues to be palpable alongside an emergently "late"-imperialist appetite for the exotic, most often condescendingly rendered, cultural objects of the global periphery. For Waugh, in these signal pieces of "late"-modernist war fiction, such distant cultural objects comprise both the homosocial and exotic spaces of *fin-de-siècle* Europe and the war-bound atrocity stories of genocide and stateless persons which his British cast of characters experience as constant news of war.

II) Writing Big Margins for Global War in the *Sword of Honour* trilogy

This trilogy, Waugh writes in its preface (which he pens from his home in Combe Florey, in the parish of Somerset, two years before *Sword of Honour* goes to press), is a recension of three war novels all of which had been conceived, written, and published in the years immediately following World War II. These war novels were titled *Men at Arms* (1952), *Officers and Gentlemen* (1955), and *Unconditional Surrender* (1961); of these titles, the trilogy preserves just "Officers and Gentlemen" in name, as the title of its seventh chapter (out of eleven total).⁶⁵ All were published in Great Britain through Chapman & Hall, which had published *Put Out More Flags* as well, in 1942, almost twenty-five years before it put the trilogy in print. Chapman & Hall was indeed Waugh's most frequent

⁶⁵ Patey, p. 4: With a tinge of Sophoclean fatalism, Chapman & Hall had hired Waugh's father, Arthur Waugh, the year before Waugh's (Arthur Evelyn St. John's) birth on 28 October 1903, in the London suburbs surrounding Hampstead.

British publisher and it had been, in the high-imperial Victorian era we've been tracing as one contributory pre-history to Euro-American "late" modernism, the eminent British publisher of Thackeray, Trollope, and Dickens.

In his preface to the war trilogy, Waugh expresses satisfaction that the work may be read as one, integrated narrative unit, and as such remedy the "[r]epititions" and "discrepancies" that had made the war novels sometimes contradict one another: "The product [the trilogy] is intended (as it was originally) to be read as a single story."⁶⁶ Whereas Waugh, in the belated preface he writes to *Put Out More Flags* in 1966—the year of the trilogy's publication—claims that this novel was "the only book [he had] written purely for pleasure," and likewise a work in which the "characters about whom [he had] written in the previous decade came [back] to life," the trilogy may be contextualized, in the terms of *its* prefatory material, as both something of an editorial slog and as unprecedented, where characters and events occur as fresh new conceptions to their author, and always in the immediate context of the global war the trilogy charts.

Here, in that "single story" of the war trilogy, Waugh goes on in the preface to explain that, in it, he had "sought to give a description for the Second World War as it was seen and experienced by a single, uncharacteristic Englishman, and to show its effect on him."⁶⁷ In one sense, the "uncharacteristic Englishman" who centers the war story of the trilogy, Guy Crouchback, is implicitly and

⁶⁶ SH 9

⁶⁷ *Idem* 35

retroactively Waugh himself, the soldier-author of *Sword of Honour* who serves what Hayden White, following Auerbach, might call the pre-figuring *Figuralstruktur* (figure) function of real war experience that then finds its historical-realist figural apotheosis in historical fiction itself.⁶⁸ Yet where this “uncharacteristic Englishman”—alias Evelyn Waugh—is in many self-evident ways Guy Crouchback, an Anglo-Catholic outsider just like Waugh,⁶⁹ the designation is encrypted also into the trilogy in the figure of the archaistic soldier and deliciously bad writer “Major-Corporal” Ludovic, who is the subject of much of my analysis in this section.

Recall that Ludovic is *Sword of Honour*’s fictional analog to Ambrose Silk in *Put Out More Flags*. Both Ludovic and Silk are queer “writer” characters who stand in peripheral relation to the centers of contemporary historical time and to a standardized late/new-imperialist moral perfectionism inherent to post-1900 British liberal discourse and ethicist politics. In their minor British articulations of a wide-ranging politics of exclusion, Waugh’s “home-anthropological” cyphers for distant humanitarian crimes occurring elsewhere. Although we have not yet addressed how such crimes get told in *Put Out More Flags*, I have intentionally reserved this sub-plot in order to read it alongside Waugh’s telling of a similar crisis in the war trilogy’s “Last Battle” chapter. In this penultimate chapter—the last one of the British war period, since the *very* last one, “Unconditional Surrender,” brings us to *postwar* London—Ludovic’s “late”-

⁶⁸ White 93, 50; on “alternative” (male) Englishness: Ian Baucom, Simon Gikandi ref TK.

⁶⁹ Patey 35: Waugh was received into the Roman Catholic Church on 29 September 1930.

modernist writerly achievements merge in diegetic time with Guy Crouchback's encounter with Jewish refugees who have been stranded in Yugoslavia.⁷⁰

As homosexual men out of joint with history and with the platitudes of benevolent liberalist politics, both Silk and Ludovic's queer and Orientalist articulations of outsiderism speak powerfully to the dialectics of exclusion and sovereignty that underwrite Agamben's transhistorical account of "bare life" in the figure of the *homo sacer*. "[T]he [concentration] camp," Agamben concludes, which brings to the surface of recent memory the deep historical time he has excavated for his analysis in the first book-length installment of his *Homo Sacer* series, "is the very paradigm of political space at the point at which politics becomes biopolitics and *homo sacer* is virtually confused with the citizen."⁷¹ Here, in the critical merger he performs between overlapping lines of inquiry in Foucault (biopolitics) and Arendt (totalitarianism), Agamben offers a formulation for the melancholy illuminations offered through the figure of the *homo sacer*, the personage—ethno-religious foreigner, sexual deviant, political prisoner, all consigned to the Nazi concentration camp—who makes evident for a modern political audience how tenuous the rational claims to basic human rights really are. The clarity which the *homo sacer* brings to the Janus-faced obscurity of a very dark modern time may be seen, moreover, to radiate, from a philological angle, from the traditionally binarized set of meanings for the Latin word *sacer*—in Roman law and philosophy, it had meant both "sacred" and

⁷⁰ Gandhi 4-16 ; more context re : British politics, philosophy (localized)—expand to Anglo-Indian convergences in (queer) late-19th c. aestheticism generally in *Common Cause*.

⁷¹ *Homo Sacer* 171

“profane.”⁷² In, so to speak, other words, a two-pronged word may be the verbal wedge into modern political duplicity of a Western post-Enlightenment stripe. Returning us to the scene of a *fin-de-siècle* Euro-America housing both homosexual persecution and Orientalist regimes of knowledge-acquisition, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick instructs us that the persecuted queer dandy, Oscar Wilde, one of our models for cosmopolitan symbolist aestheticism writ large, also dealt in consequential binaries. Sedgwick’s critical play with a semantics of “sameness” and “otherness” (“same” as the binary opposite of “other”) surrounding *homo*-sexual (“same”-sexual) identification among modern Euro-American men of letters—from Herman Melville (1819-1891) to Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) and beyond—finds a point of special relevance to my reading of Waugh’s war aesthetes in the convergence she finds among Wilde’s “orientalist” taste for Asian finery, his Irish “difference,” and his homosexual distinction.⁷³

Let us turn now to the war trilogy’s penultimate chapter, “The Last Battle.” As with *Put Out More Flags*, through which the meta-literary plot line of contemporary literary print culture serves as one of the novel’s major thematic axes (recall the political consequences of Ambrose Silk’s “Monument To A Spartan”), *The Sword of Honour* is preoccupied with the published writing it generates within its own diegesis. “Corporal-Major” Ludovic, who first appears

⁷² Idem 75-90; see also Freud’s use of “taboo” (the Polynesian equivalent of the Latin *sacer*) in *Totem and Taboo* and *Moses and Monotheism*.

⁷³ *Epistemology of the Closet* 175; D.A. Miller queer narrative for the Jane Austen “stylothete,” Barthes’ S/Z, gen. (japoniste) poststructuralism ref TK.

in Crouchback's brigade in Cape Town at the apocryphal and seemingly pre-modern rank of "Corporal of Horse," is the resident writer in the trilogy;⁷⁴ his big novel, *The Death Wish*, finally appears as a culminating event in the chapter "The Last Battle." The trilogy's resident publisher, Everard Spruce (fictional analogy to Geoffrey Bentley in *Put Out More Flags*), whose war-time literary journal *Survival*, supported by London's Ministry of Information, operates in "defence of the cosmopolitan *avant garde* [which] had become a patriotic duty in England," has just published Ludovic's heavy tome.⁷⁵ Spruce begins a dialogue about the literary reception of *The Death Wish* which is worth observing in full. His interlocutor is one of his employees at the small publishing house he maintains on Cheyne Walk in Chelsea, Frankie, a female secretary.

"You've read *The Death Wish*?" Spruce asked,

"Bits. It's pure novelette."

"Novelette?" It's twice the length of *Ulysses*. Not many publishers have enough paper to print it nowadays. I read a lot of it last night. I can't sleep with those damned bombs. Ludovic's *Death Wish* has got something you know."

"Something very bad."

"Oh yes, bad; egregiously bad. I shouldn't be surprised to see it a great success."

"Hardly what we expected from the author of the aphorisms."

"It is an interesting thing," said Spruce, "but very few of the great masters of

⁷⁴ SH 383; I'm not classifying Ian Kilbannock, the resident journalist in the war trilogy, as a writer of the same kind as Silk and Ludovic.

⁷⁵ SH 667

trash aimed low to start with. Most of them wrote sonnet sequences in youth. Look at Hall Caine—the protégé of Rossetti—and the young Hugh Walpole emulating Henry James. Dorothy Sayers wrote religious verse. Practically no one ever sets out to write trash. Those that do don't get very far."

"Another bomb."⁷⁶

Calling Ludovic's *Death Wish* "pure novelette," Frankie is cast as uninformed about the grand epic ("twice the length of *Ulysses*") that Ludovic, after years of dabbling in writing short aphorisms that recorded aspects of his prosaic experience, has just published to London's Blitzed reading public. With authorial knowledge of Ambrose Silk's queer epithet as the "Jewish cosmopolitan *pansy*" of *Put Out More Flags*, Waugh has Ludovic call his aphorisms, over the course of the trilogy, and in a vigorously reverse-anachronistic and equally funny nod to the French philosopher Blaise Pascal (1623-1662), his *pensées*; "[a] pansy sitting on its laurels," Ludovic summarizes.⁷⁷ To Silk's identification as a "Jewish cosmopolitan pansy," Ludovic appears, then, in the war trilogy, "as queer as a coot," one who queerly "wear[s] bedroom slippers all day" and "[eats] copiously and with a peculiar precision and intent care in the handling of knife and fork—'like a dentist,'" his military acquaintance, Frank de Souza, calls it.⁷⁸ What's more, Ludovic shares with Silk a contemporary—"late-modernist"—Camp idiom.⁷⁹ Within the trilogy's diegetic time-scape, Ludovic's homosexual life

⁷⁶ Idem 755

⁷⁷ Idem 567

⁷⁸ Idem 655; 383; 647

⁷⁹ *POMF* 87; *SH* 657; Mackay 124-5

seems to have begun in his role as traveling “secretary” and “valet” to Sir Ralph Brompton, the resident foreign diplomat in the series; and it seems reasonable to assume that it was Brompton who, in the ambassadorial polish he applied to Ludovic’s “tones of the barrack-room,” improved him into an accent worthy of the “officer” class. Consequently, “Ludovic had his two voices,” which, as a virtuoso of Camp versatility, the man toggles between frequently over the course of the war trilogy.⁸⁰

From a critical angle that engages and offers some furtherance to Paul K. Saint Amour’s reading of Sedgwick (herself reading the Austrian-British psychoanalyst Melanie Klein), I would understand Ludovic’s queer identification as an identification-bound impulse toward “late”-modernist “reparative encyclopedism”: it’s the residually traumatic effect of Ludovic’s queer and raced self that drives the “egregiously bad” war-time epic of the gargantuan *Death Wish*. For Saint-Amour, such “late”-modernist “reparative encyclopedism” works as an epistemophilic (equally paranoid) defense-mechanism against the “bad surprises” that are so dangerous to a traumatized psyche.⁸¹ And indeed, it is the case that we are made privy to Ludovic’s worry when we learn about the trauma he may have suffered after the Battle of Crete, when he was forced to evacuate the island with Guy Crouchback and others. (Laid up in a hospital bed, Crouchback suffers from mutism for several weeks following the evacuation; he is brought back to life when he hears the globe-trotting Mrs. Algernon Stitch

⁸⁰ SH 564-5

⁸¹ Saint-Amour 217-8; Saint-Amour does not include Waugh in his book.

speak to him in Italian. Along with general gossip, she tells him that it was Ludovic who carried him to shore at Sidi Barani.)⁸² Ludovic “had read,” Waugh tells us, “enough of psychology to be familiar with the word ‘trauma’; to know that to survive injury without apparent scar gave no certainty of abiding health.”⁸³ Rendered in Waugh’s characteristic satirical flourish, it becomes apparent that Ludovic, like Ambrose Silk before him, projects an air of “persecution mania” that we may read as originating in a variety of difficult associations and experiences.⁸⁴

In his transhistorical and transnational account of “total war” in the archive of World War II, Saint-Amour reads the literary phenomenon of encyclopedic modernism in a literary-critical trajectory that finds one important inspiration in the Enlightenment project of Diderot and d’Alembert’s 18th-century *Encyclopédie*. As with the *avant-garde* spark abiding in various forms over the long interval of Euro-American modernism, Enlightenment-era encyclopedism, Saint-Amour writes, “understood that knowledge could not be produced by denying the contingency of its arrangement, the brevity of its dominion, or the fragility of the historical conditions best suited to its persistence.”⁸⁵ With one archival foot in the French Enlightenment, Saint-Amour goes on, in *Tense Future: Modernism, Total War, Encyclopedic Form*, to offer “weak-theoretical” correctives to the towering critics of “Epic” and “Culture,” Franco Moretti and Leo Bersani, as he

⁸² SH 521-532

⁸³ Idem 570

⁸⁴ Idem 633

⁸⁵ Saint-Amour 199

reads, among other variously modernist pieces, the late fiction of Virginia Woolf, Joyce's *Ulysses*, and Ford Madox Ford's war tetralogy. The promise of a subjunctive, non-determinist historical time, which Saint-Amour makes the theoretical premise in his book, works ever and always against classically *backshadowed* historiographies that take on (among other subjects) the subject of war. Furthermore, the emphasis Saint-Amour places on recent critical theories of non-futurity-bound queer temporality, as well as his application, to the context of "total war," of Derrida's postwar, poststructuralist reflections on the epistemological consequences of nuclear power, make his most recent scholarship an indispensable resource for me in building a critical understanding of Waugh in the global and historical context of World War II.⁸⁶

Along with Saint-Amour's book, Tyrus Miller's earlier scholarship on Euro-American "late" modernism helps to contextualize, in literary-critical modernist terms, the "egregiously bad" *Death Wish* that Waugh emplots in *The Sword of Honour*. Ludovic's long novel is of course titled as an allusion to Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), who had first theorized the idea of a psychic impulse toward self-destruction in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920). Setting up a lexicon of "rationalization," "spectacle," and "laughter" as his critical context for "late" Euro-American modernism—articulated in an aesthetic range accommodating both the biting satire of Wyndham Lewis (1882-1957) and the surrealist panache of Samuel Beckett (1906-1989) and Mina Loy (1882-1966)—

⁸⁶ Idem 23-33

Miller reminds us that Freud first began to formulate his reversal of a psychoanalytic theory of “wish fulfillment” on the heels of World War I (1914-1918). When shell-shocked veterans of that war came back from the front to dreams that fulfilled no wishes whatsoever, Freud was compelled to think again about the vital energies of the human subconscious. For Freud, only an idea of what Ludovic—and behind him Waugh, in a cultural period he shares with Freud—might call “the death wish” could explain the nightmarish sleep of traumatized minds.⁸⁷ For Ludovic, it seems significant, then, that the culminating event in *The Death Wish*, the death of Lady Marmaduke, involves “no violence,” only “a protracted, ceremonious killing like that of a bull in the ring.”⁸⁸

Merging a politics of queer sex/gender [Gayle Rubin] with an Orientalist imperial history, Ludovic begins his *pensées*, which directly anticipate his *Death Wish*,⁸⁹ in Alexandria, Egypt. For Said, Alexandria is a site of strong imperial-historical resonance.⁹⁰ To establish the point of Ludovic’s proleptic inscription of the damages of 19th-century imperial history into the carnage of the World War II period, in historical-fictional terms, we may recall that Ludovic first emerges—as per my account up above—within the trilogy’s historical diegesis in the historically colonial space of South Africa’s Cape Town. Once made part of the ranks of Crouchback’s “Hookforce” brigade (named after Ben Ritchie-Hook, the brigade’s former first-in-command, who goes missing after a botched escapade at

⁸⁷ Miller 49-50

⁸⁸ SH 738

⁸⁹ Idem 439; en route from Alexandria to Crete, Ludovic writes this *pensée*: “Major Hound seems strangely lacking in the Death-Wish.”

⁹⁰ *Orientalism* 82, 244

the Battle of Dakar), Ludovic promptly moves on with his military brethren to the camp of Sidi Bishr in Alexandria. “Alexandria,” Waugh remarks acidly in the “Officers and Gentlemen” chapter, “ancient asparagus bed of theological absurdity, is now somewhat shabbily furnished with churches.”⁹¹ From Alexandria, Hookforce sails to the Battle of Crete (May-June 1941), where, as it had been with Dunkirk a year earlier,⁹² an evacuation of British military forces is bungled. Taken together, Ludovic’s emergence in Cape Town and his Mediterranean travels immediately thereafter shadow and reinforce his queer outsiderism with discursive intimations of ethno-religious difference and a history of global violence predicated on same. When Ludovic meets up again with Sir Ralph Brompton in the “State Sword” chapter—in Sedgwickian terms, we might say that this “State Sword,” Churchill’s *Sword of Stalingrad* (1943), forms a deep-historical phallic circuitry of war with the sword of Roger of Waybroke, Knight (The Second Crusade) that is Guy Crouchback’s primary inspiration as he leaves his home in Santa Dulcina delle Rocce for London in August 1939—he is fed from Brompton’s cache of “Lapsang Suchong” tea. “Bartered in what strange eastern markets, I know not,” Brompton declaims to his former lover in his love-nest on London’s Ebury Street.⁹³

Turning this chapter to a close through a reading of Waugh’s treatment of global genocide in these signal pieces of Euro-American “late”-modernist war fiction, let us suspend the war trilogy momentarily and return to *Put Out More*

⁹¹ *SH* 395

⁹² *Idem* 507

⁹³ *Idem* 15-16, 566; Sedgwick TK.

Flags, to a London at war in the spring of 1940. Ambrose Silk is, as we have already observed in significant measure, engaged in his aesthete's lecture at London's Café Royal. From the "[p]rimitive peoples" who could be ruled with the "foggy" poetics of Victorian England's imperialist politics, Silk turns his eyes to China, which stands as something of a cultural model for his cosmopolitan principles. "We must return to Chinese scholarship," he says, "Chinese scholarship deals with taste and wisdom"; "European culture has become conventional," by contrast—and "we must make it hermetic," Silk says to his small audience of men.⁹⁴ In signaling a *return* to the "hermeticism" of Chinese intellectual culture, Silk makes thoroughgoing his imperialist attitude to cultural alterity, however inflected this attitude may be with condescending appreciation for foreign charm and however much Silk may be himself, within the London context, an exoticized and self-exoticizing queer man. More largely, we might say that Silk articulates, here, at the Café Royal, a classical anthropological worldview in which ethno-religious difference registered across the straight horizon of a shared and contemporaneous historical time seems able to accommodate within it *earlier* histories, those which appear, to those inclined to see it that way, profoundly archaic, backwards, unevolved both in ontogenic (individual) and phylogenic (social) terms. This said, my interest in Ambrose Silk has less to do with the politics of his *symboliste's* brand of enlightened-imperialist magical thinking and more to do with the commentary his presence, in Waugh's

⁹⁴ POMF 224

Put Out More Flags, affords to a critical understanding of the literary-cultural politics of Euro-American “late” modernism in a time of global war. The import of Silk’s short disquisition on the Chinese has to do above all else with the textual pattern his high diction makes within the contours of the British encounter with global fascism that the novel makes part of its imaginative universe, as we may see further with a closer look.

The descriptors that Silk chooses to name grandly what “European culture” both *is* and *ought to be* (“conventional” and “hermetic,” respectively) get misapplied humorously to the literary journal, the *Ivory Tower*, which proves Silk’s downfall in the fate of “fascist” scapegoating that forces Silk into political exile. Conceived as “something like the [1890s] Yellow Book,” Silk’s *Ivory Tower* is really just the published *cahiers* of one rather self-delighted literary man: in its first and only issue, Silk, under an assortment of clever pseudonyms (“Hucklebury Squib,” “Bartholomew Grass”), writes each and every artistically reactionary article.⁹⁵ Herein, Silk’s article titled “Hermit or Choirmaster” is, Waugh tells us, “an expansion of [his] theme at the Café Royal,” only with the comic difference that “conventual” replaces “conventional” and “cenobitic” stands boldly in for “hermetic.”⁹⁶ The third term in this series of four, deriving from the Ancient Greek for “common” (*koinos*) and “life” (*bios*) and effectively meaning “monastic,” insists indeed on its own impressiveness as a synonym for “hermetic.” The first term in the series, however, “conventual,” falls short in

⁹⁵ *SH* 235, 242

⁹⁶ *Idem* 236

overreaching: *almost* “conventional,” but *not quite*—to echo Bhabha’s remarks on postcolonial mimicry in the oblique context of Waugh’s British “late” modernism: *almost the same, but not quite*—is this adjective meaning just “of or pertaining to nuns in a convent.”⁹⁷

Still, it is in the pages of the *Ivory Tower* that Silk, in “Monument to a Spartan,” is finally able to publish the story of his closeted love affair with Hans, which dates to Munich, two years prior. Germany was, at that historical juncture, being appeased by the Munich Agreement of September 1938. “To publish [the “Monument”] was a symbolic action of the laying down of an emotional burden he had carried too long,” Waugh writes. Hans, to Silk, as he commemorates him in “The Monument,” had been “affectionate, sentimental, roughly sensual, guilty; above all, Hans [had been] guilty, haunted by the taboos of the forest,” and he had afterwards “lov[ed] his comrades, finding in a deep tribal emotion an escape from the guilt of personal love.”⁹⁸ Hans had at once expiated and masked the “taboo” of his homosexuality, it appears, in the “deep tribal emotion” of homosocial military comradeship during the German lead-up to war. In the Teutonic fable Silk constructs for his former lover, what appear to be personal memories mix with what appear to be speculative reconstructions of Hans’s adolescence (in the Hitler Youth) and homosocial life (among Hitler’s Brown-Shirted *Sturmabteilung*) that Silk was not able to observe first-hand. Little matter Hans’s patriotic efforts now, though, since, as we learn early in the novel’s

⁹⁷ Gloss Bhabha.

⁹⁸ *Idem* 238

diegetic time (fall 1939), “Hans lay [now] in the unknown horrors of a Nazi concentration camp.”⁹⁹ As Silk is suffered to leave London under the rakish influence of Basil Seal, his time in Munich comes back to him as a reminder of how he, like Hans and others who orbited too close to Nazi power, end up being expunged from society, or being forced to expunge themselves. “All his life [Silk] had been an outlaw,” Waugh tells us; “and the days in Munich were still fresh in his memory when friends disappeared suddenly in the night, leaving no address.”¹⁰⁰

A victim of his own purist aestheticism, Silk is Waugh’s British—and equally minoritized—cypher for humanitarian crimes not occurring in metropolitan England but still implicating it intimately. That Silk’s *Camp* persona finds its genocidal homonym in the Nazi death *camp*s of Hans’s political fate occurs within the novel, we might say, as a terribly beautiful kind of verbal irony. Waugh’s war trilogy, too, registers the distant movements of a world at war in the refugee crisis it sketches in the “Last Battle” chapter that we have already observed as the site from which Ludovic’s “late”-modernist encyclopedic fireworks, *The Death Wish*, spring into strange life. While Ludovic is engaged in building his literary reputation in London, and working simultaneously as a commandant at a secret military training ground in Essex,¹⁰¹ Guy has been made a communications officer in the “British Mission to the Anti-Fascist Forces of

⁹⁹ Idem 46

¹⁰⁰ Idem 249

¹⁰¹ *SH* 570

National Liberation (Adriatic)."¹⁰² From the fictional Croatian town of Begoy, which Waugh plots as somewhere in the vicinity of the real Croatian town of Zagreb, Guy first encounters a vocabulary of "displaced persons":

[Guy] received a signal: *U.N.R.R.A.* [United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration] *research team requires particulars displaced persons. Report any your district.* This phrase, which was to be among the keywords of the decade, was as yet unfamiliar.

What are "displaced persons"? he asked the squadron leader.

"Aren't we all?"

He replied: *Displaced persons not understood*, and received: *Friendly nationals moved by enemy.* He replied: *One hundred and eight Jews.*

Next day: *Expedite details Jews name nationalities conditions.*¹⁰³

As Ludovic "dreamed of words and woke repeating them as though memorizing a foreign vocabulary . . . [he] had become an addict of that potent intoxicant, the English language,"¹⁰⁴ this aphoristic writer brings to novelistic culmination, in *The Death Wish*, the obsessive relationship with his native tongue that he develops post-Crete. So too, Crouchback is engaged in his own verbal encounters surrounding emergent disclosures about the realities of civilian displacement, internment, and genocide during the war. Here, in his characteristically satirical fashion, Waugh juxtaposes the comic to the serious. While Ludovic, a seemingly parodic "late"-modernist version of Diderot and d'Alembert, and equally a

¹⁰² Idem 700

¹⁰³ Idem 728

¹⁰⁴ Idem 571

decadent philologist on the model of Paul Bourget's *fin-de-siècle Essais de psychologie contemporaine*, hunts down and misconstrues "coistrel . . . coition . . . Coke-upon-Littleton" in Essex,¹⁰⁵ Crouchback, in Begoy, encounters for the first time the embodied reality of a Jewish troupe of "displaced persons." Mostly Yugoslav nationals, it turns out, these "displaced persons" are Jews who have been shuttled around and interned over the course of the war. At the point at which Crouchback first meets them, they are introduced as the survivors of massacres by the Croatian Ustachi and of forced labor by the Italian fascists.¹⁰⁶ All survive into the spring of 1944 only to end up abandoned by the British mission and the United Nations behind them.

Mme Kanyi, Waugh tells us, is from Hungary, and she and her husband were in flight to Brisbane from Central Europe when they were stopped and put in an Italian concentration camp off the coast of Croatia, on the island of Rab (this is a real island and there was a real concentration camp on it).¹⁰⁷ It is ultimately Mme Kanyi who tells Crouchback that the Yugoslav Jews, after false promises of political security were made, were carted up and brought to a place "twenty miles away": "It is not a place of good repute. It is where the Germans and Ustachi made a camp," she tells him; "They kept the Jews and gypsies and communists and royalists there, to work on the canal. Before they left they killed what were left of the prisoners—not many. Now the partisans have found new

¹⁰⁵ *Idem* 624

¹⁰⁶ *Idem* 724-5

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

inhabitants for it.”¹⁰⁸ Tito’s partisans, whom the nominally Anti-Fascist British military forces are courting as political allies, have returned the refugees to their status as disenfranchised inmates, the stripped biopolitical bodies of Agamben’s camps. In the narrative of Waugh’s penultimate chapter, “The Last Battle,” Mme Kanyi and her husband are ultimately disenfranchised, too, tried in a People’s Court for “counter-revolutionary” treason against Tito and promptly put away.¹⁰⁹ Yet her last words in Begoy ring powerfully alongside Ludovic’s London-based writing, her pronouncement forming an echo and a distant reinforcement of Waugh’s “late”-modernist aesthetic of strong despair. “Is there any place that is free from evil? It is too simple to say that only the Nazi wanted war,” Mme. Kanyi muses. “These communists wanted it too. It was the only way in which they could come to power. Many of my people wanted it, to be revenged on the Germans, to hasten the creation of the national state. It seems to me there was a will to war, a death wish, everywhere.”¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Idem 787

¹⁰⁹ Idem 792

¹¹⁰ Idem 788

Chapter 2—Imperial Women

Put out by Rokkô Press (*rokkô shuppansha*) in 1951, Hayashi Fumiko's *Floating Clouds* (*Ukigumo*), a novel about postwar Japan and the decades of imperial war that preceded it, was first released to an adoring reading public the year of its author's death. Just two years earlier, Hayashi had received the preeminent Women's Literary Prize (*joryû bungakusho*) for "Late Chrysanthemum" ("Bangiku"), a short story chronicling the plight of several modern geisha struggling to make ends meet in a postwar setting of desperation and penury comparable to that which *Floating Clouds* adopts in its framing narrative. Belated time—the historical and more locally personal time of late-imperial nation and tired citizen, native culture and minoritized existence—as well as uprooting are the postwar themes that these two stories, of withered flowers and shifting skies, center as pointedly women's issues in their immediate postwar context. Much as the volumes of writing that Hayashi left to posterity over the short span of a twenty-one year career get classified most often in the category of modern Japanese "women's literature" (*joryû/josei bungaku*), recent feminist recuperation of her life in letters seeks to redress this peripheralizing classification: of the eighty-six novels and sixty-two short stories that Hayashi published between 1930-1951, a mere 7% were first printed in *côterie* or general-interest women's journals.¹

¹ Ericson 100, Tyler 53. Ericson 33: Women's Lib, live-ins, sociology; general arc of Japanese

While doing a food tour for an article on the Iwashiya restaurant in Ginza, set to be published in the magazine *Housewife's Friend* (*Shufu no tomo*), Hayashi died of a heart attack in the twilight hours of 27-28 June 1951—the year of the publication of *Floating Clouds*. With the last serialized installment of *Floating Clouds* having gone to press just two months prior, in the venerable *Bungakukai* magazine (*Literary World*; 1936-1944; 1947-present), Hayashi left unfinished four serialized novels and a smattering of short stories—*Rippling Waves* (*Sazanami*), “A new ten-foot-square hut” (“Shin hōjōki”), *A Family of women* (*Onna kazoku*), *Food* (*Meshi*), “Raichō” (“Snow grouse”), *Shinjubo* (*Mother of pearl*), “Kiku obana” (“Chrysanthemum pampas grass”). At the time of her death, Hayashi’s contemporary, the writer and philosopher Mushanokōji Saneatsu, speculated that Hayashi’s keen desire to return to Paris, where she had visited in the first blush of success after her first major publication, drove her to work too hard in the pursuit of ever more fame and fortune; seen in hindsight, Hayashi’s record of publishing 30 pages a week over the course of her career would seem indeed to validate this argument—to keep it up, she smoked two packs a day and very often worked through the night.² Having attained celebrity status, over the course of two decades, in a literary market that had in the course of this writer’s life expanded with the consumerist demands of an increasingly mass-cultural readership in the public arts, Hayashi marked her consummate prestige by

feminism/feminist periodicals from late nineteenth century. Snarky comments about “typical” women’s (literary) traits via Ericson. Marnie S. Anderson, *A Place in Public: Women’s Rights in Meiji Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010). Donald Keene, Mostow ref. Harootunian/Sakai.

² Ericson, Joan.

enrolling, in the year before her death, her son, her only child, whom she had adopted prior to evacuating war-era Tokyo for the countryside in 1941, in the imperial Peers School (*Gakushûin*). Prior to the SCAP's (General MacArthur's) Occupation-era overhaul of Japan's constitutional monarchy—the imperial-democratic political structure that the Meiji Restoration of 1868 had established and that Japan's defeat in 1945 forced into emergent Cold War-era global relations—the school had been reserved for the children of the imperial family and their high-born fellows in the upper orders of Japan's modern class system.

So, then, in the years leading into her death had Hayashi arrived in the ranks of the imperial class—a *narikin*, a denizen of the nouveau riche since her origins were anything but high-born. In a funeral ceremony befitting Hayashi's hard-won literary celebrity, Japan's first Nobel Prize-winning author, Kawabata Yasunari, officiated the services, remarking that he wished that at his funeral, too, both the literary elite and fans from the lower orders of society, residents of the “downtown” (*shitamachi*) of Tokyo, might throng the ceremony. Known as one of the High-Modernist masterminds behind the “New Sensationist” (*shin kankaku*) literary movement, a “new” coterie aesthetics of anti-establishment “art for art's sake” that was propagated, in the early-mid 1920s, by a young Yokomitsu Riichi and Kawabata himself, Kawabata gave the solemn ceremony a most august veneer; in an earlier decade, the New Sensationists had advanced a revolutionary poetics of externalized, unmediated subjectivity.³ To Hayashi's

³ Shu-meishi: 231-275. Supplement Plotless Novel Debate: Akutagawa vs. Tanizaki (1927); cf. Christopher Bush: Ideographic Modernism (2009).

immediate postwar moment, rife with loss and the first movements of structural political and economic change, Kawabata indexed the historical memory of an earlier era of free-wheeling Taishô- and early Shôwa-era cosmopolitanism and radical artistic experimentation.

By most critical accounts, Hayashi's postwar oeuvre marks a maturation of and improvement on her earlier writing, the first ten years or so of a literary career that mined the rich autobiographical sources of a hard-scrabble youth spent, at the dawn of the twentieth century, in the peddler communities of provincial Honshû and Kyûshû. Born on 31 December 1903 (though there is conflicting evidence for the exact date), Hayashi, the illegitimate daughter of Hayashi Kiku and Miyata Asatarô, belonged in name to her matrilineal line; this unconventional matriarchal inheritance was later repeated in Hayashi's own life, when her husband, the painter Rokubin Tezuka, whom she married in 1926, altered his family registry to take his wife's family name. Having attained major literary success with the 1928-1930 serialization of her pseudo-autobiography *Diary of a Vagabond (Hôrôki)*, published in an early Shôwa-era women's journal, *Women's Art (Nyônin geijutsu, 1928-1932)*, Hayashi was off to an auspicious start at the tender age of twenty-four. Double that number and we arrive at the end of a life whose trajectory into literary and cultural celebrity, given constraints of class and gender, had been anything but foreordained. Following her first love, Okano Gun'ichi, whom she had met during her time as a student at the Onomichi Municipal Girls' High School, Hayashi left the provinces for Tokyo in 1922. Once her relationship with Okano fell out, she assumed an itinerant urban

lifestyle, switching lovers frequently and frequenting gatherings of Europhilic anarchist and surrealist artists and writers. In July 1924, the publisher of the Dadaist magazine *Damudamu*, Kanbe Yûichi, published a joint-authored pamphlet of poetry, written by Hayashi and her friend, the poet Tomotani Shizue; with some juvenile poems in print by this time, the young Hayashi felt bold enough, by the mid-1920s, to approach Uno Kôji and Tokuda Shûsei, established male writers a good deal her senior, for advice on (and financial assistance in) launching a literary career. Indeed, it was Uno Kôji who at this time gave Hayashi the life-altering advice “to write just as she spoke.” For the young Hayashi to adopt, that is, a vernacular prose style which was to become her signature feature.

From the intimate poverty of working-class origins to the collective social poverties of Japan’s postwar wasteland, then, this chapter tracks Hayashi’s life as it embeds itself within a contemporaneous global history of Japanese modernity—a world-historical history within which, yet again, modern Japanese expressions of literary-cultural modernism, or *modanizumu*, as it was transliterated from Latin script in the late 1920s, propagates itself as a mass-cultural outgrowth of twentieth-century modernity.⁴ At the intersection of local culture and transnational concourse, Hayashi Fumiko’s (late-)modernist, postwar *Floating Clouds* renders with vivid detail not only the lineaments of its author’s own fascinating life story, seen with new clarity at the end of a life, but equally

⁴ Tyler, William J.

and with broader import the precipitous history of Japan's military-imperial advances and reversals in the early decades of the Shōwa era (1926-1989). Moreover, Hayashi's appropriation of the title of Japan's "modern" classic, Futabatei Shimei's 1880s realist novel *Floating Clouds* (1887-9), in her own 1951 novel of the same name, makes evident the expansive scope of the writer's late-career historical and global resonance within a later yet continuously "modern" Japanese context. In Hayashi's *Floating Clouds*, the narrative in which this chapter's analysis of Hayashi Fumiko's place in global literary history seeks to stake its major claim, then, the author's sensitive articulations of imperial decline and new democratic, late-capitalist rebirth show as vernacular expressions of gendered and transnationally hybridized experience. As such, Hayashi's mass-cultural, middle-brow literary style, cresting into the annals of history only at the close Japan's Asia-Pacific War (1931-1945), becomes a modestly incisive and acutely political instrument through which to read the inevitable convergences of art and politics.

Modernism, Realism: Hayashi Fumiko's Metropolitan Vagabondage (1930)

Serialized in the first years of Japan's modern Shōwa period (1926-1989), Hayashi Fumiko's wildly popular *Diary of a Vagabond (Hôrôki)* recounts, in playful turns both confessional and elusive, its author's formation in the provincial mining communities of southern Japan and the booming Tokyo metropolis of the 1920s.

A testimony of personal life events written in an accessible vernacular style identifiable as feminine in voice, Hayashi's *Diary* adapts a narrative genre that had been deployed to great effect by both Heian-era (794-1185) court ladies and generic stylistic innovators whose artistic output, as Thomas Lamarre has shown, contributed to an emergent nexus of literary cultures in the East Asian archipelago of that time. During the Heian-era efflorescence of the arts—on our wager, a treasure of classical precedent for global modernism's long view of history—it was, however, most often aristocratic women's scriptive language, composed in the lexicon of "nativist" phonetic simplicity (*kana*), as distinct from the "continental" ideograms of male-identified Chinese script (*mana*), that demonstrated the unique graphic sensibility of a femininized writerly hand—(*w*)onna no te or (*w*)onnade.⁵ Sei Shônagon's *Pillow Book* (*Makura no sôshi*; c. 996) and Murasaki Shikibu's *Tale of Genji* (*Genji monogatari*; c. 1010) stand as exemplars of that period and genre. Around 1930, Hayashi Fumiko's modernist (*modanisuto*) revival of Heian-era aesthetics in her *Diary* marks a signal instance of global modernism's vast socio-realist imaginary—the inextricability, in other words, of global realism from the world of modernism.

While the political inflections of Hayashi's subaltern participation in a gendered subset of modern literary culture are powerful,⁶ I suggest reading Hayashi's text

⁵ Thomas Lamarre, *Uncovering Heian Japan: An Archaeology of Sensation and Inscription* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000), 107–13.

⁶ See Joan E. Ericson, *Be a Woman: Hayashi Fumiko and Modern Japanese Literature* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997), 25–33.

both from afar and up close in the terms of “distant” global modernism and “local,” if globally embedded, realism. Of course, this logic of itinerant “global” form (the novel, for instance) and situated “real” content (material and social ontologies) borrows from Franco Moretti’s seminal essay “Conjectures on World Literature” (2000). Yet as Moretti notes, his own sociological “conjecture” was indebted to Fredric Jameson, who was, in his turn, in the early 1990s, adapting material from Karatani Kôjin’s deconstructionist account of the “origins” of modern Japanese literature.⁷ Despite its conceptual debt to a reading of modern literature in Japan, Moretti’s model has been critiqued for its diffusionist model of Anglo-French exemplarity and inattention to critical nuance.⁸ We can supplement Moretti’s account of distant reading, then, with Harry Harootunian’s history of “co-existing or co-eval modernity” in Japan’s interwar period. Signally, Harootunian, in a Marxist cultural frame, moves beyond theories of a “retroactive” or “alternative” modernity that impose a hierarchy of value in comparative studies of the transnational twentieth century.⁹ As it reveals some theoretical affinities with Western ideologies of modernity, Harootunian’s notion of a “co-existing or co-eval modernity,” in the context of “modern” interwar Japan, also aligns with Shu-mei Shih’s logic of imperialist, “Japanized

⁷ See Franco Moretti, “Conjectures on World Literature,” in *Distant Reading* (New York: Verso, 2013), 43–62, 49–59. I am most indebted to Hoyt Long, at the University of Chicago, for elucidating this connection.

⁸ See, for instance, Elaine Freedgood, *Worlds Enough: The Invention of Realism in the Victorian Novel* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019). Freedgood attends to Moretti’s misreadings of global critics of national literatures, Karatani Kôjin among them; in this way, Moretti can be seen to perpetuate the myth of an original European genre of the novel, “seamless” in its integration of innovative narrative techniques that effectively capture realist content.

⁹ Harry Harootunian, *Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), xvi–xvii.

Orientalism” on the scene of Sino-Japanese relations in Republican China’s May Fourth Period (1915-1921).¹⁰ Taken together, Harootunian and Shih afford a broadly global and regionalist theoretical frame for situating Hayashi’s realist *Diary* as a singularly modernist-metropolitan product of the early years of Japan’s expansionist Shōwa period.

Modern(ist) Temporalities and Global Realisms

In a recent consideration of Cold War-era revivals of thirties/forties’ realism-versus-modernism debates, Joe Cleary historicizes “Eastern bloc” versus “Western bloc” polemics over realist inheritances—for the Soviets, Georg Lukács as spokesman of the working class, and for the Americans, Erich Auerbach as patron saint of wordliness—as a clash between the postwar ideologies of communism and capitalism. At the same time, in Cleary’s account, the antiestablishment experimentalism of modernist literature provided some of the core tropes of emergent postcolonial critique.¹¹ As these remarks make clear, realism and modernism do not sit inert as literary-historical signifiers, impervious to sociological change and contextual revision, but rather reconfigure themselves ever and again in new global contexts.

Jameson, for instance, has hypothesized a co-emergence of realism and

¹⁰ On Japan’s “mediation” of Occidental modernism, in Republican China, and “Japanized Orientalism” more generally, see Shu-mei Shih, *The Lure of the Modern: Writing Modernism in Semicolonial China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 16–30, 140–44.

¹¹ Joe Cleary, “Realism after Modernism and the Literary World-System,” *Modern Language Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (2012): 255–68, 263–66.

modernism in early twentieth-century Japan that, in some sense, concretizes Cleary's insights. In his essay on Natsume Sôseki's last novel, *Light and Darkness* (*Meian*), Jameson proposes that, where "modern irony"—itself often attendant upon the mysteries of linguistic and cultural translation—persists as a literary sensibility in the Euro-American tradition across the realist-modernist nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the ironic modality of the "modernist" Sôseki suggests comparison with the ironic modalities of the "modernists" Samuel Beckett and Marcel Proust.¹² Jameson then turns to a discussion of modernist temporality that has implications for discourses of realism. In a version of the East versus West polemic that Cleary sets up in the context of the Cold War, Jameson writes:

Any speculation about Sôseki ought to include a discussion of whether in Japanese social life in this period there existed the same kinds of bourgeois stereotypes about everyday life that were constructed in the West during the realist period and which had in the modern already entered into crisis and become the object of satirical or Utopian condescension. . . . [O]ne could imagine a situation, in the modernizing East, in which the construction of bourgeois everyday life (the realist moment) took place simultaneously with its modern moment. Indeed, the wondrous rhythms of the daily life of Sôseki's characters—what Genette called the iterative;

¹² Fredric Jameson, *The Modernist Papers* (New York: Verso, 2007), 307: "The unfurling of a wave of modern irony over late nineteenth-century European culture—beginning with Flaubert and Baudelaire, and then becoming the explicit program of a host of novelists from Henry James to Gide, not to speak of the relativism of newer playwrights like Pirandello or of the point-of-view poets like Fernando Pessoa, with their multitudinous personae—is a sociological event, as well, and signals the porosity of the middle classes to their Others, whether within the nation state, in the form of hostile subaltern classes, or outside it, in the form of the colonized."

what, in Proust, constructs the very idea of a routine and a daily life in the first place—are here seemingly at one with a virtually modernist distension of temporality. (*Modernist Papers* 300)

In the case of modern Japan, Jameson speculates that a modernist “distension” of the temporal order occurs more or less simultaneously with the “iterative” narrative conventions of realist verisimilitude. The new experimentalisms of Japanese modernism appear, then, to intertwine themselves with realist practices in a literary-historical dialectic of approximately synchronous historical forces across the global East and global West.

If one were to side with Lukács’s modern realism of social totality over Ernst Bloch’s modern surrealism of social fracture in their 1930s debates over the nature of the aesthetic “real,” then the bourgeois conditions of modernity should always be legible through a Marxist dialectic of unity and disunity.¹³

Importantly, this dialectic would reinstate, at a ground level, a larger history of mutually implicated realisms and modernisms. In fact, Lukács’ market-driven flux—public and material as much as private and psychological—is clearly entertained in Hayashi’s modernist-realist narrative. Quintessentially modernist in its temporal fungibility and assumptions of self-reference—“Surrounded by the din of this cafe, it was trying to even write a line in a diary,” one diary entry

¹³ See Georg Lukács, “Realism in the Balance,” trans. Rodney Livingstone, in *Aesthetics and Politics*, (New York: Verso, 2007), 28–59, 30–36.

winks to its reader; and in another, we read, “When I’ve taken care of business, I’ll take out my diary from the period and read it”—yet quintessentially realist, too, in its preoccupation with vernacular socialities and idiolects, Hayashi’s *Diary* reflects at one and the same time both modernist and realist prerequisites.¹⁴ And Hayashi writes from within a culture that is both external to Euro-America and classically sympathetic with its modern cultural programs, confirming Harootunian, Shih, and Jameson’s insights about East-West convergences. In sum, then, disfigurements of diegetic time work alongside Heian-era allusiveness to make Hayashi’s *Diary*—itself ironic in its non-aristocratic riff on classical aristocratic literacy—a global modernist text while these same modernist sleights of the time-telling hand make clear Hayashi’s own realist preoccupation with Japan’s cresting imperial modernity around the year 1930.

Lyrics, Histories, Clocks

In the *Diary*, modernist play with authorial self-reference extends to a “confessional” encryption of modern derivations of classical Heian-era form and language. In the last month that the *Diary* records, Hayashi’s itinerant narrator makes an entry that registers a striking encounter with a specter from that bygone era: “I stared in fascination at the landlady, whose teeth were blackened like in the old days” (210). Interpellating the reader all along, the story moves toward closure cyclically as it resumes the transitional season in which it

¹⁴ Hayashi Fumiko, *Diary*, trans. Joan Ericson, in *Be a Woman: Hayashi Fumiko and Modern Japanese Literature*, 119–219, 167, 208.

began—winter. At close, in the *Diary*, as the narrator meets the Heian past, a wintry context mirrors, therefore, and reinforces the beginning of the story. And in this seasonal pattern of echo and response, Hayashi adapts the lyrical sounds of Heian-era women's *uta monogatari* (poem tales) to her own modernist context (Ericson, *Woman* 59–63). In the same entry that observes Heian “blackened teeth,” the narrator sets the scene by referencing the snow that her friend and roommate, Toki-chan, welcomes with a popular song: “Though you see the swirling light snowfall drift, / It disappears, without a trace, an evanescence. / Willows may sway gently / In the spring, the dawn of the heart,” Toki-chan croons. Occasioned by the sentimental space of winter, the vocal register of this girl's lament is prefigured in the first framing poem of the story—itsself redoubled throughout the *Diary* in the several dozen lyrics interspersed throughout the narrative—that the *tanka* poet Ishikawa Takuboku (1886-1912), Hayashi's near contemporary, provides as a paratextual port-of-entry into the post-preface matter of the tale. Responding to snow, the introductory verse from Takuboku reads, “Alighting at a station at the end of nowhere, / In a bright snow / I enter a lonely town.” So celebrated, Hayashi's narrator, the writer's persona in some guise, arrives in the big city in or around the Euro-American “High Modernist” year 1922.¹⁵

¹⁵ Biographers agree that Hayashi arrived in Tokyo in 1922 (Taishō 11). With its dynamic modernist engagement of classical voice, Hayashi's *Diary* extends and amplifies the purview of Thomas Lamarre's transhistorical study of Heian-era “cosmologies” of poetic form. Lamarre's resistance to a post-facto importation of nationalist, “domesticating” discourse on the analysis of classical *waka* poetry sees an unexpected ally in the Euro-American “modernist raid on the [poetic] frame”—Pound's fragmentary inhabitations of Sappho, for instance, or his theory of *imagiste* “superposition” (see Lamarre, 1–10, 127–30).

Still, Hayashi's narrator does toe the line between Jameson's account of modernist experiment in narrative temporality and the counter-movements of a contrapuntal realist objectivism, predicated on the stiff architecture of capitalist ideology. First, concerning modernist temporality at a global scale, it is clear at the most obvious level of figural representation in the *Diary* that diegetic time is bifocal. The time of the narrative is measured in temporal regimes both "traditional" (Japanese) and "modern" (Western). A nocturnal writer, as Hayashi was herself (Ericson, *Woman* 97), the narrator observes the time: "Resting my head on the wooden pillow, I heard the two a.m. clacking of wooden clappers by the night watchman from the licensed quarters" (204). Elsewhere, in another month, it is an Austrian "cuckoo clock" that tells the hour: "I composed this poem in my head as I lay restless in bed. Downstairs, the cuckoo clock struck three" (160). Compounding this sense of vertiginous temporal bifocalism is the fact that the entries use only the structuring principle of the month to mark their sequence and progress; there are no years or days in Hayashi's "confessional" history. Proleptically, the non-differentiated cyclicity of Hayashi's narrative—recurrent wintry seasons, echoic songs—seems heavily prefigured in the symbolism of bodily marking that the young heroine observes, in the *Diary's* preface, on a thumbless prostitute who works the local mining precincts of Kyûshû. There, the narrator, then a wide-eyed child, tells, "A snake tattooed in a circle all around [the prostitute's] belly was sticking a red tongue out at the navel. This was the first time that I had ever seen such an impressive sight" (125).

Self-reflexive and meta-diegetic in its modular experiments with narrative time and authorial perspective, Hayashi's *Diary* ratifies altogether some of our canonical assumptions about modernist innovation. But it is not only in this way that we may understand the *Diary's* preoccupations.

Onna-Femme/Subaltern Feminism

A suffering realist, Hayashi's heroine often goes hungry, suggesting at the same time the wider socioeconomic implications of that experience. "Despite past declarations about honor in poverty, those last five cheap sweets failed to convince my stomach," she cries, thickening the refrain of economic struggle that runs through the story. In the same entry, Hayashi's pseudo-self continues, "Hunger and sex! Could I get a bowl of rice by doing what Toki-chan did? Hunger and sex! Wanting to cry, I chewed on these words" (213). The patent if unstated direct object of Toki-chan's "doing" is the middle-aged man that she visits in exchange for expensive gifts. Ultimately, as locally conditioned actors within a global network of imperialist modernity, the narrator and Toki-chan have divergent wage-earning trajectories: one becomes a sustainably paid writer and the other a handsomely paid escort. To get to her position as a paid writer, however, our metropolitan narrator of the provinces follows a disjointed path of temporary, low-paying employment in Tokyo. She tries to work at the Italian Embassy, as a nanny for an established Japanese writer, as a peddler of men's underwear, as a worker at a celluloid doll factory, and, recurrently throughout, as a waitress in neighborhoods bordering the edges of the urban prostitution

industry.¹⁶ Exiting regional poverty and entering economic independence at the intersection of global-metropolitan crossroads, Hayashi's realist-modernist protagonist instantiates a version of Christopher L. Hill's traveling "figure" in discourses of nineteenth-century naturalism. Hill's "formal transpositions" of Zola's *Second Empire Nana* from discourse and into movable character, or figure, all as a modular reflection of changing social theories and methods of representation, reveal temporal and spatial dislocations of female personhood in the *Diary* as yet another powerful instance of translatability across the transnational nineteenth and twentieth centuries.¹⁷

We might also translate the Marxist-realist dialectic of consciousness and class relations that Lukács puts in evidence in the 1930s to the way Hayashi's narrator flips often and erratically, throughout the *Diary*, between hermetic private musing and engaged public language. If Hayashi's reflective heroine is a kind of revived "Nana" on the political scene of the 1930s, then she skirts, too, the edges of feminist "individualism" on the model of Spivak's "Three Women's Texts and A Critique of Imperialism," refracting a counter-imperialist critique which can't help but be embedded in imperialist-capitalist epistemologies that exploit the lumpen periphery through ascriptions of gender and identity. As the narrator struggles to make ends meet with the few *sen* she earns as a poet and ad hoc

¹⁶ On the theme of prostitution, in the *Diary*, as a Derridean transgression of genre that extends beyond considerations of form, see Seiji M. Lippit, *Topographies of Japanese Modernism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 164–67, 179–85.

¹⁷ Christopher L. Hill, "Nana in the World: Novel, Gender, and Transnational Form," *Modern Language Quarterly* 72, no. 1 (2011): 75–105, 97–99.

temporary worker, we see these contortions of self in evidence. A spliced diary entry tracks the protagonist's chronic loneliness as a citizen of the world. Hayashi's realist stance takes up, therefore, not only Spivak's call for a critique of feminist individualism but also the spirit if not the letter of her classic postcolonial counter-ideology of non-transparent feminist subalternity. Here, then, free indirect discourse cuts without buffer to indirect discourse: "*I was lonely. Worthless. I wanted money. I wished to walk all alone along one of the fragrant acacia-lined avenues of Hokkaido,*" the narrator muses to herself; then we read, "'Are you already up?'" It was unusual for Isori to be calling to me from the other side of the shoji. "'Yes, I am.'" (*Diary* 159). A haphazard transition from inner *parole* to social *langue*—a call, beyond the partition of the shôji, to wake up and engage the public—limns in text the heroine's socio-economic struggle in Tokyo's social margins, the appeal of escapist reverie pulling against the necessity of getting down to the urban working day.¹⁸ A global realist indeed, the narrator, subsisting in the so-called periphery of metropolitan culture, collectivizes her plight: "There was no shortage of suffering women," one diary entry summarizes (175).

Global Spaces

¹⁸ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism," *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 1 (1985): 243–61, 243–45, 254. In her reading of the analytic affordances of symptomatic, localized predication, Spivak's famous rejoinder to Freud's 1919 linguistic diagnostic finds therefore a new, perhaps unexpected, global ally in the tracks of Hayashi's narrative psyche (see "Can the Subaltern Speak?," in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988], 272–313, 296).

To understand Hayashi's *Diary* in a twentieth-century world order of transhistorical realist and modernist transmission, we ought to think ourselves out of prescriptive accounts of Japan's Meiji restoration (1868)—its "opening" to "Western" modernity—and against canonical histories of global-imperialist and global-capitalist exchange. Pascale Casanova, citing Haruhisa Kato, has held that a "phagocytotic" (omnivorous) principal of constant, robust civilizational innovation generates a strong if inscrutable tradition of modern Japanese literature. Of course, in Casanova's towering story of modern allocations of world literary space, a West-centered emergence of capitalist logics of international competition at global scale and local literary rivalry at local scale affords the socioeconomic grid on which a Paris-centered cultural temporality gets configured as the *omphalos* of literary modernity.¹⁹ Prior to her death, Hayashi's late-career desperation to return to Paris, where she had visited in her first blush of success after the *Diary's* publication, would seem, on a surface level, to endorse Casanova's Gallocentrism (see Mushanokôji Saneatsu, "Hayashi Fumiko no shi [The Death of Hayashi Fumiko]," in *Bungei* [September 1951]). But such readings are too easy. As a corrective, Christopher Thorne's analysis of Casanova's ultimately colonialist anti-colonial paradigms of thought, in her literary republic's affixing of "abstract" modernism to internationalism/cosmopolitanism and "concrete" realism to nationalism/localism, helps disaggregate ever further rigid hierarchies of place.²⁰

¹⁹ See Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 87–88, 106–107, 387n27.

²⁰ See Christian Thorne, "The Sea is Not a Place; or, Putting the World Back into World Literature,"

Furthermore, where a Eurocentric summary of Japan's contribution to modernist literary culture is patently inadequate, we should look to Christopher Reed's recent monograph on global dialectics of queer *japonisme*. With an eye toward recovering the trope of modernist "alienation" as a positive, radical force involving shifting, opportunistic profit- and pleasure- seeking affiliations with home cultures (Japan or the West) on the one hand and cosmopolitan foreign locales (Japan or the West) on the other, Reed's multidirectional schema for reading cosmopolitan Japanese culture fits well the multivalent aspects of Hayashi's global-modernist scope and local-realist imperative.²¹ More recently still, Grace Lavery's queer historiography of Victorian attachments to a "quaint, exquisite" phenomenology of modern Japan, at once temporally alternative and subversive of high-modernist mandates of abstraction, offers fresh new perspectives for the minor world of minoritized subjects that Hayashi's *Diary* constructs for its diverse readers.²²

Sensitivity to an economic politics of transnational exchange, formalized through global-modernist literary techniques, makes Hayashi's *Diary* legible at the scale

boundary 2 40, no. 2 (2013): 53–79, 59–67.

²¹ See Reed's discussion of modern Japanese self-mythologization as "Occidentalism" or "Reverse Orientalism" in Christopher Reed, *Bachelor Japanists: Japanese Aesthetics & Western Masculinities* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017), 10–17, 291–93; see also Reed, "Alienation," in *A New Vocabulary for Global Modernism*, ed. Eric Hayot and Rebecca L. Walkowitz (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 11–28.

²² Grace E. Lavery, *Quaint, Exquisite: Victorian Aesthetics and the Idea of Japan* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019), 106–12; on Alexandre Kojève's regard for the always-already *snobiste* "post-historical" postmodernism of Japan across three centuries, and its foundational relation to his evolving views on Hegel, see Lavery 28–30.

of both global modernity and local realism. Where a playful harkening back to Heian-era cultural conventions betoken Hayashi's classically modernist deployments of mythological revival, and name the terms of her modernist renditions of narrative time, her engagement with realist modalities of subaltern representation makes her an agent, of a kind, for de-centered voices beyond the global pale. While Hayashi would take a turn toward fascist complicity (itself a perennially modernist problem) during Japan's protracted Asia-Pacific wars, in the earlier historical moment of the *Diary*, she is at pains to give literate voice to the otherwise illiterate prostitutes—women from the imperial peripheries of Korea, Manchuria, and Sakhalin—whose histories of sexual labor go untold (*Diary*, 170–83). That Hayashi does all this from within a framework of simultaneously elite and non-elite modernist and realist discourses makes her a virtuoso writer of the transnational twentieth century.

Aesthetics vs. Marxism post-45

In September 1951, Takeuchi Yoshimi—a leading Japanese Sinologist and pacifist—published a short article in *Literature (Bungaku)*. He titled it “The Ideology of the Modern and the Problem of the Ethnic Nation” (*Kindaishugi to minzoku no mondai*). On this occasion, Takeuchi had been prompted to state his views, on the interrelation of Japan's “ideology of the modern” (*kindaishugi*) and its “ethnic state” (*minzoku*), by the Institute of Pacific Relations's eleventh conference, held in Lucknow, India, the preceding October. This conference took

as its political agenda the postwar rise of postcolonial Asian nationalisms and global Cold War-era relations.

Takeuchi's "Ideology of the Modern" canvases the question of modernity and race in terms that are most immediately relevant to the Pacific archipelago of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, its terms of analysis—the problem of an isomorphic "modernity" (*kindaishugi*) that elides cultural difference and the problem of autochthonous "ethnicity" (*minzoku*)—extend to the transnational scope of my project's global considerations. A dissenter during Japan's protracted Asia-Pacific War (1931-1945), Takeuchi had begun his studies of Chinese literature in Beijing in 1937, just after the start of the Second Sino-Japanese War. In the midst of the Asia-Pacific War, Takeuchi's war-era studies would culminate in the publication of a first major study, *Rojin* (Lu Xun), in 1944; *Rojin* was published a year after Takeuchi was drafted into the Japanese imperial army and sent to fight in China. He survived the hostilities. Later, during the U.S. Occupation and until his death in 1977, Takeuchi continued to articulate his political views on topics ranging from opposition to the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty to the relationship between postwar Japan and single-party rule in post-dynastic China.²³

Historically, and with both local and global ramifications, Takeuchi's article positions itself within a culture of literary-political debate in postwar Japanese

²³ Dower: *Embracing Defeat* p. 405 + ff. re: postwar censorship, *Lady Chatterley* obscenity trial (D.H. Lawrence/Itô Sei); Jay Rubin re: long history of Meiji censorship and "public morals"; trace single-party rule in China as history; Bourdaghs, ed. *The Politics and Literature Debate in Postwar Japanese Criticism 1945-1952*, p. 322.

letters. Taking up the intersection of art and politics, the debate's interlocutors published a spate of sparring essays that date principally to the years of the American Occupation—1945-1952. A postwar and "women's-literary" instantiation of Futabatei Shimei's original modern novel—his vernacular *Floating Clouds* of the revolutionary 1870s—Hayashi Fumiko's *Floating Clouds* (1951), as a literary-cultural product of a particular time and place, dates to Takeuchi's immediate context. Within the globally enmeshed literary culture of postwar Japan, Takeuchi's stated position, in "The Ideology of the Modern," presents the problem of teleological modernity in both national and transnational terms which, in turn, set some preliminary terms for reading an aesthetics of global modernity and transnational encounter in both Futabatei and Hayashi. Recall that the second part of this chapter is concerned with investigating how these Japanese writers, across the global nineteenth and twentieth centuries, deploy figurations of female subjecthood as their lens onto the problem of a progress narrative in modern history—a civilizational narrative that may be interrogated, in this case, through historiographical accounts of a modern Japanese temporality that is imaginatively elliptical rather than empirically linear. Keyed to current modernist-studies investments in recuperating a realist aesthetics and politics of representation—one which is often periodized as antecedent to much of the twentieth century—the first part of this chapter explored competing and ultimately convergent strands of realist (local) and modernist (global) modalities in Hayashi's metropolitan history of itinerant women in 1920s Tokyo. As such, it fits the general scheme of this chapter and

project: the persistence of an at once vanishing and recalcitrant archival past in the shifting world-historical present of mid-century modernism. Like Benjamin's well-known citation of Paul Klee's backward-looking "Angelus Novus," in 1940, the contemporary world modernisms I track in this project are "turned toward the past" (I 257). Following upon that reading of *Diary of a Vagabond* (1930), then, this section turns to intimate portrayals of women's lives during revolutionary periods of democratic reform and imperial war. Its settings are localized across the global-imperial terrain of modern Japan in the years 1870-1950.

Before turning to those readings, let's return briefly to Takeuchi Yoshimi's postwar essay, on modern Japan's *kindaishugi* and *minzoku*—as glossed above. To reiterate, Takeuchi presents the problem of universalist ideology (globalized modernity) alongside the problem of particularist racialization (localized constructions of ethnicity) in the Cold War-era Pacific. Both Takeuchi's stated position on these keywords and his immediate literary-political context serve to historicize Hayashi's own postwar milieu at the time she was writing *Floating Clouds* and, in so doing, bring the global past into view as a crucial precedent for Hayashi's global postwar moment. From this vantage, then, Futabatei's Russo-Japanese realism, in his prior *Floating Clouds*, becomes visible as a crucial literary-historical precedent for Hayashi, one that she both repeats and adapts to her own postwar ends.

Even as Takeuchi's postwar interlocutors fractured along generational and ideological lines, they oriented without exception to the immediate historical past of the 1930s; as such, they situated themselves in a global postwar present

not by speculating about a better, “utopian” future but by evaluating instead the political legacy of Japan’s immediate past. Their aims were twofold: first, to evaluate the “war responsibility” of Japanese writers who were active during the Taishô and Shôwa periods; and second, to articulate a stance relative to Japan’s ethnic “people” (*minshû*—a cognate of Takeuchi’s *minzoku*). On one side of the debate fell an older generation of early twentieth-century literary Marxists who had gained visibility during the international “red decade” of 1925-1935. Prominently, they included Kurahara Korehito, Nakano Shigeharu, and Miyamoto Yuriko; undoubtedly, their martyr and *cause célèbre* was Kobayashi Takiji. And their organ of publication was *Shin Nihon bungaku* (*New Japanese Literature*). Of bourgeois origins, they worked from the “enlightened” principle that literature’s responsibility was to represent all orders of society, and in so doing, expose class-based injustices.²⁴ On the other side of the debate fell a somewhat younger generation who had witnessed the fallout of early twentieth-century ideologies—political programs that ranged from Meiji modernity’s reformative, incrementally imperialist agenda to populist activism deriving from Marxist patterns of thought.²⁵ The Marxist-skeptic side of the debate, which included Takeuchi Yoshimi, advocated for an aesthetics duly divorced from actionist politics. Theirs, in the words of Ara Masahito, Odagiri Hideo, and Sasaki Kiichi’s “Founding Words: A Manifesto” (“Hakkan no kotoba”), was instead a “proper politics . . . freed from each and every political ideology.” In

²⁴ Norma Field re: Trotsky’s bourgeois-ness; range of proletariat writing.

²⁵ Reference Meiji’s major political and cultural campaigns here.

counterpoint to *Shin Nihon bungaku*, this group's organ of publication was *Kindai bungaku* (*Contemporary Literature*).²⁶ Disappointed by the apparent hypocrisies of Marxism—whose visionary aspirations neither deterred, in the case of Showa-era Japan, imperialist predation nor operated along progressively feminist lines—Takeuchi and his colleagues stood behind the idea of art as an autonomous and individualist cultural enterprise.²⁷

Self, Genre, Ukigumo: Hayashi Fumiko's Japanese Modernism in Global Space and Time, or, Hayashi Revisited—

In her chapter on “World Literary Space” in the *World Republic of Letters*, the French literary scholar Pascale Casanova proposed an anti-positivist notion of aesthetic temporality, one which differed, in altogether imaginative and sociological modes, from the “historical (which is to say political) time that is established as official and legitimate.” Casanova defined this notion of a non-canonical *aesthetic* measure of market-driven literary time through the spatio-temporal rubric of a “Greenwich Meridian of Literature”—a prime meridian that is [up], on this account, *the present of literary creation which is to say modernity* (88).

Tracking across modern vernacular cultures and practicing a rather diffusionist

²⁶ In this Japanese-language slant on morphologies of twentieth-century temporality, “new” (*shin*) means older-than-contemporary and “contemporary” (*kindai*) means of-proximate-time. This is one permutation of differential historical time that lives in the archaeology of this chapter—its study of modern-historical recursivity in and through Hayashi Fumiko.

²⁷ ref. Housekeeper's Debate (Bourdagh's xx): Hirano Ken, Ara Masahito (aesthetes) call out Marxists' instrumentalization of women as bogus, hypocritical—Sugimoto Ryôkichi (m) used Okada Yoshiko (f) “as his springboard to running the Karafuto border”; Hirano Ken critiques Kobayashi Takiji (*Tôseikatsusha*) for using women as cover for political activities.

logic of literary innovation, Casanova's is a long, global history of literary modernity that—despite any decolonial feelings I may have—I've found to be indispensable in thinking about asynchronous or non-synchronous valences of aesthetic time, space, and interiority in the historical fiction of the global modernist Hayashi Fumiko—and indeed in my dissertation and research generally.

Via Casanova's semantic turn on Bourdieu's *Homo academicus*—Bourdieu's writing on disaggregated synchronicity (*synchronization*) and structural coincidence (*coïncidence*) across academic fields of anti-institutional cultural production during Paris' May sixty-eight protests (Minuit: 226)—I turn then to Hayashi's *remarkable work* as a literary cosmopolitan and modern iconoclast of the global period 1930-1950. I choose this interval of decades—the first decades of Japan's long *Shôwa* period, which ran from 1926-1989, tracking across national phases of military-imperial aggrandizement, deflation, U.S.-led colonial occupation, and postwar economic boom—because they bookend Hayashi's career as a popular, mass-cultural writer, one who both inhabits and exceeds categorically gendered determinations of Japanese women's literature (*joryû* or *josei bungaku*). To this point: recent feminist scholarship has shown that a mere 7% of Hayashi's 86 long-form narratives and 62 short stories, published over the course of these two decades of active literary output, were first printed in *côterie* or generically taxonomized women's journals (BW: 100). Most often a record, in some sense, of intimate personal experience, descriptively rendered, Hayashi's writing was anything but the product of a peripheral writer even as she resisted

major affiliations and schools of thought. A denizen of imperial-era modern Japan, Hayashi, we might better say, was a global modernist whose realist and vernacular modalities enact “auto-ethnographic” narrative in a manner marking a culturally specific instance of what the literary scholar Mary-Louise Pratt has called a *subaltern* expression of writing that transcends *both* the categories of “authentic” self-documentation and “inauthentic” mimesis of imperial culture (102).

The illegitimate daughter of Hayashi Kiku and Miyata Asatarô, Hayashi was born in late 1903 *or* 1904—official records don’t agree—to itinerant peddler communities at the intersection of Japan’s southerly Honshû and northerly Kyûshû islands. She belonged in name to her matrilineal line; this unconventional matriarchal inheritance was later repeated in Hayashi’s own life, when her husband, the painter Rokubin Tezuka, whom she married in 1926, altered his family registry to take his wife’s family name. A graduate of the Onomichi Municipal Girls’ High School, in Hiroshima prefecture, where she had settled in May 1916 with her biological mother and adoptive father, the young Fumiko was one of the privileged 10% of girls who at this time could claim a high-school education. Despite the inferior class status of her peddler merchant-class origins, Hayashi was seen as a gifted student by her formative teachers in Onomichi—these included Kobayashi Masao and Imai Tokusaburô. Kobayashi, for his part, had taught Hayashi at the Second Municipal Elementary School in Onomichi, and it was he who helped the young student pass the entrance exams to high school. A child indeed of the laboring class, Hayashi, biographical

accounts hold, then paid her way through her high-school education by working at a local sail factory and noodle shop, as a housemaid, and then also during night shifts at a twine-making factory. Much of this vital experience of early penury is told and refracted, in prose-poetic diary form, in Hayashi's first major work—*Diary of a Vagabond (Hôrôki)*, which was first serialized in 1928-1930, and then was published in multiple iterations from 1930 through to the postwar period. For the young Hayashi, nevertheless, under Kobayashi and Imai's formative tutelage, a *penchant* for cosmopolitan literature in translation was fostered: Walt Whitman, Goethe, Abbé Prévost, Suzuki Miekichi, Jack London, Chekhov, Balzac, and Novalis numbered among her favorites. And yet even as—or perhaps precisely *because*—Hayashi showed remarkable literary promise early on, she graduated ingloriously in the bottom 10% of her high school. Her formal education ended there.

In a recent anthology of Japanese modernism circa 1910-1940, William J. Tyler has identified some of the topical centers of the *modanisuto* literary moment in modern Japan: these include the “anti-naturalist” spectacle of Kawabata Yasunari (who, along with Yokomitsu Riichi, was co-inventor of a radical New Sensationist—*shinkankakuha*—poetics) and Itô Sei (who brought James Joyce and D.H. Lawrence to Japan); the cosmopolitanism and exoticism of Edogawa Ranpo (a gothic writer who took Edgar Allan Poe as his namesake) and Abe Tomoji (self-styled aesthete of anti-Marxist orientation); and, finally, the politically “actionist” (*kôdô-shugi*) writings of (again) Abe Tomoji and Funahashi Seiichi (who, in the wake of Japanese Marxism's literary demise, advanced an anti-

nationalist aesthetics of cultural autonomy that espoused a doctrine of cosmopolitan *esprit nouveau* - calqued as *atarashi seishin* or *espuri-nûbô*). Even as Tyler's curatorship of Japanese *modanizumu* occludes much of Japanese "women's writing" of the time—only two of the anthology's twenty-five literary pieces are authored by women—his account of modern Japan's vernacular *modanizumu* reminds us of the noteworthy fact that, in the period 1900-1930, Tokyo's metropolitan population ballooned from one to six million, making it the second largest global metropolis after New York City (26). These are the decades that witness Hayashi Fumiko's development as a provincially tintured metropolitan writer who bridged Japan's modern Meiji, Taishô, and Shôwa periods. More from Tyler: "If Meiji was the modern Neo-Confucian nation state that stood for gunboats, paternalistic control, and imperial pomp, then *modanizumu* had the foresightedness to look farther down the road and envision a time when Japan might become a superpower in the business of living (*seikatsu taikoku*), to cite a phrase coined during the days of Japan's Economic Miracle" (37-8). Arriving in Tokyo, from Hiroshima prefecture, in 1922, Hayashi's urbane cosmopolitanism culminated in 1951—the year of her death, the year of her receipt of Japan's preeminent Women's Literary Prize (*joryû bungakusho*), and the year her last complete novel, *Ukigumo* (*Floating Clouds*), on which I offer some concluding thoughts, went to press.

Let's set Hayashi's course into the global postwar by sojourning, for a moment, in our contemporary moment of 1930—when Hayashi first gained literary visibility through her pseudo-autobiographical *Diary of a Vagabond*

(*Hôrôki*). And here, a side glance to Jed Esty's work on "late" British modernism, if you'll permit me: on the scene of late-imperial British modernism, this year also marks the beginning of a turn to late British-modernist *nativism*, a new /late literary modality in which the emergent contraction of the British empire may be seen to articulate itself as a reflexive literary-epistemological interest in *itself* rather than in its *distanced colonial subjects*; a late-born empire, modern-imperial Japan both does and does not participate in such an historical logic of shifting imperial borders and literary focalization around this year. Hayashi, here, then, in "My Horizon" ("Watashi no chiheisen"), written on the eve of the writer's travel by sail and by rail via the Sea of Japan, through the Korean Peninsula, and across Manchuria and Siberia by way of the Trans-Siberian railroad—she lands in Europe to reside as an artist of the Japanese global diaspora, staying in Paris, London, and Naples until May 1932. Insisting upon authentic *nihilism*, *realism*, and *kana-centric phonetic vernacularity*, Hayashi's "My Horizon" stands as a kind of literary manifesto that also acts as a preface to the writer's first international travel, circa 1930, travel which she repeats yet differently and again in a major sense across mainland China and the Asian archipelago during Japan's protracted Asia-Pacific War (1931-1945). Cornerstone moments in Hayashi's later travels through war-torn Asia—experiences which resurface and refract through her postwar novel *Ukigumo*—include mixed-genre reporting from Nanjing, Shanghai, and Hankou through the late 1930s. Saliently, Hayashi earned the distinction of *first woman in* when Nanjing fell to the Japanese military in late 37-early 38 and, then again, when Hankou fell in November 1938. From October

1942 through May of 1943, Hayashi persisted in this brand of propagandistic literary work, traveling through French Indochina and colonial Southeast Asia as a reporter for the Japanese News Corps (*Hôdôhan*). From these fronts, she scribbled journalistic pieces like “Below the Equator” (“Sekidô no Shita,” 1943) and “Sumatra—Island of the Western Wind” (“Sumatora—Seifû no shima,” 1943) that carried militarist favor with the Japanese reading public of that time.

Informed by Hayashi’s travel *through* and writing *out of* mainland China and Southeast Asia during the war, *Ukigumo* is a melodrama that flits anti-linearly, provocatively, between postwar Tokyo and early 1940s-era Southeast Asia, where imperial French and Japanese forces battle for military ground. In its vernacular modernist style, moreover, Hayashi’s tragic *Ukigumo—Floating Clouds*—owes its title to Futabatei Shimei’s pioneering 1870s novel of the same name; and indeed both are stories of thwarted, triangulated romance set against a backdrop of climactic “world-historical” change. In Hayashi’s case, then, this historical backdrop is the rise and fall of Japanese imperial predation in the Pacific, and its local consequences in bombed-out postwar Tokyo. In Futabatei’s, it is Japan’s shift from “closed country” military dictatorship—feudal rule by a military shogunate—to “open country” imperial dictatorship—incarnated in the figure of the emperor—and the ramifications of this structural change for intimate relationships among friends and lovers. As such, the “floating clouds” (*ukigumo*) under view, as a thematic motif for both Hayashi and Futabatei, trace the environmental, political, and affective lines of major global-historical change. In a turn on Futabatei’s own vernacular and realist literary innovations during

the 1880s (itself a radical product of transpacific translation cultures across contemporary Russia and Japan), in the postwar context, Hayashi's vernacular and realist *modanizumu* repurposes and newly *modernizes* a key aesthetic of Edo literature—the notion of the *ukiyo* or “floating world.” The phoneme *uki*, ideogrammatic prefix to *ukigumo*, can designate a host of contradictory meanings like “drifting,” “sad,” and/or “happy.” Such are the composite complications and intricacies of both Hayashi and Futabatei's transhistorical narratives of global and modern Japan.

I'll conclude with some thoughts on the capacious global contours of Japanese modernism's relationship with a concurrently “realist” Japanese naturalism (*shizenshugi*), a particular brand of naturalism which—as Donald Keene has classically shown in *Dawn to the West*—focalized its authors' interiority: [quote] The Naturalism of Zola or Maupassant came to be interpreted not as a method of examining human beings with scientific detachment, but as an absolutely faithful reproduction of real events, without admixture of fiction or even of imagination [close quote] (221). In a manner that resonates with my own thinking about multidimensional (modern) aesthetic time, Tomi Suzuki has argued that the generic I-novel (*watakushi/shi shôsetsu*) of Japanese modern literature emerged as an embattled—alternatively consensus- and dissensus-driven—discursive construct over the long first half of Japan's modern twentieth century; nevertheless, Tayama Katai, Mushakôji Saneatsu, and Shimazaki Tôson, dating to the first decade of the twentieth century, may be seen as exemplars of this “confessional” tradition. One of Hayashi Fumiko's most important influences—

her literary mentor Uno Kôji, who, in 1920s Tokyo, encouraged her “to write just as she spoke”—participated in these important debates over modern literary transparency and subjectivity. At once anticipating and reinforcing the advice he gave to Hayashi to write in the *subjective* vernacular, Uno, whose views on the matter were later adapted by Itô Sei in the postwar period, claimed that Japan’s I-novel of transparent naturalist interiority (*mottomo fukai watakushi*) was most appropriate for Japanese modern literature, whereas the “authentic novel” of the Western tradition, on the model of Turgenev, Tolstoy, Chekhov, and others, configured a *fictional* authorial self that was not readily legible in said fiction itself. Turning these paradigms to the global postwar that is Hayashi Fumiko’s own closural moment, Itô Sei writes it well in his 1948 *Method of the Novel* (*Shôsetsu no hôhô*): “Contrary to the belief held by the Japanese literary community that the I-novel is a uniquely Japanese problem, when it comes to the novel, the question of the author’s self [watakushi] is the most essential problem in modern world literature, or literature in general [Albert Thibaudet]” (59).

Nihilism, Diaries, Floating Clouds Redux—

A self-described “proponent of nihilism,” a writer of “raw nihilism between the lines,” Hayashi Fumiko was for twenty short years—between the first serial installment of her highly remunerative *Diary of a Vagabond* (*Hôrôki*) in late 1928 and her last pieces of postwar fiction—a darling of the Japanese reading public. Her death in 1951 did not, however, mark the end of her life in the public arts. Hayashi continues to be read voraciously and has been widely translated;

famously, she inspired her contemporary, the Japanese *auteur* Mikio Naruse (1905-1969), to direct several filmic compositions based on her short stories and novels. For the two decades in which Hayashi's remarkably prolific writing career lasted (on average she published around 30 pages per week), it was her vernacular accessibility as a prose stylist, the unadorned "nihilism," in her own self-assessment, of her literary sensibility that garnered her praise and fame.

As Hayashi explains in her 1931 essay "My Horizon" ("Watashi no Chiheisen"), where she stakes this manifesto of aesthetic spareness, her motivation as a writer was above all else "to reach many readers"; "I must target a large audience," she summarizes. A mere three years after *Diary of a Vagabond* landed her a reputation as a young woman writer (*joryû sakka*) of talent, Hayashi was twenty-eight when she penned "My Horizon." That year, royalties from *Kaizôsha* press, which had consolidated the magazine serial of the *Diary* into a book, allowed Hayashi to travel from Japan to Europe by sail and by rail. In November 1931 she crossed the Sea of Japan, arrived on the Korean peninsula, and went from there through Manchuria and Siberia by way of the Trans-Siberian railroad; landing ultimately in Paris, London, and Naples, she resided in Europe as an artist of the Japanese diaspora until May 1932.

"My Horizon" was written on the eve of this departure overseas, detailing therefore not just this young artist's visionary aesthetic of "nihilism" but quite literally too an opening of geographical space in the global world order she was

then entering for the first time. In the transnational context within which this chapter situates Hayashi's postwar novel *Floating Clouds (Ukigumo)*, the year of 1931 houses also a slight but impactful world-historical event in the long Asia-Pacific war (1931-1945) that contains Japan's involvement in World War II (1939-1945). In 1931, Hayashi's transit from the Asia-Pacific archipelago through to Western Europe parallels, as literary history, the global political history of Japan's expanding militarism through the 1930s and 1940s. Just as Hayashi leaves for Paris, then, setting her sights on the global West, the Japanese Kwantung army extends westward and northward its ever far-reaching grasp on Northern China: as inauguration of Japan's Asia-Pacific war, the brutal "Manchurian Incident" of September 1931 exposed the ulterior designs of Japan's military-imperial state; repressing Chiang Kai-shek's nationalist army with one hand and quashing the last vestiges of autonomous governance in Northern China with the other, the Kwantung army decided in late 1931 that control of the South Manchurian Railway and the port cities of Harbin and Mukden were no longer enough. A mere six months after the incident, a ruse orchestrated to justify Kwantung belligerency, Japanese dominion in Manchuria had increased considerably. On Japan's homefront, domestic political reverberations were felt immediately in the assassination of the internationalist prime minister Inukai Tsuyoshi (1855-1932) and the subsequent supersession of "national unity" cabinets in place of the old party system. Between 1932 and 1945, years that mark the surge and decline of Japanese imperialism, 14 prime

ministers held office in spastic short-term periods.²⁸

Hayashi's involvement in the global theatre of the Asia-Pacific War becomes evident through a reading of the fragmented realist contours of her popular postwar novel, *Floating Clouds*, but a consideration of that work in global and historical context requires some groundwork first in the author's own life story. As "My Horizon" attests, a young Hayashi, then the author of just a smattering of works—a thin collection of poetry juvenilia, *I Saw A Pale Horse* (*Aouma o mitari*), three short stories, and first versions of the *Diary*—had accessed already a keen sense of personal vocation as a writer and stylist. In "My Horizon," Hayashi addresses most pointedly the contemporary Japanese vogue for *lumpen* literature (*runpen bungaku*), art forms that told the story of society's vagrants, paupers, and prostitutes in alternatively salacious and heart-wrenching detail.²⁹ In this pointed address, Hayashi distances herself from the *lumpen* genre, indeed, from any aesthetic or ideology at all, claiming authenticity instead as a nihilist realist with a personal history of living on the economic margins of metropolitan culture. In response to a critic who had called her break-through *Diary* a work of

²⁸ Buruma: 88-92

²⁹ Shimomura Chiaki (1893-1955) was seen as the standard-bearer of the genre; through the 1920s and 30s, his fiction and investigative reporting on the theme of poverty were published in the journal *The Central Quarrel* (*Chûô kôron*) and the *Asahi* daily. After the global market crash of 1929, economic distresses ramified in broad ways within the Japanese politico-cultural context: they were visible in the economic stagnation of the non-metropolitan countryside, where, as of 1930, two-thirds of the country still resided; and likewise in the metropolitan center of Tokyo—from 1922-1930, Tokyo's homeless population increased sixfold (in the winter of 1930-1, seven "Noah's Arks" were constructed as shelters for the thousands who had been displaced by endemic poverty). Menacingly, Japanese imperial militarism also developed as one consequence of this economic distress, although of course its origins in the twentieth century were multifarious and complex.

“second-rate proletarian literature,” Hayashi writes,

[That critic] may consider my work to be “second-rate proletarian literature,” but I have never carried the proletarian banner; it is precisely proletarian literature that I oppose . . . I write with the intention of coming to grips with real life as it appears to me personally. I often discover strange words in my sentences. I compose extremely raw nihilism between the lines.

She continues,

Perhaps as a result, my work is sometimes seen as *lumpen* literature, or literature that lacks volition, or literature that runs away from reality . . . The term “proletarian literature” in Japanese really means “the literature of poverty.” If one talks about the literature of poverty, then my works certainly fit into that category. The foreign word “proletarian” reeks of the intelligentsia and ideology. But the literature of poverty! In all its meanings, my work is the literature of poverty. Thank goodness for the Japanese language! But the term “literature of poverty” also has a *lumpen*-eque quality. The magical spell of language causes a strange chasm in meaning in cases such as these (159-160).

If anything, this defensive, circuitous, rather playful manifesto succeeds in asserting only one clear point—Hayashi’s personal experience of poverty makes

her more legitimate, as a *realist* writer of *poverty*, than any intellectual schooled in Marxist political economics or for that matter any well-read journalist slumming the gutters for the next juicy story. In her work on Hayashi, Joan Ericson has traced the connotation of the Japanese calque *lumpen* as “lacking volition” or “running away from reality” to its original instance in Marx’s German *runpen*, set forth in his 1850 “The Class Struggles in France.” In Marx’s original use of the term, which had its application in the French Revisionist Government of February 1848, *runpen* had been used as a term of rebuke for the Mobile Guards who were, in Marx’s estimation, mere listless onlookers to a revolutionary event that only the progressive, actionist proletariat were capable of bringing about.³⁰ To Hayashi in 1931, a young writer still awkward in her new-found access to social acclaim and financial stability, any political (and therefore, to her mind, elite) label was suspect—*lumpen* and *proletariat* (*puroteria*) alike.

“Where exactly blew the wind of revolution? You Japanese radicals certainly knew many clever words.” So declaims the protagonist of Hayashi’s *Diary*, on an unspecified day in an unspecified year—only “November” marks the diegetic time.³¹ She goes on, “I wondered exactly what kind of fairy tales the socialists

³⁰ Ericson: 63

³¹ The *Diary* first emerged as a serial publication, from October 1928 - October 1930, in the pages of the early Shōwa-era feminist magazine, *Women’s Arts* (*Nyonin geijutsu*). As a “confessional” or observational diary, the *Diary* recuperates a genre that had been deployed to great effect by Heian-era (794-1185) artists, court ladies in particular. Takasue No Musume’s *Sarashina Diary* (*Sarashina nikki*; c. 1050) stands as one classic(al) instance of the genre. In Hayashi’s *Diary*, an allusiveness to prior aesthetic forms that women especially had wielded to great effect looks forward, too, in historical time: the story had a two-decades long afterlife in the handful of revisions and re-publications to which Hayashi submitted the original text. A sequel, *Diary of a Vagabond, part 2* (*Zoku Hōrōki*), is published by *Kaizōsha* in 1930. Ryūjo shobō issues a third volume, in 1949; this version had been serialized in *Japan(ese) Short Stories* (*Nihon shōsetsu*) from May

were inventing. Exactly how much longer did we have to separate newborn babies by class, babies puffier than brown rice buns, by choosing for them a silk or a cotton diaper?" (143). This diary entry represents a slice of time in the first autumnal season the *Diary* sets out. From the vague pre-history of the story's prologue, which tells of the protagonist's origins in the impoverished mining communities of southern Honshû and Kyushu, the *Diary* moves first into a generic month of December, in an anonymous year. The first entry, a dozen or so entries before this anti-socialist outburst, describes the narrator's thankless labor as a babysitter for the famous writer Chikamatsu Shûkô; and the new year sees her newly fired and moving from job to job, doing everything from soliciting work at the Italian Embassy (the place had "smelled foreign, like soap" [134]) to selling men's underwear in the hawking district of downtown Tokyo. Arrived now as a factory worker at a celluloid doll factory—"Kewpie doll, I hope our utopia of cooing doves comes soon," a later month observes (147)—the narrator's political consciousness is piqued by the discordance she senses between an intimate, personal experience of destitution and the conceptual inaccessibility of radical politics.

The narrator's likening of the socialist cause to an inscrutable "fairy tale" bears some profound irony, however, in the fact that after she starts publishing poems within the diegesis of the story she turns her efforts to the fairy-tale

1947 - October 1948. Ericson, pp. 101-2, tracks the permutations of mood—the variation with which Hayashi pictures her own history of poverty—in several pieces of autobiographical and travel writing that span 1940 – 1949.

imaginary of children's literature—signally, it is in this genre that she makes her first real income, with the Jiji Newspaper. And here the *Diary* ends. With the promise of personal independence betokened by the substantial twenty-three yen the protagonist earns (214), the narrative breaks off, suspends itself in conclusion, in the "February" of an unspecified date in an unspecified year. Notwithstanding this subtle paradox, the *Diary* teems all along with caustic references to the rhetoric of political actionism. "Selling several children's stories and poems didn't mean I'd be eating high off the hog. Hunger made my head fuzzy, and even my ideas ended up growing mold. My head made no distinction of Proletarian or Bourgeois. I only wanted to cook and eat one handful of rice," the narrator observes (177). Later, during the narrator's phase of working as a café-girl in the Nishikimachi district of Kanda, a self-identified "Anarchist" complains that the standard Ebisu beer he's served isn't to his cultivated liking. He leaves without paying and the narrator throws the bottle he leaves against his departing shadow. A tragi-comic episode ensues: "Hey!" "You fool!" "Watch it. I'm an Anarchist!" "What, such people really exist? I don't believe it! What a puny terrorist" (183). In the literary history made by Hayashi's *Diary*, this customer's gestures of emancipatory moralism go down in the annals of time as laughable, indeed, as the political object of satirical representation.

Closer to Marxist worldview than the *Diary* ostensibly sets out, however, and "My Horizon" would at first glance seem to suggest, Hayashi was arrested in 1933 and jailed for nine days for having subscribed to *Red Flag* (*Akahata*), Japan's

Communist Party newspaper. There is no record of her political apostasy (*tenkô*). Hayashi admired the writings of Kobayashi Takiji, the undisputed martyr of the *puroteria* literary movement; “I read [his] work with reverence. The author is not heroic in his work nor is he pompous. Kobayashi’s works are pieces of literature that anybody can understand and they have a certain freshness no matter which one one reads” (“My Horizon,” 161). Famously, Kobayashi Takiji’s *The Factory Ship / The Crab Cannery Boat* (*Kani kôsen*; 1929) had proposed the obstreperous *lèse-majesté* of having Emperor Hirohito eat and choke on crab meat mixed with gravel.³²

A cornerstone event in the discomposed aesthetic consciousness of Japanese *modanizumu*, the Great Kantô earthquake of 1923 is documented in Hayashi’s *Diary* in an oblique reference which meta-fictionally traces Hayashi’s own uneasy “class progression” into the ranks of literary prestige culture. Though Hayashi only explicitly identifies herself as the persona behind the *Diary* after the story’s first magazine serialization (Ericson 69), the parallels between author and protagonist are clear to any reader versed in the writer’s biography. As Japan sits in a semi-peripheral zone of imperial history, moreover, the narrative is self-referential in a manner marking a culturally specific instance of Mary-Louise Pratt’s classic definition of “auto-ethnography” as peripheral, subaltern

³² Comparison with proletariat writer Miyamoto Yuriko (also d. 1951); cf. Nakamura Mitsuo, Edward G. Seidensticker: with the legislation of the 1925 Peace Preservation Law, the Japanese government had rounded up, jailed, and forced into apostasy (*tenkô*) at least 500 authors and many others affiliated with the KOPF (culture federation) and NALP (writers’ league). There is no indication that Hayashi ever made an apostasy. Both groups also worked in Esperanto – a direct connection with Russia. Esperanto in relation to Futabatei Shimei’s Russian-anarchist genealogy and its permutations in Hayashi’s postwar context. Postwar Anpo protests TK.

expression that transcends both the categories of “authentic” self-documentation and “inauthentic” mimesis of imperial culture (102). A restless wanderer both because her disenfranchised status compels it and because it rather much befits her cosmopolitan temperament, the protagonist-heroine of the *Diary*, into whom Hayashi channels her own life story, flits in and out of the working-class districts of Tokyo. And it is in provincial spaces external to the big city that this character encounters a figural representation of the devastating consequences of environmental disaster and poverty more generally.

Thinking in moments she’d prefer Osaka or Kyoto, Kobe or Chiba, and often circling back through the hometown of Shimonoseki, at the south-western tip of Honshu, the narrator travels extensively within the domestic context the *Diary* sets out. In Kobe, near the end of the story, Hayashi meets an old woman who sells beans as pigeon feed to eke out her meager existence. The narrator enters the woman’s hovel and observes,

Just as I imagined, it was like a pigsty. I placed my basket on my lap. The hut reeked of beans . . . Swollen soybeans were soaking in an oil can. Amulets and hard pieces of seaweed lay under the glass covers of two boxes. All the goods were covered with dust.

“Ma’am, please give me a plate of those beans.”

As I put down my five-sen coin, the shop woman’s wrinkled hand bushed mine aside.

“Forget the coin.”

In response to my asking, she told me she was seventy-six. She was just like a once-elegant doll, moth-eaten and forgotten.

“Is Tokyo all recovered from the earthquake?” she asked.

The toothless woman’s mouth looked like the tightened drawstring of a money pouch. She eyed me kindly. (199-200)

As a novel of historical fiction that told the story of a late phase in Japan’s Asia Pacific War (1931-1945), *Floating Clouds* was published first in short serial installments, from November 1949 to April 1951, in the magazines *Fûsetsu* and *Bungakkai*. For Hayashi, who, in earlier years, had gravitated to the short-form structure of the lyric and the confessional diary entry, vernacular genres she never fully abandoned as a literary stylist, novels were often the culmination of shorter, less ambitious pieces of writing. In the case of *Floating Clouds*, the last serial installment, written for a magazine readership, evolved into one piece of the novel whole that synthesized the content of those earlier publications—in all, in its final form, sixty-seven short novelistic chapters which, like the clouds that “float” across its title, travel the Pacific archipelago and the Japanese mainland during an extended period of global war. (Unsurprisingly, there is no commanding substructure to the novel, no thematic demarcations marking off one cluster of the novel’s chapters from another.) Despite the simplicity with which it was written, however, this geographically sprawling narrative is difficult on two levels: temporal complexity reinforces the topographical

dislocations that are everywhere palpable in the postwar story, here, in a work that is by most accounts Hayashi's finest. For a writer whose major talent was her translation of personal experience, and displacements attendant upon the same, into accessible literary form, the twin preoccupations of memory and migration seem appropriate indeed to a mature late-career novel.

With artful design, *Floating Clouds's* appeal lies in its interleaving of fragmentary chapters that flash back to the war with scenes from a contemporary postwar (*senjo*) Japan. In the last decade of her life, as Japan's military-imperial power waxed and waned over the Pacific, Hayashi traveled extensively through mainland China and Southeast Asia. In November 1937, her husband, the painter Rokubin Tezuka, was conscripted into the imperial army and served for about a year and a half as an assistant nurse. At the time, Hayashi felt little enthusiasm for her country's militarism; she registered her skepticism in an essay she wrote about her husband's involvement in the war, "Before and After the Conscription" ("Ôshô zengo," 1937). Just two months after Rokubin was drafted, however, Nanjing fell to the Japanese army and Hayashi accepted a post from the *Daily News* (*Tôkyô nichichi shimbun*; after 1 January 1943, *Mainichi shinbun*) to report back from the war fronts of Nanjing and Shanghai. One of a cohort of popular novelists, dramatists, and critics who were sent by news outlets and journals of the period to propagandize the war, Hayashi Fumiko gained fame as the first Japanese woman to enter the city of Nanjing after its fall. She earned the same distinction of "first woman in" when Hankou fell to the Japanese in

November 1938. Livid at the idea that her literary peer and sometime nemesis, a fellow female writer, Yoshiya Nobuko, had been selected by the *Daily News* to cover the fall of Hankou, Hayashi promptly abandoned her post in Shanghai, boarded an *Asahi News* truck, and made her way to Hankou ahead of Yoshiya. The first woman of her kind to cross the front into newly occupied Nanjing and Hankou, Hayashi reported favorably to the press on the advances the Japanese army was making in the region.

Marking a turn from her original skepticism of Showa militarism, Hayashi's mixed-genre war reporting from mainland China during the late 1930s—"Battlefront" ("Sensen," 1938), "Northern bank platoon" ("Hokugan butai," 1939), "Rough seas," ("Hatô," 1939)—revealed the ease with which she let her literary reputation be coopted by military-imperial protocols. One of a twenty-two person troupe of traveling writers, the Showa Cabinet's war-era "Pen Unit" (*Pen butai*), formed in August 1938, Hayashi generated elegies, of a kind, for fallen Japanese soldiers and the horses who died with them. Inspired by Okumura Sayuko's "patriotic" tour of Japanese forces during the Eight-Nation Alliance's suppression of the anti-imperialist Boxer Rebellion (1899-1901), Hayashi wrote poems, from the Asia-Pacific fronts she toured, that were promptly turned into the lyrics of popular jingoistic songs. "Northern bank platoon," a poem taken from the eponymous article she'd written in 1939, and "Spark" ("Hibana"), lyrics which took their inspiration directly from Okumura Sayuko's earlier patriotism, were soon broadcast on the radio; the singer Tezuka

Fumiko, whose name was an uncanny merger of Hayashi's first name and her husband's surname, was the first to perform "Spark," in a radio broadcast that premiered on Tokyo radio waves on 7 February 1938. In her choice to invoke the nationalist spirit of the singer Okumura Sayuko, Hayashi indexed to her own contemporary moment in the Asia-Pacific war an important episode in the ascendancy of modern Japanese imperialism—the quashed anti-imperialist Boxer Rebellion which fell decisively between Japan's victory over late-imperial China in 1895 (the first Sino-Japanese war) and its win over Tsarist Russia in 1905 (the Russo-Japanese war).

From October 1942 through May of 1943, Hayashi traveled through French Indochina and colonial Southeast Asia as a reporter for the Japanese News Corps (*Hôdôhan*). At the time, the Japanese News Corps was tasked with boosting Japanese imperial ideology, its idea of a "Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere." However, in Susanna Fessler's reading, Hayashi's journalistic articles from the period—"Below the Equator" ("Sekidô no shita," 1943) and "Sumatra—Island of the Western Wind" ("Sumatora—Seifû no shima," 1943)—amounted to no more than apolitical portrayals of the writer's own touristic experience at these tropical Pacific fronts; on this account, Hayashi's war reportage from the South Pacific lacks the evident military-imperial investment of the testimonial pieces written out of Nanjing and Hankou just a few years prior. To extend Fessler's reading further, one might come to view Hayashi's war journalism, and the postwar short stories and novels which were in some measure ethnographic

chronicles of Hayashi's own travels through the South Pacific, as just the opportunistic outpouring of a politically agnostic writer who saw the world as an always potentially lucrative space of creative possibility. From the retrospective vantage of the end of Hayashi's short literary career, then, one might understand Hayashi's brief life as dictated by an absence of fixed (if potentially evolving) political ethics; understand her, in other words, as a politically indifferent modernist innovator whose stylized modulation between prosaic realism and poetic abstraction was engineered to cater to the changing appetites of a capitalist marketplace of readers. No less, in Meiji Japan, the number of female readers, who formed the core of Hayashi's contemporary readers c. 1930-1950, had increased steadily: from 1875-1910, the percent of girls who gained basic literacy climbed from 18% to 97%; and by the mid-1920s, 10% of adolescent girls had graduated from a girls' high school (Ericson 22-3). Given the rigor with which the boundaries of class and sex/gender were policed during the pre-modern Edo period (1603-1868) and the earlier decades of the modern Meiji period (1868-1912), the latter figure of 10% marked no small feat in the liberal political and literary scene of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century "modern" (*kindai*) Japan.

A graduate of the Onomichi Municipal Girls' High School, in Hiroshima prefecture, where Hayashi had settled in May 1916 with her biological mother and adoptive father, the budding writer was one of that privileged 10% of girls who claimed a high-school education. Despite the inferior class status of her

peddler merchant-class origins, an inheritance which placed her in the very last tier of the hierarchy that underwrote traditional Japanese classism (samurai/*shi* - farmer/*nô* - artisan/*kô* - merchant/*shô*), Hayashi was marked as a gifted student by her teachers in Onomichi—the male pedagogues Kobayashi Masao and Imai Tokusaburô. Kobayashi taught Hayashi at the Second Municipal Elementary School in Onomichi, and it was he who helped the young student pass the entrance exams to the Onomichi Municipal Girls' High School. A child of the laboring class, Hayashi paid her way through her high-school education by working at a local sail factory and noodle shop; other biographical accounts have her working night shifts at a twine-making factory and as a housemaid. Under Kobayashi and Imai's tutelage, the young Fumiko was formed into a kind of Transpacific Euro-American Renaissance Woman. She developed a penchant for cosmopolitan literature in translation; voraciously, she read works by Walt Whitman, Goethe, Abbé Prévost, Suzuki Miekichi, Jack London, and Novalis. Even as Hayashi showed remarkable literary promise early on, she, a victim of the impoverished circumstances of her youth, graduated ingloriously in the bottom 10% of her girls' high school. Over the course of Hayashi's life as a modern(ist) female writer of the modern Japanese Taishô and Shôwa periods, a female writer (*joryû sakka*) within an historically gendered canon of female literature (*joryû bungaku*), the multifarious challenges of this upbringing refract powerfully as motive forces in the social themes and transnational vocabularies that this twentieth-century artist adopts in her mature years.

When the great Kantô earthquake hit metropolitan Tokyo on 1 September 1923 [cf. Auden's "September, 1939"], it was to Kobayashi's home in Onomichi that Hayashi fled. It was there that Kobayashi, Hayashi's first fan, insisted that the writer start rendering her first name, Fumiko, in erudite Chinese characters [insert here] rather than in the colloquial phonetic script of *katakana* [insert here]. Before Kobayashi made the suggestion, Hayashi had been publishing amateur poetry primarily under the pseudonym Akinuma Yôko. The environmental crisis of the Kantô earthquake, which both displaced and reduced to penury whole swaths of Japan's urban population, thus, in one sense, made for Hayashi's own genesis as a woman writer of recognizable merit. Thereafter, she had a "public" name that was legible to the literati class of Japan's twentieth-century intelligentsia. Prior to the Meiji project of "unifying written and spoken language," the democratizing *genbun itchi* movement that made available for literary use and consumption the vernacular language of phonetic Japanese—its native readings of Chinese characters, the phonetic *kunyomi* of modern Japanese as against the scriptural *onyomi* of classical Chinese—the language of literary erudition had been limited to classical Chinese readings of classical Chinese characters. Though Kobayashi's suggestion to render "Fumiko," in 1923, as a composite of Chinese characters and Chinese readings was, therefore, rather anti-modern, it nevertheless took on a sheen of literary erudition that Hayashi, then just an aspiring writer, was eager to assume for herself.

Written in the years following Hayashi's travels through French Indochina

and colonial Southeast Asia, *Floating Clouds*'s diegesis involves three main characters: Koda Yukiko, the novel's melodramatic heroine, and the men Tomioka Kengo and Kano Kyujiro—each of whom vies for Yukiko's affections in destructive ways. In Japanese convention, the family name precedes the first name, and I conform to that convention here; throughout, I refer to each character by her or his first name. Yukiko, Kengo, and Kyujiro first meet outside of the Japanese mainland (though they all return there after the war), in the fictional space of the Ranbean highlands, in Vietnam, where each has been posted to work on behalf of the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Whereas Kengo and Kyujiro, both educated at an elite Tokyo agricultural school (30), serve as high-ranking officers in the ministry, Yukiko works as a typist for the Pasteur Research Center, an organ of the diminishing French imperial presence in the region that collaborates with the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

Above all, *Floating Clouds* is concerned with the postwar circumstances that frame its narrative of global war; postwar deaths are legion and those who die are predominantly female. There are, accordingly, no stories of direct combat, of famous battles recounted as "live" history. It is not therefore war per se but the *memory* of war and the *consequences* of war on the home front and in the peripheries of obsolescent empire that are Hayashi's authorial preoccupation. Just as postwar Japan frames a story of war remembered, then, a history that is relegated to past time as it is reaccessed through prismatic approximations of

phenomenal reality, the framing apparatus of one of Emperor Hirohito's bureaucratic engines of war, its Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, is Hayashi's structural point of entry into a global history of militarized conflict. Where Hayashi touches most closely upon the military experience of war, it is in the character of Kyujiro. Throughout, for Hayashi, Kyujiro stands as the representative Japanese soldier figure of this war era: to die as one body forming a part of a social collective—no less than “the honorable death of the hundred million”—was Kyujiro's heroic ideal (49). Before coming to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in the later years of the Asia-Pacific War, Kyujiro had served his country “as a draftee of the Akabane Engineers Corps,” and as such participated in Japan's siege of Nanking (35). A draftee but still a participant in the institutionalized violence of global war, Kyujiro would have been perhaps reluctant to trumpet the nationalist cause at first, but he grows steadily acclimated to its brutal policies. In a jealous rage, the sword (*katana*) he takes to Yukiko's arm, still in the diegesis of the late years of the war, is one metonym for the unchecked imperial reach of war, its concurrently global and local casualties in a period of war whose consequences surpass the chronological bounds of formal declarations and armistices, and the tidy distinctions between battle fronts and home fronts.

Through one of Yukiko's flashbacks in the novel's first chapter, we learn that the Pasteur Research Center housed a plantation for growing quinine as it was being used in the treatment for malaria—a disease that had reached epidemic

proportions in the Pacific theater of World War II (4). [Hayashi succumbs to malaria in Hankou.] As this mosquito-borne contagion spread, then, in the congested tropical conditions of the Pacific wars, Yukiko suffers her own bodily casualty: the female object of prey in a heterosexual rivalry between Kengo and Kyujiro, one fateful night Yukiko is stabbed in the arm by a drunken and jealous sword-wielding Kyujiro (98). In the postwar context that the novel's first chapter sets out, the enduring physical evidence of that attack, a "long, thick vertical welt [*futoi mimizubare no tate ni nagai kizuato*]" on Yukiko's arm (73), is foregrounded as a mysteriously unexplained "scar—thick and raised like a worm [*mimosa no yô ni moriagatta, kanari ôkii katanakizu*]" that protrudes from her skin as she observes her wasted body in the bath she takes at a local lodging house (2). Flash forward to the novel's penultimate chapter and it is the voice of Yukiko's assailant and sometime admirer—"Kano's [Kyujiro's] voice"—that the heroine hears as she lies dying on the remote island of Yakushima, in the historical-fictional year 1947 (293). Here, in a flourish of free indirect discourse, Hayashi pries open Yukiko's interiority in a seamless integration of private self-questioning within *Ukigumo's* third-person narrative. Dying, on Yakushima, Yukiko wonders to herself, "Where had it come from—this rapid dissolution of her flesh that was coursing through her now with a thunderous roar of collapse?" (293).³³

As a victim of patriarchal mores and of a global industry of war, Yukiko's

³³ Rancière: Why Emma Bovary Had to Die? Confusion of Life with Art in the wrong way, as bourgeois acquisitiveness. Here is a different spin on the political dimensions of Rancière's critique of mass-cultural modernity.

physical degeneration traces not only to the scar inflicted by Kyujiro, a foundational trauma that is revealed prismatically in the fragmentary time-scape of the novel, but, as well, to two other sites of sexual violence, equally complex in their temporal representation. The first is Yukiko's sexual abuse in the Iba household, in central Tokyo. Related to the household through her sister's marriage, Yukiko, after completing secondary school in Shizuoka, had moved in with the family so as to attend a typing school in the urban environs of Kanda; by the end of the first week, the patriarch of the household, Iba Sugio, had raped her, and in full, over the course of the several years she lived in the home, "behaved toward Yukiko just as he might with a prostitute [*shôfu*]" (11-12). Hayashi recounts all of this pre- and early war-era detail to the reader in the postwar context that the novel's first chapters set out, thereby using more or less fragmentary memory as her narrative device of choice. Later, in this postwar frame, Sugio reemerges as a proselytizer for the "Great Sunshine Religion" cult that takes root in the bombed-out remnants of Tokyo, a city living with the biopolitical consequences of atomic warfare, razed cities, and the ghosts of the many dead. The cult's religious leader, Narimune Senzo, a former "staff officer at the front in Burma and the Malay States" (178), and also a former disciple of Indian letters in India, makes available to the disillusioned and grieving citizens around him a kind of religious panacea that is intended to make him lots of money. Under Sugio's auspices, Yukiko works for a time for the organization, and it is from it that she steals the money she needs to go to Yakushima with Kengo (ch. 51), her final destination in her fictional life. Notwithstanding the rise

of feminist culture in Japan's cosmopolitan 1920s, and of that culture's complex permutations during Japan's military-imperial expansionism during the 1930s and 1940s, Yukiko is in sum a second-class citizen tethered to the movements of domineering men. In the final measure, Yukiko shuttles from Sugio to Kengo via Kyujiro, only to end her days as an invalid on a distant island to which she has come as supplement to Kengo's budding career as a writer-cum-forestry technician. As with the particulars of Yukiko's history of violence with Kyujiro, Yukiko's intimate connections with Sugio and Kengo rely upon the temporal dilations and occlusions of memory-bound narrative to have their story told.

Wasting away in postwar Tokyo, out of work and out of means, Kyujiro dies ultimately of complications resulting from tuberculosis. In a postwar chapter halfway through the novel, Yukiko goes to visit Kyujiro, who is then living in a squalid tenement house in the Minozawa district of Yokohama; there, lying under a "soiled army blanket" and now with a face "thin and sharpened by hardship," Kyujiro looked to Yukiko "like a perfect stranger" (154-6). As they dialogue, Kyujiro describes his condition to Yukiko: "My body's completely broken down. I worked for a while as a longshoreman. But I caught a chill in the rain, and I've been in bed for forty days. I'm a living corpse" (155). At first a reluctant draftee and now a disillusioned and battered veteran, Kyujiro asks Yukiko to forgive him for attacking her in Vietnam: "The Kano I was back then died in the war," Kyujiro promises; "I put everything I had into that war. But it can't be helped" (157). Politely, appeasingly, Yukiko tells him that everyone was

acting “crazy” in Indochina, herself included:

Kano’s concern for the wound on her arm moved Yukiko to tears.

“I acted truly unforgivably toward you, I’ve thought.”

“No! It was I who was unforgivably selfish toward you, Kano-san. We were all acting crazy [dôka shitetano].”

“We were all acting crazy [kyôjin], it’s true. I’ve sometimes had the feeling you deliberately leaned into my sword. It was Tomioka [Kengo] I meant to cut.

When I went to his room, there you were, and that made me even angrier.

When I think about it now, I know I acted like a fool.” (158)

Told in the third-person, in flat indirect discourse, this dialogue between Yukiko and Kyujiro forecloses any expression of private feeling or thought, any revelation of conscious interiorities which from time to time obtain in Hayashi’s selective use of free indirect discourse throughout the novel. Yukiko’s self-indictment might be insincere, for instance, her forgiveness begrudging in tone, in mood. In this signal moment of dramatic catharsis, then, what a reader has access to is mere behaviorist dialogue. And later in the postwar diegesis, there is the news, ultimately, that Kyujiro, too, has died: “Yukiko read the letter from [Kyujiro’s] mother several times. [Kyujiro’s] will had specified that he was to have a Catholic funeral service. It struck Yukiko as strange that [Kyujiro], who had been such a lover of his country and believed that Japan could not lose, should have chosen to have a modest Catholic funeral. It seemed that in his last

years [Kyujiro] had truly been a victim of war" (184). All told, Kyujiro's turn, over the course of *Floating Clouds*, from resolute militarist to Catholic penitent and general "victim of war" marks a history in miniature of Japan's own retraction from brutal military-imperial expansionism to brutalized diminution in the wake of the nuclear bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. [More needs to be said about atomic war here—its conspicuous absence from the story of *Floating Clouds* and mythologization in postwar Japan.]³⁴ Likewise, Kyujiro's conversion to Catholicism indexes an emergent postwar / Cold War-era Japan that sought with survivalist fervor to extricate itself from nativist imperial ideologies.

[[As of late 1943, when Yukiko arrives at the Vietnamese port city of Haiphong, Japan's imperial reach in the Pacific—which Hayashi is chronicling in this novel written immediately after the author's tour of Japanese-occupied areas in war-era Southeast Asia—extended to much of France's Indochina (Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos), to historically British colonies (Singapore, Burma, Malaya, Borneo) and to US territories overseas (the Philippines, Wake Island, Guam, the Attu and Kiska islands). The sprawl of imperial Showa-era Japan would seem to be so big it couldn't fail. And yet the collective mood captured in the novel's scenes of retrospection make evident the frailty of these main characters' conviction that their work overseas could be in the service of an honorable cause,

³⁴ Yoneyama: *Hiroshima Traces* TK. Miller: *Japan's Modern Myth* TK.

much less redeemed by victory.

“We can’t win,” Kengo declares in chapter eight. “At least that’s what they’re saying in Saigon” (31). Yukiko, Kengo, and Kyujiro have just met in Dalat (a real place), in the Ranbean highlands (a fictional place). It is late 1943, or, in the Japanese imperial calendar, Shōwa 18. Japanese military-imperial forces have set up camp at Dalat’s police station, where the palimpsest of global imperial history, to which the Japanese language now contributes, is scripted in the multiple languages Yukiko reads upon arrival—Japanese, French, and “Annamese”:

When the truck entered the garden of a white-walled building that was said to have been the town’s police substation, Yukiko saw that a Japanese flag [*hi no maru no hata*; the sun-circle flag] was hoisted high on a pole in the middle of the garden. A new signboard reading Local Forestry Office [*chihosanrinjimusho*] had been fastened to the stone gate. Beneath the sign, boards had been attached on which the same legend was written with India ink in smaller letters in Annamese and French (21).

After its colonial expropriation of Vietnam in the mid-19th century, during the Second Empire (1852-1870), the French proceeded to carve up *le Viêt Nam* into three regions. These comprised the Protectorate of Tonkin (*le Protectorat du Tonkin*) to the north, The Protectorate of Annam (*le Protectorat d’Annam*) in the

center, and Cochinchina (*la Cochinchine*) to the south. It was not until the Geneva Accords of 1954 that French “Indochina” was officially disbanded, although, as is well known, this mandate brought with it a new host of regional conflicts in the global postcolonial era. Nevertheless, in the thick of 1943, that which Yukiko observes going into obsolescence, now that the Japanese have arrived and hoisted their imperial flag, are the contemporary languages of imperial French and its colonial “Annamese” / VIETNAMESE (*la langue annamite, annamu go*). With the collaborationist Vichy government in place as of the spring of 1940, France’s global imperial hold on its Pacific territories is compromised. The Japanese are able to march into French “Indochina” with less local resistance than they might have had were the French not themselves occupied by the Germans.]]

On Hayashi’s *Floating Clouds* (1951):

Japan’s imperial reach ca. 1943—in the interstices of history

As of late 1943, when Yukiko [Hayashi’s heroine in *Floating Clouds*] arrives at the Vietnamese port city of Haiphong, Japan’s imperial reach in the Pacific—which Hayashi fictionalizes, as history, in this novel written immediately after the author’s tour of war-era Southeast Asia—extended to much of France’s Indochina (Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos), to historically British colonies (Singapore, Burma, Malaya, Borneo) and to US territories overseas (the Philippines, Wake Island, Guam, the Attu and Kiska islands). The sprawl of imperial Showa-era

Japan would seem so self-secure it couldn't fail. And yet, throughout the novel, Hayashi makes evident the frailty of her characters' stated conviction that their enlistment overseas could be in the service of an honorable cause—much less redeemed by victory. Both Hayashi's frame story of postwar Japan and the fragmentary story of a war-era Pacific archipelago, recollected in glimpses, capture a foreboding made gothically legible in hindsight.

In Dalat, Yukiko, Kengo, and Kyujiro read a colonial palimpsest

"We can't win," Kengo declares in chapter eight. "At least that's what they're saying in Saigon" (31). Yukiko, Kengo, and Kyujiro have just met in Dalat (a real place), in the Ranbean highlands (a fictional place). It is late 1943, or, in the Japanese imperial calendar, Showa 18. Japanese military-imperial forces have set up camp at Dalat's police station, where the palimpsest of global imperial history, to which modern Japanese now contributes, is scripted in a tier of native/non-native words that Yukiko reads upon arrival—Japanese, French, and Annamese:

When the truck entered the garden of a white-walled building that was said to have been the town's police substation, Yukiko saw that a Japanese flag [*hi no maru no hata*; the sun-circle flag] was hoisted high on a pole in the middle of the garden. A new signboard reading Local Forestry Office [*chihosanrinjimusho*] had been fastened to the stone gate. Beneath the sign,

boards had been attached on which the same legend was written with India ink in smaller letters in Annamese and French (21).

Over the long nineteenth and twentieth centuries, imperial French reach in Southeast Asia included the Protectorate of Tonkin (*le Protectorat du Tonkin*) to the north, The Protectorate of Annam (*le Protectorat d'Annam*) in the center, and Cochinchina (*la Cochinchine*) to the south. It was not until the Geneva Accords of 1954 that French "Indochina" was officially disbanded, although, as is well known, this mandate brought with it a new host of regional conflicts, and proxy attachments. Nevertheless, in 1943, that which Yukiko observes going into obsolescence—now that the Japanese have arrived and hoisted the emblems of their belated empire—are imperial (continental) French and colonial "Annamese" (*la langue annamite, annamu go*) language systems. With the collaborationist Vichy government in place as of the spring of 1940, France's imperial hold on its Pacific territories is compromised. In the early 1940s, the Japanese are able to march into French "Indochina" with less militarized resistance than they might have had were the French not themselves occupied by the Germans.

Primal scenes of violence, the postwar order

Wasting away in postwar Tokyo, out of work and out of means, Kyujiro dies ultimately of complications resulting from tuberculosis. In a postwar chapter halfway through the novel, Yukiko goes to visit Kyujiro, who is then living in a

squalid tenement house in the Minozawa district of Yokohama; there, lying under a “soiled army blanket” and now with a face “thin and sharpened by hardship,” Kyujiro looked to Yukiko “like a perfect stranger” (154-6). As they dialogue, Kyujiro describes his condition to Yukiko: “My body’s completely broken down. I worked for a while as a longshoreman. But I caught a chill in the rain, and I’ve been in bed for forty days. I’m a living corpse” (155). At first a reluctant draftee and now a disillusioned and battered veteran, Kyujiro asks Yukiko to forgive him for attacking her in Vietnam: “The Kano [Kyujiro] I was back then died in the war,” Kyujiro promises; “I put everything I had into that war. But it can’t be helped” (157). Politely, Yukiko tells him that everyone was acting “crazy” in Indochina, herself included:

Kano’s concern for the wound on her arm moved Yukiko to tears.

“I acted truly unforgivably toward you, I’ve thought.”

“No! It was I who was unforgivably selfish toward you, Kano-san. We were all acting crazy [*dôka shitetano*].”

“We were all acting crazy [*kyôjin*], it’s true. I’ve sometimes had the feeling you deliberately leaned into my sword. It was Tomioka [Kengo] I meant to cut.

When I went to his room, there you were, and that made me even angrier.

When I think about it now, I know I acted like a fool” (158).

Narrated as dialogue, this difficult reckoning between Yukiko and Kyujiro stymies any expression of private feeling or thought, any rounding out of the

landscape of inner life—illuminations, however partial, which obtain only from time to time in Hayashi's selective use of free indirect discourse throughout the novel. Yukiko's self-indictment might be insincere, for instance, her forgiveness begrudging in tone, in mood. We don't know because in this novel Hayashi's prose style is behaviorist, anti-psychological. Later in the postwar diegesis, there is the news, ultimately, that Kyujiro has died: "Yukiko read the letter from [Kyujiro's] mother several times. [Kyujiro's] will had specified that he was to have a Catholic funeral service. It struck Yukiko as strange that [Kyujiro], who had been such a lover of his country and believed that Japan could not lose, should have chosen to have a modest Catholic funeral. It seemed that in his last years [Kyujiro] had truly been a victim of war" (184). All told, Kyujiro's turn, over the course of *Floating Clouds*, from resolute (Eastern) imperialist to Catholic (Western) penitent—his transition from an inscription in triumphalist history to the annals of the periphery—marks a history in miniature of Japan's own retraction from empire to colony in the global postwar order.

Chapter 3—*The Enemy Within*

Primarily, this chapter surveys several loosely autobiographical pieces of writing, published first in French by the Franco-Asian writer Marguerite Duras (Donnadieu) in the years 1950-1985. They are *Moderato cantabile* (1958), *Hiroshima mon amour* (1960), and *The War/La douleur* (1985). Between 1950 and 1985, Duras published some ethnographically “late”-modernist—alternatively “realist”-modernist or “modernist”-realist—memoiristic texts that I selectively assemble in this chapter. As these quotation marks signal, I am wagering here and throughout my project that, in a philosophical spirit suited in ways to 20th-century Heideggerian critique, we can place these three terms *sous rature*, and so question canonical determinations of time, genre, and isomorphic language, especially when these categories are applied to practices of categorization across diverse global contexts.

For Duras, the decades 1950-1985 index an extra-diegetic universe of postwar writing that exceeds belatedly the diegetic time of these historical memoirs. Whereas 1950-1985 is the time of postwar writing, in other words, earlier decades are the time of lived experience itself—the vital archive of a life unfolding in the hubs and interstices of France’s waning global empire.¹ As such, Duras’s postwar memoiristic fictions both describe and obliquely invoke France’s imperial centers and reaches from the late nineteenth century into the middle

¹ Todd Shepard (2006).

part of the twentieth century. After the historical times depicted in these fictions of empire, global war, and transnational intimacy, Duras wrote them up, in a career of multi-genre writing that spanned from 1943 through to her death in Paris in the mid-1990s. Her personal and professional biography locates her clearly in the critical narrative of this dissertation.

Marguerite Duras was a twentieth-century modernist of vivid but elusive kind: an unfixed cosmopolitan in senses equally linguistic, geographical, historical and indeed autobiographical [via Hayashi, the I-Novel tradition: Naturalism, Realism/LEJEUNE/De Man]. Official records indicate that Marguerite Germaine Donnadieu was born at 4am on 4 April 1914 in Gia Dinh (Vietnamese for “perfect tranquility”), an alluvial suburb of Saigon that sits between the Saigon and Mekong rivers. Born to her father’s surname, she later changed Donnadieu to Duras when she published her first novel, a pseudo-autobiography, with Plon—*The Insolents* [*Les impudents*] (1943). At one level this authorial act of self-refashioning comes out of a will to distance from ugly family connections—Duras’s brother Pierre, four years her senior, was a notorious pimp, ‘voyeur,’ and opium addict in Paris’ Montparnasse district of the 1930s (earlier, in Sadec, just outside of Saigon, he would stuff coins down his pet monkey’s throat and when that bored him, masturbate publicly from the family’s

porch).² Duras's father's premature death in 1921 from nervous exhaustion, attributed to life in the colonial tropics, contributed to Pierre's sadistic deviancy and conditioned the family's economic hardships, which were a source of both inspiration and shame for Marguerite as she emerged as a writer. Renaming herself Marguerite "Duras" in 1943, after her father's native village of Duras, in the Lot-et-Garonne *département* of southwest France, Marguerite Duras later transmogrified her origin story even further. She would tell her biographer Laure Adler in the 1990s that she was born not in Vietnam's Gia Dinh but in France's Saint-Gratien, in the northern suburbs of Paris.³

This chapter proceeds in three parts. First, I'll lay out a tableau of genealogical approaches to humanistic study that crosses Elizabeth Povinelli's theory of liberalism's compulsory, reproductive "genealogical society" (2006) with Karatani Kôjin's poststructuralist "genealogical method" (1977-1993). Taken together, these distinct critical methods generate an approach to reading transnationally that de-naturalizes both historical master narratives and the meliorist self-evidence of the modern nation-state. In sum, this chapter explores and amplifies our global modernist peripheries as discrepant spaces of humanist life and historiography.

I) Povinelli-Karatani, Duras

² Sade's place in *The Lover* note TK.

³ Adler 108; more on Duras' parents in the imperial class system; other bios/secondary sources in French ref. TK.

This section initiates Marguerite Duras in theoretical spaces of global capture. Here, I foreground a working theory of “genealogical method” in the terms of its historical and social embeddedness: it is situated in and moves across the temporalities of historical content—the pastness of the historical past—and the temporalities of the historicist frame—in historical fiction written in a multiplicity of (a)-synchronous contemporaneities.⁴ In preceding chapters centered on Evelyn Waugh and Hayashi Fumiko, I explored the somber vitality of past time in historical fiction at mid-century. Here, as in those chapters, the melancholic elisions of past and present time are made visible with salience to questions of the geographical and affective range of nationalism and transnationalism in the historical period under view. Derived from γενεα⁵, one of antiquity’s lexical morphologies for contemporary anglophone discourse’s conception of both “generation” and “race,” the genealogy-in/of-genealogical method implicates both the historical dimensions of generational succession in time and the geographical latitudes of cultural constructions in a broadly modern(ist) time.

In order to read Duras’ literatures of cross-cultural intimacy and war in the middle decades of the twentieth century, therefore, I first set up a transnational

⁴ re: “historiography” (narrativist, particularist) vs. “philosophy of history” (analytical, generalist) see Hayden White, “Historicism, History, and the Figurative Imagination,” pp. 101-120, in *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978).

⁵ Accent aigu over α. OED ref.

dialogue between two contemporary thinkers who traverse the fields of global literary study, anthropology, and gender and sexuality studies. From Elizabeth Povinelli's *Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality* (2006) and Karatani Kôjin's deconstructionist *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature* (1975-1993), we derive something like a working theory of genealogical methodology, altogether empirically driven across global contexts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and ethereally poststructuralist across Euro-American and Japanese canons of literature and literary study.⁶

Povinelli historicizes "genealogical method" in the years c. 1870 – 1975. As integral to her study of the material and discursive imbrications of genealogical society, Enlightenment autological rupture, and the liberal fiction of the conjugal "intimate event," her lens is transnational and skeptical of the universalist liberal pieties of liberal empire in the modern North/West.

Her first focal point is the last third of the nineteenth century. In 1871, the American anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan (1818-1881) published *Systems of Consanguinity*, where he formulated two distinct practices of naming kinship links (consanguinity), extended to the so-called global peripheries, in what anthropological scholarship has called Victorian-era debates over "the savage slot." The debates, in other words, over which populations were modern and which were pre-modern—temporal logics of progressiveness and belatedness

⁶ Note on Yale seminar taught, history of translation (Brett de Bary, etc); on Duras' Communism/Marxism via Engels (stages of social development) et al. see Adler, "The Party."

which extended to global spaces of politically and economically hierarchized civilizational models. On Morgan's account, in 1871, there were descriptive systems and classificatory systems; in the former case, family members were discretely and minutely classified with specificity, and in the latter case, family members were grouped in ways that generalized logics of possible familial specificity (social function trumped determinist biological connections). What Morgan contributed to Victorian, Gilded-Age Euro-America was new ferment for evidence—material and discursive—for contemporary thinking about what to make of ethnic and cultural difference as metropolitan economies flourished through imperial depredations.

As Povinelli also shows, c. 1870 (Meiji Japan) was a moment in Euro-America where 17th- and 18th-century Enlightenment models of backwards, passions-besotted "savages" shifted into discourses and organizing logics of "binary exchange," conceived and structured around reproductive heteronormativity. Povinelli writes, "Homosexuality, polyandry, and wife-swapping were immediately transformed into solutions for the seeming scarcity of women [a consequence of the "first rule of exchange," the incest taboo] . . . More social forms and relations fell off the genealogical grid or were recast as a mere by-product of its logic, as the atom of kinship and the very nature of culture emerged as the dialectic of binary exchanges that consisted of I and thou; man and woman; parent and child; wife-givers and takers" (221). Via Morgan's anthropological model of consanguinity c. 1870, Povinelli traces the implications of the anglophone anthropologist's work for the francophone Durkheim and

Mauss' structuralist ideologies of "savage" mind and society. Here we can see a shift from seeing "savages" as evidencing total lack of cognitive and behavioral control to one of reckoning with humanistic alterity, but only through mechanisms of tightly conceived systems of dualistic order. Povinelli calls this development the growth of a pervasive "dialectic of binary exchanges," which is, for her, one of empire's foundational dialectics. Out of her recounting of the Morgan-Durkheim-Mauss trajectory, brightly pictured as the pre-history to current critical conversations surrounding global and social inclusivity, Povinelli introduces the inception of the 20th-century moment in the work of the British psychologist-cum-anthropologist W.H.R. Rivers (1864-1922).⁷ An adventurer and thinker whose work had global implications pointedly relevant to this chapter's focalization of Marguerite Duras' mid-century modernism, Rivers pioneered, in Povinelli's telling, a "genealogical method" that channeled the material of ethnographic inquiry and evidence toward a metaphysics of systematic thinking regarding global paradigms of social and ethnic difference.

In 1901, Povinelli recounts, Rivers had just returned from anthropological adventures in the Pacific Torres Strait Islands (a small archipelago lying between the northern-most tip of Australia and the southwestern corner of Papua New Guinea). In this story of global intimacies in the long age of empire, Rivers pioneered—one year into modernism's long 20th century—a "genealogical method" through which concrete social evidence, gleaned from studies of

⁷ Note on Craiglockhart and WWI shell shock.

populations in this Pacific archipelago c. 1900, was mobilized into a universal “structural principle” whereby all human “kinship” and “affinity” linkages could be systematically theorized (the latter terms are glancing synonyms Povinelli provides for “genealogy” proper in this context) (219). Through the publicity given it by Rivers’ student, A. R. Radcliffe Brown (1881-1955), “a *tool* for generating social data” was “transformed . . . into a *theory* of the generative structure of social systems” (219). In the transformation from “generative” tool to “generative” theory, Rivers’ *genealogical method* itself was born, the basic means by which new genealogical logics could be diversely thought and practiced over the long 20th century. Of course, this is not the first time an idea of this transformational sort was had (that matter translates to a kind of general reason), but the modern context of anglophone imperialist capitalism, and the unique social context that Rivers and Brown bring to this transnational consideration, is specific as historical precedent for Duras’ mid-century Eurasian modernism. Importantly, to the end of destabilizing canonical assumptions about modernism’s literary genres and reactionary political proclivities, Povinelli’s turn on Rivers and Radcliffe-Brown is that their ideology of “minimal dual pairs” (essential sex difference, the reproductive heterosexual couple) comprising the “elemental family” is grossly inadequate in current social contexts, and for contemporary political mandates for thinking and acting in the terms of interracial and non-heterosexist global inclusion (219).⁸

⁸ Note on Povinelli re: *Loving v. Virginia*, *Bowers v. Hardwick*, *Lawrence v. Texas*, p. 175 + ff. TK; Povinelli p. 222 + ff. re: Fifth Pan-African Congress in Manchester, 1945 TK. Lisa Lowe, *Intimacies* re: C.L.R. James, Fernando Ortiz, and Asian migratory labor c. 1830/40—global circuitry of capitalist exchange—in bodies

Turning her sights to a later decade that falls between Duras' publication of *Hiroshima mon amour* (1960) and *The War* (1984), Povinelli brings the "genealogical" logics of Rivers and Radcliffe-Brown's late-Victorian 20th-century methodology to applications in radical faerie communities of 1970s San Francisco. These post-Stonewall sexual politics, negotiating identity formations and nomenclatures at the intersection of diverse discourses, social behaviors, and legal practices, provide the critical stakes and one critical paradigm through which to read the iconoclastic intercultural sexual politics that Duras stages in every piece of historical fiction under view in this chapter. Moreover, in this context, Povinelli's citation of Foucault's late work on individual freedom(s) invokes an historically revisionist, alternatively deconstructionist, methodology and practice that is central both for Karatani Kôjin's "genealogical method" in this era and to my project's exploration of modernist biopolitics more generally. Freshly arrived at Berkeley's French Department in 1975, Povinelli recounts, Foucault emblemized a "genealogical method" that manifested an awkwardly illiberal "constructionist attitude" toward the critical practice of transgressive, self-authenticating "legitimate strangeness"—one which certain members of the radical faerie community rejected as contravening their right to "berdache [third-gender] spirituality" (157).⁹ Contesting the limitations of dualist gender

and goods—across West Indies, European metropolises, and the Global East. Ann Laura Stoler, Lauren Berlant on the domestic and reproductive spheres of intimate life, liberal subjecthood within (neo)-liberal empire; Locke-Macpherson: "possessive individualism"; Afro-Asian neo-Bandungism (Colleen Lye—2008).

⁹ Povinelli, p. 157: "For [those in this community who were dissatisfied with Foucault's "genealogical

paradigms is one version of a sexual analogue to the deconstruction of univocal ethnicity and culture that Duras enacts in her late-imperial fiction—a deconstruction of socialized norms which indeed most often implicates the sexualized valences of ethnic formations generally.

The same year Foucault arrived at Berkeley, Karatani Kôjin, a Japanese literary critic and philosopher, came on the scene at Yale as a guest lecturer. He taught there from 1975 to 1977, forming close ties with Fredric Jameson and Paul de Man.¹⁰ I draw upon Karatani's critical dialogues with other Euro-American critics such as Žižek and Derrida elsewhere in my project, but this chapter focuses mainly on Karatani's "genealogical method" as elaborated in his *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature* (1977-1991).¹¹ Even as the book had its genesis in the productively estranging context of Karatani's teaching a course on Meiji-era

method"], the orientation of radical faeries is not to an *event horizon* [future], but to the reestablishment of a *severed spiritual genealogy* [past]."

¹⁰ Discussion of friendship with de Man; de Man as humanist theorist invested in the material basis of language; de Man's fascism awkwardly side-stepped, p. 187: "My acquaintanceship with Paul de Man was especially significant. Had I not encountered this enigmatic 'stranger,' an émigré from Belgium who had published just one book, and received his encouragement, I would probably not have been able to sustain the course my work has followed into the present. It is not so much because I want to give credit to the late Professor de Man that I emphasize this point, but because of the way he is now being discredited on account of his own kind of 'strangeness' to American society. For what struck me about de Man was not his theory in the narrow sense, which was thoroughly external to American society, but rather that as an existence he *could not but be* theoretical. Somewhere within de Man there was the dark but penetrating awareness that the nature of the human condition was existence in language. This insight should not be confused with a general orientation that makes language the basis for diverse disciplinary inquiries. It is an awareness that was ignored in the 1980s, when theory gained currency and became institutionalized in its own right"; on debate over de Man as symptomatic of revival of "critique of modernity" debates that run the gamut from 1930s Heideggerian romanticism to the global postwar New Left, which included a range of radical discourses of the postwar period (poststructuralism, postmodernism), see p. 191: "For at the intellectual core of the radicalism of the late 1960s (particularly the discourse of poststructuralism, or what has come to be called postmodernism), we may note the impact of the 'critique of modernity' developed by certain controversial thinkers. One was Heidegger, who was positively complicitous with Nazism. That this matter was problematized anew as postmodern thought gained influence in the 1980s is well known. In America, this problematization took the form of the debate over Paul de Man, which was also fueled by the conservative revival of new versions of modernist and enlightenment thought."

¹¹ Nihon Kindai Bungaku no Kigen [日本近代文学の起源]

Japanese literature (1868-1911) to anglophone students at Yale, it was written, Karatani attests, as a series of essays intended for a non-estranged *Japanese* readership and as late-1970s journalistic in genre (190). This crux of defamiliarized native literature and familiar readership proved especially fruitful for Karatani, as he wished to leverage both the refreshed perspicacity that comes from geographical and linguistic distance while at the same time avoid the pitfalls of blunted generalizations, which are often the consequence of “translating” native content to non-native publics (190).¹² Most broadly, Karatani’s study is an investigation of the Meiji-/early Taishô-era literary theorist-critic and writer, Natsume Sôseki (1867-1916), whom I reference in my second chapter. In the *Origins*, Karatani’s focus is the aesthetic ferment of the 1890s in Japan, when new vernacular, generic, and broadly stylistic conventions came into practice in the West-emulating, newly “liberal” nation-state of Japan. Recently “opened to modernity” through the Restoration of the emperor in 1868, Karatani reminds us that between Japan’s victories in the first Sino-Japanese War (1894) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904), Japan’s so-called modernity was secured ever more aggressively in the imperial prowess it demonstrated as it expanded its geopolitical reach in the East Asian archipelago of the cusped 19th/20th-century moment.

“My book, then, is not a literary history but a critique of that history of

¹² Michael Warner ref. TK.

Japanese literature which includes classical literature. A critique that returns to the 'origins' must also critique the 'origins.' For the nationalism that seeks the originality of Japanese literature in a source prior to modernity is itself nothing other than the forgetting of origins" (194). Here we see Karatani placing his heaviest pressure on a "classical" origin story for national literature, where that myth of origins—Japanese or otherwise—creates an ideology of the nation that enforces singular identities *en masse* and precludes identities that are composited across nations, cultures, and genders. With poststructuralist flourish, which is also his deconstructive "genealogical method," as we see below, Karatani concludes his study in an afterword to the English edition written some fifteen years after teaching his first course on Meiji-era Japanese literature at Yale. The whole point of the book, Karatani concludes, was to simultaneously postulate and submit to cynical doubt the idea of a "modern origin" to "modern" Japanese literature. That is, the postulate of a point of literary-historical origin to Japan's literary modernity in the 1890s both articulates and disarticulates itself in its very thesis, and in this dialectical inflection finds something like the concretization of a critical idea. Grounded in the literary example of Natsume Sôseki's "modernity," this critical idea contests, moreover, univocal nationalisms and, with them, nation-state-bound historical master narratives that occlude transnational circuits of global exchange [Karatani's interiority/landscape]. What Sôseki shares with Karatani, Spinoza, and Descartes himself is not the classical formula of "I think therefore I am" ("cogito ergo sum") but its very upending—"doubting, I am," "a cogito as difference" (186-7). This differential reckoning is

the result of an existence *between* cultures and systems, whether for Descartes in exile from France, Sôseki as an ethnographer of London, Spinoza as a European cosmopolitan, or Karatani at New Haven's institutions of higher learning. And a "cogito as difference" is the spatial, social and cultural analogue to the temporal, historical mandate of the "genealogical method," which Karatani sees himself inheriting from Foucault's *Order of Things*—and Marx and Nietzsche's earlier work. The "genealogical method attempts to expose the way in which we take what has been historically produced as natural, the contingent as the necessary," Karatani writes (186). Karatani's de-naturalization (*tentô*) of nationalist myths of origin—classical, romantic, and otherwise—both mobilizes the logic of historical points of origin, as necessary for thinking historical and literary narrative itself, and destabilizes the concept of historical and historicist fixity, especially where such calcifications neglect the generative transgressions of transnational intercourse.¹³

Taken together, Povinelli and Karatani mobilize a broadly humanist, global framework for reading Duras across transnational frontiers of the middle decades of the twentieth century. Their Euro-American and Japanese interpretative and methodological affordances serve primarily to frame Duras' postwar *Hiroshima mon amour* across epistemological and geographical spaces that situate, with suggestive precision, the filmic narrative's own sites of

¹³ Karatani on Foucault re: "history" vs. "historicity" in "Nietzsche, Genealogy and History" (*Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*—1977).

reference. In short, Global Japan and Global France, as at once aggregate and disaggregated configurations of national cohesion, are the cultural touchstones of where this chapter begins its story of Marguerite Duras—*Hiroshima mon amour*. While I speculate on some philosophical parameters for genealogical critique across the transnational nineteenth and twentieth generally, in this project,¹⁴ the Povinelli-Karatani merger foregrounds here a comparative interpretive “method”—invested in humanist displacements of time and space across the Global East and Global West—for reading Marguerite Duras’ Asia- and Europe-bound fictions of transnational intimacy in times of late empire. More specifically: where Povinelli simultaneously mobilizes and submits to radical critique some liberalizing assumptions in the human sciences and anthropological study, she finds contemporary kinship ties across a genealogical “empire of love” that contests logics of Enlightenment individualism, heterosexist reproductive imperatives, and nationalist meliorisms generally. And reciprocally: Karatani allows us to enter the cultural scene of postwar Japan in a transnational configuration of native (Japanese) and non-native (non-Japanese) reading publics—a global “post”-modern moment that, in the unique contextual specificity Karatani makes available c. 1975-1991, deconstructs logics of progressivist history and varieties of imperialist nationalism that are inseparable,

¹⁴ Foucault re: “history” vs. “historicity” in “Nietzsche, Genealogy and History” (*Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*—1977)—in *LCP* is in Karatani???: ref. Nietzsche’s *Genealogy of Morals* (1887) [how N works with “genealogy”] and then reception history—what Yeats and Symons do with N in symbolism book—N seen as Blake’s heir (Yeats/Symons discussed in Waugh chapter); Auden, *New Year Letter* 1941, released in *The Double Man*: “O masterly debunker of our liberal fallacies...all your life you stormed, like your forerunner Blake”; Sedgwick on Nietzsche and queer masculinity in *EC* (most relevant to Waugh).

he shows, from “national” developments in Japanese language and literature.

II) *Hiroshima, Moderato cantabile*—1958 and after

From July to December of 1958, Duras wrote the film script of *Hiroshima mon amour* for the French New Wave film director, Alain Resnais. Dissatisfied with René Clément’s filmic “salvaging” of her first novel, *The Sea Wall*,¹⁵ Duras was pleased to be approached by Resnais in the first half of 1958 to act as scriptwriter for what Resnais, along with Anatole Dauman, founder and executive of Argos Films, envisioned as their forthcoming documentary about Hiroshima. The two *cinéastes* first thought to call their film project “Picadou,” after what they understood to be the Japanese nickname for the atomic bomb.¹⁶ Resnais and Dauman had just collaborated on a short documentary about the European Holocaust—*Night and Fog*¹⁷—and now, with some dispatch, it would seem, they could move on to another atrocity story from the war.¹⁸ In point of fact, Resnais and Dauman first considered Simone de Beauvoir and the popular novelist Françoise Sagan as possible scriptwriters for the film; they never ended up approaching the first while the second allegedly forgot about the meeting as planned at Paris’ Pont Royal bar.¹⁹ Limning the collective energies of postwar

¹⁵ Adler trans. 216 – 7 / Adler orig. French from *Dimanche* 19 February 1956, 316 : « Ce n’est pas moi qui l’établirai (le scénario) et j’en suis fort triste. Le titre sera conservé ainsi que mon nom sur le générique (end credits) ».

¹⁶ Adler 218 / re: “picadou” Treat, Shibata – Japan Studies refs.

¹⁷ *Nuit et brouillard* (1956/32 mins)

¹⁸ Note on Pontecorvo’s *Kapò* (1960). Morris-Suzuki, Shibata on *Night and Fog*.

¹⁹ Adler 218 - 9

nihilism and mass culture in their consideration of documentary scriptwriters, Resnais and Dauman's sights turned with some verve to Marguerite Duras, whom Resnais appreciated as a writer who had "tone."²⁰

Primarily, Resnais based this impression of Duras on having recently read her "new novel" *Moderato cantabile* (1958).²¹ In general terms, Adler's biographical account holds that Duras—who in the 1950s had published only the first tenth of a life's work that spanned five decades—had turned a corner both stylistically and thematically with her publication of *Moderato*. Through a mystifying trope of musical performance, *Moderato* takes as its primary theme the mystery of human behavior, altogether epistemological, homicidal, and sexual—biopolitical on a local scale. Accordingly, contemporary critics and readers in the postwar period understood *Moderato* as a novel written with the "behaviorist" preoccupations of the postwar *nouveau roman*. *Hiroshima*, I am suggesting, follows in the literary-political—the proverbial politics of the literary and the literariness, or rhetorical letter-boundedness, of politics—wake of the *Moderato* text. Invoking Benveniste's work on linguistic *enunciation* in his own treatment of narratology, Genette's classic explanation of "simultaneous" narrative voice in the postwar behaviorist novel affords a frame for reading the elements of mystification that Duras makes

²⁰ Adler 219 / Adler orig. French from interview 339 : « C'est alors, poursuit Resnais, que j'ai évoqué le nom de Marguerite Duras. Je venais de lire *Moderato*, j'avais eu le coup de foudre, j'avais beaucoup aimé *Les petits chevaux de Tarquinia*, je venais de voir *Le square* et j'avais été ému par la musicalité de la langue... Et puis j'adorais *Conversation en Sicile* de Vittorini que je traduisais chaque soir à des copains. » Pour Resnais, Duras est un auteur qui a un « ton ». Forthcoming Adler [F] p. 339 + ff.—bits about Resnais and Duras' friendship/collaboration that are missing from the English translation. Bernard Pingaud is original scriptwriter.

²¹ Adler 219 / Gloss *The Square* (1955), *Tarquinia* (1953)

integral to her transnational literature of the global mid-century period—her late-imperial displacements within and across global Asia and Europe. With Robbe-Grillet, Dujardin, and Beckett, among other writers of “mysterious” fictions, Genette tells us, “the last trace of enunciating that still subsisted in the Hemingway-style narrative . . . now disappears in a total transparency of the narrative, which finally fades away in favor of the story” (219). Here, then, in the collective postwar’s *weltschmerz*, there should be no more *telling* of the tale. There would be only tale—“bare” tale, profane life, as a kind of narratological correlate to Agamben’s “bare life” in the camps of the Holocaust—and no teller. Inversely, and in a manner continuous with modernism’s radical orthodoxies of stream of consciousness narrative, “simultaneous” voice can move also in the direction of pure “interior monologue,” supplanting its totalization of *discours* with unbounded *récit*, or musings untethered from worldly contexts and referents.²² In a similarly post-humanist vein, Fredric Jameson’s more recent essay, “The Swollen Third Person, or, Realism after Realism,” historicizes the postwar existentialist moment in the terms of resurgent phenomenologies of “impersonality” in film and text (Sartre, Pasolini, Faulkner), and in their afterlives in criticism. “[T]he he or she of the third person being based on a reifying system of names and external personifications we can no longer accept today,” Jameson writes. “While the first-person narrative position itself . . . proliferates into a host of distinct subject-positions that cannot readily be

²² Genette, *Narrative Discourse* (1972: Seuil/1980: Cornell)

subsumed back into a single category” (170).²³ Whereas Jameson’s critique of the fiction of phenomenological integrity in subjects and objects, across discursive space, can of course extend to diverse times and places, it is poignantly relevant to the milieu of aesthetic and political disillusionment—as well as reconfiguration—in the immediate postwar period.

We are told at the end of *Moderato*’s first chapter that *moderato cantabile* “means moderately slow, and cantabile means melodiously. It’s easy.”²⁴ And yet, as touched upon below in relation to the story’s historical synchronicity with *Hiroshima*—and therefore, I am proposing, the texts’ global-literary inextricability from one another and from their global times and zones of reference—the implications of *Moderato*’s title (“slow,” “melodious”—“it’s easy”) are anything but transparent. As with *Hiroshima*, the novel’s enigmas transcend the evident challenges and residual ironies of intercultural *linguistic* translation to underscore, however slyly, the confusions that result even when subjects share a common language, a native language.²⁵ In the case of *Moderato*, the original text is written entirely in French with the exception of the title’s Italian-French-(English) translational aporia. With *Hiroshima*, the original diegesis is likewise in French except for two brief untranslated dialogues—near the film’s end, between native Japanese subjects (Duras renders them « lui » and « une vieille femme ») and between the film’s French actress (Duras renders her « elle ») and an anonymous

²³ Jameson, *Antinomies of Realism* Verso: 2013/2015

²⁴ MD, *Moderato Cantabile* in *Four Novels* (Grove: 1965) trans. Richard Seaver 69

²⁵ Bhabha (“Sly Civility”), Leela Gandhi (*Common Cause*)

Japanese lothario at the “Casablanca” night club in postwar Hiroshima—in Japanese and English.²⁶

Evading psychological explanation, the *Moderato* novelette centers a baffling murder and an even more baffling obsession with this murder. Indeed, where relevant to the “mysterious” enigmas of *Hiroshima*, altogether semantic-translational and historical-temporal, Duras’ biographical connection—a life at once lived and chronicled—to the social and ideological milieu of the “new” *nouveau roman* is significant: however strained it became, at mid-century Duras’ friendship (and editorial collaboration) with Alain Robbe-Grillet suggests an affinity between the *nouveau roman*’s “anti-romantic”²⁷ innovations and the perennial logics of “newness” and “nowness” that global modernism brings to bear, as a critical hermeneutic, upon discrepant spaces of modernity. These historical and formal considerations are part of the general concerns of my project, as it studies unique literary contributions of broadly historical and realist writing across national and transnational modernist spaces in the mid-century period. Following the strict chronology of Duras’ life and works, then, *Moderato* acts the part of novelistic prelude to the film script of *Hiroshima* that she writes for Resnais in the second half of 1958. For Duras, writing from her home on the Left Bank’s rue Saint-Benoît, *Moderato* (the new novel) occupies the first part of 1958, and *Hiroshima* (the filmic “novel,” the postwar global-modernist novel) the

²⁶ Duras trans. 80-1 / Duras orig. 120-2

²⁷ Adler 209 / Adler orig. French 323—Robbe-Grillet qtd... supprimer certaines naïvetés « dans le genre presse du cœur » .

second.

Where *Hiroshima* is set in August of 1957, twelve years to the month after the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, its historical referent is the mass death of Japanese civilians in August of 1945. This mass death was not only instantaneous, of course, but also globally long in its biopolitical fallout—and I engage with some transnational post-nuclear reception histories and discourses below. In contrast to the historical indexes of *Hiroshima*, *Moderato* refers obsessively back to the murder of the historically obscure, and nameless, woman about whom the novel's heroine speculates. In the spirit of the “new” *nouveau roman*, both texts are jagged, fragmentary; and yet they are dense with a sense of embodied presence. Set in a generic port city in France in an unspecified contemporary time, *Moderato* tells the story of Anne Desbaredes, a heavy-drinking socialite who is the wife of the manager of Import Export et fonderies de la Côte [sic]. A woman of some means, she enjoys consorting with the lower orders of society, harbors a bizarre distaste for the scent of magnolias, and, when not distracted by her own carnal pursuits, equal parts erotic and epistemological, lavishes any remaining attention on her recalcitrant son, who is learning the piano. Upon leaving the piano lesson that opens the novel, mother and son encounter the corpse of a woman who has just been murdered by a man in the café downstairs, along the docklands. Curiously, the man—the murderer—appears unspeakably remorseful.

A kind of surrogate for Duras herself, who alleged in a 1975 radio interview that for an entire year she fixated on her son's piano lessons and was unable to write a word,²⁸ Anne, *Moderato's* heroine, engages a working-class employee at her husband's foundry in probing conversation about the murder over the course of story. For one week, Chauvin, the factory worker, and Anne build an erotic connection that is based entirely on Anne's lurid curiosity about the murder and the "chauvinistic" pleasure Chauvin takes in toying at the edges of (masculine) pretenses of omniscience.²⁹ The murder happens in Chapter One, in the story's undated Time Zero, and it is in Chapter Three, the second day after the day of the murder, that the sexual prowess of Chauvin's epistemological power—enabled, in some sense, by Anne's relentless questioning—becomes unmistakable. In the café, Duras writes, over drinks,

[Chauvin] moved closer and said dryly:

"Talk to me."

[Anne] tried to find something to say.

"I live in the last house on the Boulevard de la Mer, the last one as you leave town. Just before the dunes."

"The magnolia tree in the left-hand corner of the garden is in bloom."

"Yes, there are so many flowers at this time of year that you can dream about them and be ill all the next day because of them. You shut your window, it's

²⁸ Adler 207

²⁹ NB: in French, "chauvin" means nationalist/patriotic and has nothing to do with gender.

unbearable.”

“It was in that house that you were married, some ten years ago?”

“Yes. My room is on the second floor, to the left, overlooking the sea. You told me last time that he had killed her because she had asked him to, to please her in fact?”

He waited before answering her, at last able to see the outline of her shoulders.

[.....]

His eyes returned to hers, and he stared at her wearily.

“I imagine that one day,” he said, “one morning at dawn she suddenly knew what she wanted him to do. Everything became so clear for her that she told him what she wanted. I don’t think there’s any explanation for that sort of discovery.”³⁰

Between Chauvin and Anne Desbaredes, wondering in conversation over a possible rationale behind the man’s mysterious murder of his lover, it is the uncertainty of distinction between knowing and not knowing that elicits the very fiction of this morbid, sultry story. Yes, “[t]he magnolia tree in the left-hand corner of the garden is in bloom,” Chauvin somehow knows, of Anne’s house on the Boulevard de la Mer. At the same time, Chauvin only “imagines” a speculative pre-history to the day of the murder itself, a voyeur’s interpretation

³⁰ *Moderato* 79-80

of a speculated “discovery” of suicidal longing that quite defies rationality. Anne, then, is at a redoubled remove from Chauvin’s own site of epistemological remove from the inscrutable murder itself. Within this interlocking series of mysteries, Duras conforms to some of Alain Robbe-Grillet’s prescriptions for the *nouveau roman* (1956): in the antibourgeois postwar “new novel,” born in Robbe-Grillet’s view of uniquely French literary traditions, readers must resist a “tyranny of significations” in characters and objects.³¹ Inside the generic zone of the *nouveau roman*, there is no sympathetic heroine, no pathetic fallacy. Little wonder, then, that while the contrarian Duras went on to resist any identification with the *nouveau roman* clique, it was Robbe-Grillet who persuaded her to publish *Moderato* with *Editions de Minuit*. And it was Robbe-Grillet who, having read snippets of *Moderato* in serial form, suggested that Duras resist certain “romantic” tendencies he saw in the earlier version of the narrative;³² Duras enthusiastically consented to Robbe-Grillet’s suggested revisions. For Duras, writing in 1958, the shift from Gallimard to Editions de Minuit was a declamatory one—though still early in her career, she had never strayed from Gallimard before. But there were social and financial tensions, and Duras wanted to send a kind of message to Gallimard’s Claude Gallimard, Odette Laigle.³³ For publication of the film script and dialogue of *Hiroshima mon amour*, written, let’s recall, in the second half of 1958, she did return to Gallimard in 1960.

³¹ 21-2, Mme de Lafayette, Balzac etc.

³² Adler pp. on friendship, fallout, MD’s later reactions to being seen as a “new novel” writer.

³³ Adler 206-10

From the year 1960's Gallimard, in Paris, we turn to Hiroshima—Hiroshima in 1945, 1957, 1958. In sequence, this series of years marks, first, the advent of the world's nuclear age, second, the diegetic year of Duras' filmic "documentary" of it, and third, the year of Duras' history of filmic writing itself. Texturizing this temporal landscape ever further, *Hiroshima* features five main sections and several minor supplementary sections—a preface, a synopsis, and appendices ("nocturnal notations"—"notes on Nevers"—written in December 1958).³⁴ In her "synopsis," Duras contests the genre of the "made-to-order documentary" that she claims does nothing to "probe the lesson of Hiroshima." By writing what she calls a "*false* documentary [emphasis mine]" in which a "personal story, however brief it may be, always dominates Hiroshima" to then and therefore "probe the lesson of Hiroshima," Duras rather chafingly self-

³⁴ On the Scene of the German's Death: "The absurdity of war, laid *bare*, hovers over their blurred bodies"; On the Shot of the Garden From Which the German Was Fired Upon: "The garden is henceforth marked by the sign of the *banality* of his death" (87). A German Soldier Crosses a Provincial Square During the War: "People no longer pay any attention to the enemy. They've grown used to the war. The Champs de Mars Square reflects a quiet despair. The German soldier feels it too. We don't talk enough about the *boredom of war*" (88). An Imaginary Nevers: "Thus Nevers is *circumscribed like a capital* [imperialism's metropolises]." When Riva's Head was Shaved at Nevers (modeled on the collaborator and salonnière Betty Fernandez, ref. in *The War*): "[For sleeping with the enemy], [t]hey are shaving someone's head somewhere in France. Here it's the druggist's daughter. The wind bears the strains of the *Marseillaise* to the crowd and encourages the exercise of a hasty, ridiculous justice. They haven't time enough to be intelligent. This is a theater where there is no performance. None. Something might have been staged, but the performance failed to take place" (99). Riva Goes Out, At Dawn, On the Quays of the Loire: "People are crossing the bridge. Banality is sometimes striking. This is peace, they say. They are the people who shaved me. No one has shaved me. This is the Loire that *takes* my eyes. I look at it, and can't take my eyes off it. I think of nothing, nothing. What order" (101). Nevers (As a reminder) Riva Herself Tells of Her Life at Nevers: "My mother [*who was either Jewish or separated from her husband*] was living in the south of France / At night, beneath the windows of my room, the Champs de Mars loomed even bigger. There was *no flag* on the town hall. I had to think back to my early childhood to remember the street lamps lighted / The war was interminable. My youth was interminable. I couldn't get away from the war, or from my youth / I began to dream of an enemy, at night, during the day. And in my dreams morality and immorality were so intertwined that soon I couldn't tell one from the other. I was twenty / for six months *I had been in love with a German soldier . . . I wanted to follow him to Germany*. At Nevers, The Resistance was already sniping at the enemy. The police had disappeared. My mother returned / I left for Paris on my bicycle. It was a long way, but the weather was warm. Summer. *When I reached Paris, the morning of the second day, the word Hiroshima was in all the newspapers*. It was extraordinary news. My hair was now a decent length. No one was shaved" (103-108).

arrogates a morally didactic stance in the post-45 context.³⁵ Nevertheless, by defying “made-to-order” generic categories for her narrative, in *Hiroshima*, Duras participates in contemporary and ongoing debates over (post)-Holocaust and (post)-nuclear narrative, aesthetics, and systems of representation.³⁶ Citing a lecture Hayden White gave at UCLA in April of 1970 (“Historical Employments and the Problem of ‘Truth’”), John Whittier Treat has written of the unprecedented need for a post-45 “middle voice,” an historical rhetoric of “strangeness” that the wide-ranging illuminations of the European Enlightenment could not, Treat surmises, have possibly foreseen. A “strange” *voice* more consonant with Genette’s “simultaneous” behaviorist voice than discordant with it, I would wager, White, on Treat’s account, proposes a way of narrativizing that is neither entirely subjectivist nor entirely objectivist. Here, then, the “kind of writing that has emerged out of Hiroshima and Nagasaki,” Treat writes, “has amended if not displaced modernism” (75-6). Following Hayden White and Michael Geyer’s work on historical representation over the long twentieth century, Treat views the “postmodern pastiche[s]” of a so-called post-genocidal “postmodernity” as suspect when applied to the residual continuities and ruptures of post-45 writing.³⁷ If poetry famously died in the Holocaust’s camps and then again on the scorched earth of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Duras’ “false documentary” may be seen to make its contribution to

³⁵ orig. French TK. Duras 10

³⁶ Lisa Yoneyama, *Hiroshima Traces* ref. TK.

³⁷ Treat 75, 452; Michael Geyer: “Man-made Transcendences: Consumerism, Violence, and the Problem of Memory.” Lecture. April 27, 1990. UCLA.

this radicalization of post-45 representational space. And if, again on Treat's account, atomic-bomb literature both inhabits and exceeds the classifications of testimonial (*taiken*) and documentary (*kiroku*) fiction (*shôsetsu*) in the national, or nativist, canons of modern Japanese literature, then Duras' avant-garde genre of the Franco-Japanese "personal story" goes some ways toward contributing to these post-45 de-naturalizations of generic classification.³⁸

The scenario of *Hiroshima mon amour* that Duras writes for Alain Resnais through the second half of 1958 is the *précis* of a faltering conversation between a nameless white French actress and a nameless Japanese architect and local politician. Emmanuelle Riva (1927-2017) plays the part of the former and Eiji Okada (1920-1995) the part of the latter. In her classic analysis of *Hiroshima* within the domain of trauma studies, Cathy Caruth has called Duras' *Hiroshima* an historical fiction of discursive "betrayal" and material transference in the

³⁸ Especially re: Lisa Lowe, I think this fn. needs to be expanded as its own series of paragraphs somewhere in the body of the chapter. John Whittier Treat, *Writing Ground Zero: Japanese Literature and the Atomic Bomb* (University of Chicago Press: 1995), see esp. "Genre and Post-Hiroshima Representation," 45-81. As Duras describes in the penultimate chapter of her "appendices," "Portrait of the Japanese," "Monsieur Butterfly is outmoded. So is Mademoiselle de Paris. . . . This Franco-Japanese film should never seem *Franco-Japanese*, but *anti-Franco-Japanese*. That would be a victory" (109). Even as this remark has elicited recent transnational and postcolonial critique (eg, Shibata: 27), Duras' late-imperial, cosmopolitan worldview can also be seen as, in fraught ways, transnationally progressive in its moment. Adler 84-93: Under Georges Mandel (1885-1944), Minister of the Colonies (1938-1940), Duras worked with her friend Philippe Roques as co-author of *L'Empire français* (Gallimard: 1940); Adler, 89-90: "*L'Empire français* is a work of pure propaganda that endorses France's dominion over the colonies. The very principle of colonialism was acknowledged as a universal truth even though the colonies were becoming a greater economic and financial burden. . . . There was a feeling of 'social humanism' predominant in France at the time which gave rise to the idea of a brotherhood of man [imperialist paternalism] . . . qtd. *L'Ef*—'It would be insane to impose on a young Annamese, whose country had achieved historical and intellectual greatness, the same working conditions as a young black child, whose evolution has been held in check for thousands of years' [bring this "benevolent" hierarchization of races—shudder—into dialogue with Lisa Lowe's *Intimacies of Four Continents*, her refrain of a "history of the present" throughout and especially in the last chapter, "Freedoms Yet to Come," see esp. pp. 153-175—Africa-Asia Marxist transferences via C.L.R. James (*The Black Jacobins*: 1938; Chinese migratory labor in Trinidad in *Beyond a Boundary*: 1963); a thematics of the global economic displacements of Asian "coolie" migratory labor].

communication it stages between Occupation-era France and postwar Hiroshima. For Caruth, the French actress' traumatic loss, through death, of her German lover during the war is reanimated in and travestied by her brief extramarital dalliance with a Japanese man: the film's embedded histories, its "story of a telling," occurs, then, through at once the introduction of a contemporary Franco-Japanese love affair *and* through an act of commemoration that the characters who are involved in this contemporary love affair share in dialogue (27). Internal to the diegetic frame of 1957, the embedded core of the filmic narrative is therefore the set-piece of commemorative reenactment, which Riva performs in the film's untitled Part IV, of Occupation-era intimacy with a foreign soldier—played by Bernard Fresson—in her character's hometown of provincial Nevers. Above and beyond the fact that both Riva and Okada's characters are married to French and Japanese nationals, the film performs infidelity, therefore, at world-scale in the fact that Riva's character sleeps with male figurations of both contemporary and latter-day Axis powers; she loved a German soldier during the Occupation and later a former Japanese-imperial combatant.³⁹ Local—and global—color in the film's Part IV: as "[n]ight falls over Hiroshima," Riva and Okada sit in an unnamed modern café where "Hiroshima ends and the Pacific begins"—and as night descends and memories of war-era Nevers return, French "bal-musette" keeps playing on the café's jukebox; "[t]o make the miracle of the lost memories of Nevers last, to keep anything from

³⁹ orig. French TK. Duras 28

‘moving,’ the Japanese pours the contents of his glass into hers.”⁴⁰

For Caruth, Riva stages “a betrayal precisely in the act of telling” (27). Moreover, Caruth suggests that Duras raises the question of ethics not only in her treatment of specifically nuclear-era atrocity but more generally also in the problem of historical discourse—historiography as both knowledge and script—*itself*. “The possibility of knowing history, in this film, is thus also raised as a deeply ethical dilemma: the unremitting problem of *how not to betray the past*” (27).⁴¹ Even as they apply especially to *Hiroshima*, Caruth’s remarks also evoke some of the epistemological and representational concerns of the *Moderato*’s new-novel narrative, epistemological and representational concerns which *Hiroshima* amplifies and globalizes. As one general parameter for my project’s chapters’ explorations of global modernism, I reference Caruth’s reading of Freud’s analysis of “taboo” in his war-era *Moses and Monotheism* (1939) in my introduction. But for the purposes of this chapter, I confine myself to the generally psychoanalytic and poststructuralist terms Caruth sets for her discussion of *Hiroshima mon amour*, which I also like to read through an historiographical, discursive, and trauma-centered lens. What Caruth’s classic analysis of *Hiroshima* lacks by way of transnational purview, Asia-studies critics

⁴⁰ orig. French TK. Duras 53, 59. For displacements of France into Japan, see also Duras 45: “[Okada] is facing [Riva]. And in the same state, almost awkward. The opposite of what a man would do if this were an *aubaine* [???] OED: 1866, *Haydn’s Dict.*—“a right of French Kings, which existed from the beginning of the monarchy, whereby they claimed the property of every stranger who died in their country, without having been naturalised, was abolished by the national assembly in 1790; re-established by Napoleon . . . finally annulled July 14, 1819.”

⁴¹ Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Johns Hopkins: 1996). NB. Caruth cites Jean-Daniel Roob’s biography of Alain Resnais (1986)—Okada learned French *only* phonetically (50, 128).

such as Yuko Shibata, Rey Chow, Lisa Yoneyama, Lisa Lowe, and John Whittier Treat supplement with force.

Recently, from a Japan Studies vantage, Yuko Shibata has tracked a curiously anti-progressive shift in the Euro-American reception history of Duras and Resnais' *Hiroshima*. Whereas anglophone and francophone 1960s poststructuralist scholarship (Wolfgang A. Luchting, John Ward) tended to give equal critical weight to the imaginative histories and pre-histories of Riva's "white" female persona and Okada's "yellow" male persona, thereby suggesting a kind of utopianist racial equivalence *avant la lettre*, a feminist turn in the 1980s/90s collectively instrumentalized, Shibata argues, Okada's non-white character in order to read *only* the fiction of Riva's life during and after the war.⁴² These more recent accounts "embod[y] . . . an othering/racializing of the Japanese man" (29). This is the critical regression that Shibata charts. In counterpoint to this trend, Shibata explores the awkward positionality of Okada's character, who is both the "ex-colonizer" of imperial Japan and the "'colonized' in the postwar world order initiated by U.S. preeminence," in order to land squarely on the political side of postcolonial critiques of empire—Bhabha, Fanon, Earl Jackson, Jr. (29-30).

Citing the work of Tachikawa Kyôichi (Keiryûsha: 2000) and Robert O.

⁴² Yuko Shibata, *Producing Hiroshima and Nagasaki: Literature, Film, and Transnational Politics* (University of Hawai'i Press: 2018), 28-30, 105.

Paxton (Columbia UP: 2001), Shibata's discussion of "forgotten" Franco-Japanese imperialist collaboration in Southeast Asia is illuminating (22-4). Here, Shibata makes evident both France and Japan's opportunistic concessions to Nazi Germany during the protracted "Asia-Pacific War" period (1931-1945). In particular, Shibata's discussion of Japan's different "occupation policies"—some liberalizing and others not—across Burma, the Philippines, Indonesia, and French Indochina (its Meigô campaign/*sakusen*) bears upon my preceding chapter's discussion of Hayashi Fumiko's war-era fiction of Japanese military-imperial occupation in Southeast Asia, *Floating Clouds* (*Ukigumo*—1951).

[Through the lens of critical race studies, this series of paragraphs wants to bring Rey Chow (2002) into dialogue with Anne Cheng (2019) through representations of "supplementary" and "ornamental" Asiatic femininity in *Hiroshima mon amour*. NB. Adler 27, 392 fn. 32: speculations that Duras' father was Chinese, not French—ill-founded but circulating nonetheless.] Shibata's postcolonial-Japan Studies recuperation of Duras finds a globally feminist antecedent in Rey Chow's analysis of *Hiroshima*, in *The Protestant Ethnic & the Spirit of Capitalism*. Extending the terms and implications of French poststructuralist feminism (Toril Moi: 1985) and mass-cultural logics of American feminism (Ann Douglas: 1977) via her readings of Brontë and Duras, Chow mobilizes a "supplementary logic of 'woman'" (160) in order to point up what she sees as an implicit and enduring whiteness in Euro-American feminism—in evidence in *Hiroshima* as elsewhere. In the final account, Chow damns Duras for

an imperialist “distribution of narrative investments” in *Hiroshima* (174). She writes,

If the most radical aspect of the textualization of politics—of the move to dislocate even a weighty historical referent such as Hiroshima—turns out to be dependent, for its own avant-garde battles, on a recuperation of referentiality and mimeticism as the semiotic ghetto in which to banish the non-white other, then “French,” we might argue, is not so distinguishable from “Anglo-American” after all (178).

Here, Eiji Okada’s character’s realist “referentiality and mimeticism”—or “coercive mimeticism,” as Chow also calls it—in his apparent lack of fulsome private memory, his flat-footedly “public” engagement with the post-atomic afterlife of Hiroshima, makes him the aesthetic instantiation of an uneducated colonial subaltern. In contrast, Riva’s French actress inhabits the complex psychic life of avant-garde modernism. She alone is afforded the dynamism of high modernism’s interplays of “radical hedonism” and “puritanism,” its dance, across psychoanalytic and economic contexts and discourses, between a “reality principle” and a “pleasure principle” (158).⁴³

What Chow sees as an absence of WOC (“woman of color”) representation in feminisms of the latter half of the twentieth century, Anne Cheng has *filled in* through an optics of the *ornamentalist* “yellow woman.” As opening salvo, Cheng

⁴³ Chow adapts some of Andreas Huyssen’s terminology in his “Mass Culture as Woman: Modernism’s Other,” in *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Indiana University Press, 1986), 44-62.

dogears the “authenticity controversy” that Maxine Hong Kingston and Frank Chin’s 1980s public debate over Asian-American identity politics stages for Asian-American Studies (xii). Duras is quite absent from Cheng’s account, but Cheng’s critical investments speak to the global considerations of Duras’ mid-century modernist fictions of war, late empire, and cultural and racial difference across global Asian and European modernist latitudes. To the “critique” of postcolonial orientalism, then, *ornamentalism* offers a “theory of being” for Asiatic femininity; even as it has been conspicuously aestheticized, and therefore objectified, this silenced and imperiled minority has worked as global empire’s “ghost in the machine” (18, 4). In coalition with other WOC feminisms, the “yellow woman” is the encrusted obverse to black feminism’s naked “epidermal racial schema” (Fanon) and “hieroglyphics of the flesh” (Hortense Spillers) (4). As embroidered object-subject-commodity, voided of interiority, the “yellow woman” becomes a racialized correlate for Genette’s narratological “simultaneous” voice, White’s post-45 “middle” voice—the handmaiden of discursive and material representations that are neither exclusively subject- / *récit*- nor object- / *discours*- bound.

III) *La douleur*—1985, 1944/5

Buchenwald. Belsen. Hamburg-Neuengamme. Mittel-Glattbach.
Ravensbrück. Mäidenek. Marguerite Duras’ litany of liberated concentration

camps, observed in the war memoir she kept in the final years of the Paris Occupation, reads with the nominating precision of an official historical chronicle—real events, real people, real moments of record—that at the same time eludes facticity, denies faithful realism. In one entry, Duras' memoirist quotes to her reader from an article she is in the process of reading, in the current issue of *Libération-Soir*: "Vaihingen [a concentration camp in Stuttgart] will never be heard of again. On the maps, the pale green of the forests will stretch right down to the Enz. . . . The watchmaker was killed at Stalingrad, the barber served in Paris, the village idiot occupied Athens" (24-5).⁴⁴ At one level, a patchwork of strange contemporary news relays without seeming alarm its own horrific strangeness, the people and places of the disassembling European theater of the Second World War (1939-1945). At another level, however, this same reader of news, the porous subjectivity of Duras' enervated Paris civilian self, sees herself as a disembodied jumble of limbs, a lunatic assemblage of body parts—"I can't hold my head up any more. My legs and arms are heavy, but not so heavy as my head. It's not a head any more, it's an abscess" (28). Head-turned-abscess, a surrealist's terrifying fancy, sits down to read the day's news, such as it is told in the controlled prose of reportage on every emergent genre there is of atrocity story. It is April 1945, we are told.

As Duras' memoirist later remarks, "This new face of death that has been

⁴⁴ Duras, Marguerite. *The War (La douleur)*, trans. Barbara Bray (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986); orig. pub. Paris: P. O. L. éditeur, 1985.

discovered in Germany—organized, rationalized—produces bewilderment before it arouses indignation” (49). Learning of the camps, of the war’s mass carnages, is done first in the relative terms of rational cognition and second in the irrational overwhelm of physical feeling. First there is stiff public “history” and second there are the private minds and bodies that history touches and alters irrevocably.

Duras’ *The War* [*La douleur*] presents as written in 1944-1945. Upon closer reading, though, it is clear that the story is overlaid with belated revisions, sutured and invisibly integrated changes that expand Duras’ narrative of her contemporary time to represent a fully dimensionalized temporal landscape of future-past revisionism. Indeed, *The War* was not published until 1985 (Editions P.O. L.; trans. Barbara Bray, Pantheon, 1986).⁴⁵ *The War* contains five pieces: “The War” [*La douleur*], “Monsieur X, Here Called Pierre Rabier” [*Monsieur X. dit ici Pierre Rabier*], “Albert of the Capitals [*Albert des Capitales*],” “Ter of the Militia [*Ter le milicien*],” “The Crushed Nettle [*L’Ortie brisée*],” and “Aurelia Paris [*Aurélia Paris*].” I’m writing on the eponymous “The War” first as it is the lengthiest and most historically dense of these five pieces of writing. Nevertheless, all these histories document Duras’ experience of the war in some way.

⁴⁵ In *The War*’s preface, Duras recounts how she retrieved her war writing from her country home at Neauphle-le-Château, from several long-forgotten exercise books in her blue cupboards; decades after the war the magazine *Sorcières* asked her for some writing from her youth (3-4).

I want to signpost two sites of discursive tension in “The War.” I hope to follow these sites of tension—sites of neutral contradiction or of value-laden hypocrisy—through to some tentative aesthetico-political conclusions in Duras’ war oeuvre as it marks a space of contribution to global writing at mid-century. The first site of tension is the disaffiliation between the estranging “content” of war atrocity and the banal “form” of political reportage on that content. This point is inspired by Arendt’s famous formulation, in *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, on the Nazi “banality of evil,” the unblinking regularization of unprecedented biopolitical evil.⁴⁶ The second site of tension is that of the multidirectional density of Duras’ historical temporality in her war writing, the revisionism she brings to contemporary writing on the event of war.

Many years after the war, Duras looks back on herself and her writing during that time. In her seventies, she writes the preface to *The War*: “How could I have written this thing I still can’t put a name to, and that appalls me when I reread it?” she asks. She confesses, “I have no recollection of having written it.” *The War* is un-nameable and amnesic. Adding to the mystery of the diary’s genesis, Duras continues, “One thing is certain: it is inconceivable to me that I could have written it while I was actually awaiting Robert L.’s return.” “Robert L.” is Robert Antelme (1917-1990), Duras’ first husband, who was active in the French Resistance, and for this was deported to Buchenwald; he returned,

⁴⁶ Ref TK.

ultimately, from Dachau. But “The War” itself turns on Duras’s anticipation of the return of her husband, who is at moments presumed dead.

Here, in the hindsight afforded in the preface, we learn then how subject to doubt Duras’ contemporary “history” of the Occupation and Liberation is—that the narrative of “The War” that hinges on the memoirist’s endless presentist waiting for her husband’s return, and the event of the return itself, was not likely concurrent with a phenomenology of historical happening, unfolding in real time. Rather, the diary is often distanced and shaped through some historical perspective. At moments in “The War” this revisionist vantage is obvious; historical distance works as a corrective to past ignorance. As “Monty” (British: General Bernard Law Montgomery) is reputed to have crossed the Elbe and “Patton” (American: General George Smith Patton) makes his way to Nuremberg, Duras’ memoirist betrays the un-contemporary nature of a diary entry which is meant to represent contemporary reality. “We don’t *yet know* that sometimes, when [the Germans] don’t have time to shoot [the camp prisoners], they leave them where they are” (24; emphasis mine). As the camps are liberated, some prisoners are spared in the arbitrary grace afforded in chance timing. Others, of course, are shot dead in the general mood of panic, as if guilt could be extinguished metonymically in the prisoners’ spectral bare lives. For Duras—the memoirist—this fact of history is learned only later. Elsewhere, in an entry from “April 28,” Duras’ memoirist reveals her revisionism in an entry that tells of François Morland’s (Mitterrand’s) discovery of “Robert L.” in Dachau. Duras

writes, "I can't remember what day it was, whether it was in April, no, it was a day in May when one morning at eleven o'clock the phone rang. It was from Germany, it was François Morland. He doesn't say hello, he's almost rough, but clear as always. 'Listen carefully. Robert is alive. Now keep calm. He's in Dachau. Listen very, very carefully. Robert is very weak, so weak you can't imagine' It was May 12, the day of the peace" (50). Undone by the biopolitical mechanics of war, "Robert L." will return to Paris a wasted body and spirit, a borderless, permeable organism. "He must have weighed between eighty-two and eighty-four pounds: bone, skin, liver, intestines, brain, lungs, everything—eighty-four pounds for a body five feet ten inches tall. . . . Once he was sitting on his pail he excreted in one go, in one enormous, astonishing gurgle. What the heart held back the anus couldn't: it let out all that was in it. Everything, or almost everything, did the same, even the fingers, which no longer kept their nails, but let them go too" (57). It is April 28 (1945) but it is also, evidently, to Duras' metahistorical psyche—altogether revisionist, corrective, and unreliable—the later month of May.

Of a dozen diary entries assigned to the month of "April" in a year alleged to be 1945, only one entry in "The War" gives the precision of day, date, and year—*Sunday, April 22, 1945* (30-36). On this day, in the historical fiction of "The War," Duras' memoirist takes corydrane (a potent stimulant, taken off the French market in 1971, that both Duras and Sartre took as uppers), decides not to go to the Gare d'Orsay (where she had been going to glean information from returning

POWs, deportees, and refugees, to circulate to families of the interned and missing; Duras/the memoirist had been publishing this information in *Libres*, the paper she founded in September 1944), reads from the *FN* (*Front National*, Communist periodical), and quotes Churchill (“We haven’t long to wait now”, Frédéric Noël (“Some people think war brings artistic revolution, but war really operates on other levels”), and De Gaulle (“The days of weeping are over. The days of glory have returned”). She also continues to help one Madame Bordes, a friend who nervously awaits news of family who may or may not return from Stalag [“POW camp”] III A, if that is in fact where Madame Bordes’ kin is. In this setting, all news is hearsay, contingent.

But even as the formal historical certitude of this entry—day, month, date, year—is exceptional in “The War” for its cardinal precision, it records too the uncentering existential “disconnections” of other entries. The memoirist’s surrealist discomposure, for instance, or the chronic incontinence of “Robert L.,” wrought in the deep damage done by the unthinkable hypocrisy of fascist biopolitical mechanization. Duras writes,

D. [Dionys Mascolo; Duras’s second husband] tells me, “You should try to read. One ought to be able to read whatever happens.” You’ve tried to read, you’ll have tried everything, but the words don’t connect with one another any more, though you suspect the connection does exist. . . .

Another connection obsesses us: the one linking their bodies to our lives.

Perhaps [Robert L. has] already been dead for two weeks, lying peacefully

in the black ditch. A bullet in the back of the neck? In the heart? Between the eyes? (35)

As “Berlin is in flames” and “fifty bombers take off every minute” on this day of Sunday, April 22, 1945, facts that are reported in the regularized periodical flow of the daily news cycle, Duras’ memoirist, however, can’t connect words to their referents, much less register the semantic linkages between words themselves. And in this derangement, she obsesses over the elusive global “connections” between her Parisian life and foreign bodies, in this instance, her husband’s wasted form as it may or may not lie dead or dying in a German ditch. A product of ravaged, epistemological uncertainty, the memoirist’s speculative obsession here occurs no doubt because the normal “connections” of life have lost their ground.

In the historical-fictional spring of 1945, “Robert L.” comes back and recuperates slowly on spoonfuls of meat-juice broth and gruel. (Robert Antelme wrote a memoir of his experience in the camps—*The Human Race* [*L’espèce humaine*, 1947]). For Duras’ memoirist in “The War,” he becomes a prism of global interconnection both during the last days of the Euro-American war and after his return, as the war in the Pacific comes to an end, too. In August 1945, “Robert L.” convalesces at Saint-Jorioz on Lake Annecy, and it’s there that he learns of Hiroshima. “Then by the side of the road one morning that huge headline: Hiroshima. . . . After Hiroshima I think he talks to D. D. is his best friend, Hiroshima is perhaps the first thing outside his own life that he sees or

reads about" (64). Earlier, an entry observes, "If Nazi crime is not seen in world terms, if it isn't understood collectively, then that man in the concentration camp at Belsen who died alone but with the same collective soul and class awareness that made him undo a bolt on the railroad one night somewhere in Europe, without a leader, without a uniform, without a witness, has been betrayed. If you give a German and not a collective interpretation to the Nazi horror, you reduce the man in Belsen to regional dimensions" (50).

"This is a true story, right down to the details" (71). So Duras promises, in the preface she writes to "Monsieur X," some forty years after the incidents it recounts. Like "The War," the first episode in *The War*, "Monsieur X" is *not* literature, it is not "writing," Duras attests, because it is all too real (72, 4). What is it, then? How does verisimilitude make literature *un*-literary, subtract it from the category of literature and literature's generic classifications?

Memorialized in this vignette, "Monsieur X" is an agent of the Gestapo who has been deployed in Paris. His identity is complex, however, as we will see. Before Duras meets him, in June 1944, in an allegedly chance encounter about a week after the Normandy landing, he has made twenty-four arrests (92). He will aim to make many more before the Liberation in August of that same year. In particular, he will target (unsuccessfully) François Morland, head of the Resistance. In this first encounter between Duras and "Monsieur X," on the rue des Saussaies, "Monsieur X" learns that Duras is attempting to get a parcel

permit to send a parcel to her husband, "Robert L.," who has just been interned at Fresnes in a camp for political prisoners. Here, "Monsieur X" discloses to Duras that it was in fact he who had arrested Duras's husband some days prior. "Robert L." is Robert Antelme (1917-1990), Duras's first husband. Both Duras and Antelme were active in the French Resistance.

With German morale wearing thin after the Normandy invasion, and Paris tensions running high, "Monsieur X" and Duras enter into a strange courtship ritual that involves the revelation of both artifice (fabricated identity) and real feeling (awkward fascist-communist sympathies). And since lives are at stake where Duras and "Monsieur X" slyly share information with one another, couched always in the terms of coy flirtation, the implications are political. Duras engages "Monsieur X" because he is her link to her husband; it is "Monsieur X," and only "Monsieur X," who can ensure for Duras that her husband remains safe (or at least accounted for, in whatever state) at Fresnes. In return, as Duras well comprehends, she must leak to "Monsieur X" some information about the Resistance network she is a part of. Each party understands what s/he risks gaining and losing. Duras, moreover, has no choice: "François Morland [Mitterand] has issued strict orders: I'm to maintain this contact, the only one that still connects us to our comrades who've been arrested" (79).

Between June and August 1944, the duration of the relationship between Duras and "Monsieur X," Duras writes how she moves through two phases of

affect—fear and the sublimation of fear into “relish.” At first, Duras is terrified at the possibility that “Monsieur X” might inflict any kind of ill he would like on her, use her in whatever way possible. Then, in the second phase, the “fear” of her own death—and of the mass death that seems inseparable from it—becomes “relish” at the prospect of turning death back on the man who traffics in death itself: “It’s a period full of the same fear, it’s true, but of a fear that sometimes turns into relish at having settled that he must die. At having defeated him on his own ground: death” (81).

Through Duras’ regular contact with “Monsieur X,” the Resistance—seemingly assured of the policeman’s whereabouts—is able to devise a time and location for killing him. This eventuality seems predetermined and inevitable at one juncture of the story (81). But as with so much of *The War*, decisive fact and the verbal registration of fact, whether in memory or in prognostication, is clouded by the subjunctive and conditional softenings of verbal mood and tense, Duras’ many hypotheticals and counterfactuals that complicate the narrative teleologies of historical record. For instance, from a later moment in this story in the memoir: “[Monsieur X] was often to say that *if he’d known*, he *wouldn’t have arrested* my husband. Every day he decided my fate, and every day *if he’d known*, he said, my fate *would have been* different. *Whether he knew or not, before or after, my fate was in his hands*” (105). What are the varieties of knowledge that are lacked, here, or occluded, and how might history and “fate” have looked different if “Monsieur X” had known whatever it is he might have known? Throughout *The*

War, Duras plays with tense, mood, and the predication of alternative futures in order to document a lack of epistemological transparency in occupied Paris. These are the paranoid last days of the war. The same mortal uncertainty about the future extends to Duras' own memories of the time, often empty and despairing as, equally, the future looms bleak and dark. "Suddenly freedom is bitter. I've just come to know the total loss of hope and the emptiness that follows; you don't remember, it creates no memory. I think I have a slight regret at having failed to die while still living. But I go on walking, I move from the street to the sidewalk, then back into the street. I walk, my feet walk" (88).

So even as the Resistance had decided to kill "Monsieur X" in the boulevard Saint-Germain on such and such a day and at such and such an hour, had "tried to extract him from the due process of law and kill him [them]selves," he's not ultimately where he's expected to be, and the assassination attempt fails (111). Apprehension and punishment fall to the local authorities and to a court of law. "Monsieur X" is arrested, put on trial, and shot, Duras surmises, in the winter of 1944-1945, in the prison yard at Fresnes (112). Duras testifies twice at his trial.

The first time Duras testifies she incriminates him. And the second time, she defends him. She tells of how, at his own discretion, he had spared certain Jewish lives (111). She remembers what the judge says: "Make up your mind—first you accused him, now you defend him. We haven't got time to waste here!"

(111).

Duras is caught between compassion for her enemy, an individual as globally universal as her Communist ideology would have her believe, and repugnance at his singular criminal misdeeds. And the sexual attraction between the two enlivens and dramatizes, of course, the common human elements of the story.

Where Duras conveys her ambivalence about her enemy, "Monsieur X," alias "Pierre Rabier," "Monsieur X" reciprocates this pattern of duality, internal to the story, not only in his own at times loving and at times hostile treatment of his enemy but in revealing, too, the truth of his war-era fabrication of identity. Duras will learn at the trial that the man she had known as a French collaborator, "Pierre Rabier," was in fact German; that he'd stolen his name from a French cousin who had died in the south of France (88). Reflecting on the "loneliness" of fascists and of fascist sympathizers (including members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union), Duras describes the strange cosmopolitan singularity of "Pierre Rabier"'s voice.

But there was something about Rabier that made him even lonelier than the rest. . . . He was living under an assumed name. A French name. And that makes a man even lonelier than other men. I was the only person who listened to Rabier. But Rabier himself wasn't audible. I'm speaking of his voice, Rabier's voice. It was made up, calculated, an artificial organ. . . .

Every so often it would have a trace of accent. But what accent? At the most you might have said, "Is it a trace of a German accent?" It was that which prevented him from having any kind of identity, that strangeness, seeping out from the memory into the voice. No one ever spoke like that who had a childhood and schoolfriends in the country of their birth" (94).

On Beckett's *Watt* (1942-45), Deirdre Bair (1978/1990): pp. 327 + ff. TK.

Conclusion, or Uneven Modernity—Minor Nations, States, Persons

Taken together, this project studies a constellation of cosmopolitan modernists whose artistic output, over the middle decades of the twentieth century, tracks public histories of late empire and war through the private capture of individual literary sensibility. Each writer is at once uniquely irreducible to her homeland—an expression of the “supranational,” in the arts of human experience, as T.S. Eliot renders it in his 1948 Nobel Prize speech—and reducible to logics, however shifting, of the modern nation-state. Caught at the cross-section of individualism and collective belonging, private musing and public obligation, equality and difference, they present what Etienne Balibar, following the instigation of Jean-Luc Nancy, has called the modern “paradox” of the legal “citizen subject.” If Foucault’s “empirico-transcendental doublet,” in *The Order of Things*, names the philosophical and historical tension between a *theory* of Enlightenment universalism and a *practice* of humanistic differentiation, then Balibar helps us follow some of the dialectical fault-lines of utopian reasoning that come out of a modern concept of the subject-as-citizen. For each person to matter as much as the next, for sovereign self-determination to be thinkable in the terms of self, property, and enfranchisement, some persons need to be made an exception to the rule—as outliers of the state at its extremes of social hierarchy (*Citizen Subject* 19-39, esp. 38-9). As is aggressively true, and all too well known, in the Global West the Enlightenment-era codification of universal rights is travestied, with abandon, in concomitant practices of

enslavement, expropriative empire-building, and settler-colonialist mass genocide.

Where each writer I study in this project is nominally a “citizen subject” of a distinct nation-state, with a native language and natal citizenship, each also contests this attribution through a worldview of global scope, and literary practices that circumnavigate that worldview. Anarchists, imperialists, resisters, and nomads—in no particular order of evaluative priority or temporal sequence—these writers inhabit a modernist territory that Deleuze and Guattari might call “minor.” If Franz Kafka’s deterritorialized German language, in early twentieth-century Prague, enunciates just what it means to contest a majority culture from *within* that culture, then the cosmopolitan writers of my project’s late-imperial era do the same work of (geo)-political and linguistic destabilization through intimate affiliations within and across national and domestic bounds (*Kafka* 16-27).

What Deleuze and Guattari make available as a post-68 concept of the “minor”—altogether Marxist, psychoanalytic, and poststructuralist—Cathy Park Hong turns to her own purposes in last year’s collection of essays, *Minor Feelings: An Asian American Reckoning* (2020). As Hong reflects, bracingly, on some politics of the minority experience in contemporary American culture, she traces her own development as an Asian-American “modernist” poet. “By the time I was at Iowa [the Iowa Writers’ Workshop], I had already decided that writing about my Asian identity was *juvenile* [emphasis mine],” Hong recounts; “As a good student of modernism,” she continues, “I was tirelessly committed to the New and was

confident that *despite* my identity, I would be recognized for my formal innovations [emphasis Hong's]." Striving yet failing to assimilate to white culture, Hong was rebuked as just yet another instance of a minority poet who sold her work on the currency of her minor(ity) identity, her minor content—the commodifiable lyrics of *ethnic poetics* in PC Culture, Inc. Here, then, for Hong playing the good modernist part, transcendental modernist Formalism would seem inaccessible given the constraints of her own ethnic conspicuousness. In one extreme instance of belied liberal benevolence, an anonymous blogger ("Poetry Snark") and classmate declared that, as just such a failed artist, Hong had better be shunted from this mortal coil. The hemifacial tic that Hong suffered with for much of her life dates to around this time (MF 15-16).¹

In calling her Asian-American identity the ground of a *juvenile* aesthetic—from within what she constellates as a broad composite of Afro-Asian American experience—Hong implicates a racialized logic underpinning progress narratives of individual development. This logic intersects with my own thinking, in this project, about the heterogeneity of modernist chronotopes across geographic and historical difference—specifically, the political ramifications of just such divergent configurations of global time. For Hong, as the Asian-American child of immigrant parents, one kind of paranoid but justifiable feeling attaches to

¹ See also Colleen Lye, *America's Asia: Racial Form and American Literature, 1893-1945* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005); Josephine Park, *Apparitions of Asia: Modernist Form and Asian American Poetics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Mark McGurl, *The Program Era: Postwar Writing and the Rise of Creative Writing* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009); Walter Benn Michaels, *Our America: Nativism, Modernism, and Pluralism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995); Richard Jean So, *Redlining Culture: A Data History of Racial Inequality and Postwar Fiction* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2020).

concern over being seen and read as a perpetual child (Hong, on her immigrant mother: “As my mother spoke, I watched the white person, oftentimes a woman, put on a fright mask of strained tolerance As she began responding to my mother in a voice reserved for toddlers, I stepped in” [MF 99]). Hong’s worry over entrenched perceptions of minority ignorance and deviance, seemingly legible through linguistic and cultural points of occlusion, refracts her essays’ eponymous preoccupation—the “minor feelings” of minority life. “Minor feelings occur when American optimism is enforced upon you,” she writes; all of “which contradicts your own racialized reality, thereby creating a static of cognitive dissonance” (MF 56). In this formulation, Hong merges Sianne Ngai’s work on an aesthetic of morally agnostic “ugly feelings”—specifically, Ngai’s emphasis on the “noncathartic” stickiness of ignoble passions, such as envy, boredom, and irritation—with Richard Pryor’s revolutionary work in black comedy. If Ngai’s “ugly feelings” help Hong create a way of making the “purgatorial” (“not white enough nor black enough”) Asian-American experience intelligible at the intersection of white entitlement and non-white instrumentality (MF 9), then Pryor’s brand of comic relief, in the discursive and materialist space of Black-American racialization, offers also a strong affective point of identification for the poet herself. Hong’s ancestry traces to Korea, which imperial Japan colonized from 1910 to 1945. As a distinct genealogy within the collective Asian-American experience that is her major subject, the trauma of this colonial inheritance is felt everywhere throughout Hong’s collection of essays. To return to my point above, then, one articulation of Hong’s residual colonial—also

racialized—trauma is anxiety over being read as temporally regressive, irrevocably *juvenile*. For Hong, Pryor’s comic upstaging of non-Black-American assumptions about Black-American experience performs, from within a racialized subject position, a version of the “national” complex of difficult feeling that the Korean-language *han* names within the global-colonial imaginary. *Han*, Hong defines, converges upon “a combination of bitterness, wistfulness, shame, melancholy, and vengefulness, accumulated from years of brutal colonialism, war, and U.S.-supported dictatorships that have never been politically redressed”; “[h]an is so ongoing that it can even be passed down: to be Korean is to feel *han*” (MF 54). Permanent and heritable as an affective complex of colonial trauma, Hong’s *han* names what it means to be an ambivalent minor subject consigned to endless neoliberal indebtedness (MF 185).

In addressing the problem of “anomalous” nationalisms amidst warring Cold War-era (anti-nationalist) Marxisms, Benedict Anderson has identified, classically, some canonical features of the nation—the enclave of the “imagined community” which, among other influences, in this story, grew out of the global-informational networks of nineteenth-century print capitalism. I would like to offer a provisional close to this project by recalling some familiar vocabularies of (national) community that Anderson has identified, and which current scholarship frequently invokes. On Anderson’s account, nations are at one and the same time “limited” and “sovereign”: they have geopolitical and spiritual bounds, of a kind, and they have in some measure graduated from a state of murderous, pre-civilizational chaos—even as, of course, as Hannah Arendt

reminds us, violence is only ever normalized and technologized as banality in modernity's due course. Here, then, "nations" rely on an imaginative logic of simultaneous modernity (for historiography) and non-modernity (for the patriotic myth-makers), simultaneous universality and non-universality, and the ideological tension that comes of muscular politics and philosophical anemia. Anderson: Nationalism has "produced . . . no Hobbeses, Tocquevilles, Marxes, or Webers. This 'emptiness' easily gives rise, among cosmopolitan and polylingual intellectuals, to a certain condescension. Like Gertrude Stein in the face of Oakland, one can rather quickly conclude that there is 'no there there' (5)." Nations, states, worlds—here, there, everywhere . . . and—utopically—nowhere. As citizens of the Global West and the Global East, the modernist writers I study in this project at once embody and espouse the native terms of nationalism defined as such *and* document, in fiction and testimonial writing, disaffiliations from such moments of circumscription.²

² *Imagined Communities* (New York: Verso, 1983); nb. Anderson's interpellations of Thomas Nairn, Ernest Gellner, and Ernest Renan (1882: Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?) as well as the evolution of his thought—surrounding the problem of nationalism and empire—into *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination* (New York: Verso, 2005); on nationalism, empire, and modernity, see also David Scott, *Conscripts of Modernity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).

In a public conversation held in 2007 between Judith Butler and G.C. Spivak, published as *Who Sings the Nation-State?: Language, Politics, Belonging* (New York: Seagull Books, 2010), the problem of univocal "nation-hood" in global international culture was on the table. For Butler (Hegel's disciple) and Spivak (Marx's disciple), this definitional and conceptual problem required theorization of alternative rhetorical and political possibilities, new instantiations at one and the same time linguistic and political for capturing the plurality of lived social experience in the present day—circa the Obama years of cresting and waning US-imperialist and -liberalist optimism.

Of course, the international modernity that Butler and Spivak were pressuring into dialogic encounter at that moment existed not merely, as always, in a good sense, made possible through enlightening channels of contact and communication, and rendered with cosmopolitan style, but, more powerfully, in the many depredations which are the inevitable consequence of increased human interconnection in sprawling eras of global modernity. One solution that Spivak proposes for the politically inflected linguistic bind of the "nation-state" is as at once morphological and semantic: with Butler, Spivak advocates for "[t]he *reinvention* of the state [that] goes beyond the nation-state into critical regionalisms" (91); indeed, it is by "thinking the nation and state separately" that the work of "critical regionalism" is begun (77). In an earlier essay, "Will Postcolonialism Travel?" (1994), now anthologized

Bibliography

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford University Press: 1998.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso: 1983.
- *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination*. Verso: 2005.
- A New Vocabulary for Global Modernism*. Ed. Eric Hayot and Rebecca L. Walkowitz. Columbia University Press: 2016.
- Apter, Emily. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. Verso: 2013.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press: 1958.
- *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Schocken Books: 1951.
- Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Princeton University Press: 1968.
- Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. University of Texas Press: 1981.
- Bair, Deirdre. *Samuel Beckett*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978/1990.
- Balibar, Étienne and Immanuel Wallerstein. *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. Trans. Chris Turner. Verso: 1991.
- Barthes, Roland. « L'Effet de réel ». *Communications. Recherches sémiologiques : Le Vraisemblable*. Vol. 11. 1968. 84-89.
- Barthes, Roland. *Empire of Signs*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1983.
- Beatty, Frederick L., assisted by Martha Ross Beatty. *The Ironic World of Evelyn Waugh: A Study of Eight Novels*. Northern Illinois University Press: 1992.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. Ed. Hannah Arendt. Trans. Harry Zohn. Schocken Books: 1968.
- Blum, Cinzia. *The Other Modernism: F.T. Marinetti's Futurist Fiction of Power*. University of California Press: 1996.
- Boltanski, Luc. *Distant Suffering: Morality, Media and Politics*. Trans. Graham Burchell. Cambridge University Press: 1999.
- Bourget, Paul. *Essais de psychologie contemporaine*. A. Lemerre: 1883-1886.
- Butler, Judith and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Who Sings the Nation-State: Language, Politics, Belonging* (2007: Seagull Books/University of Chicago

in *Other Asias* (New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), Spivak had anticipated the claims she joins Butler in making ever more powerfully, under the pressure, in the 1990s, of keeping live and vital the critical spirit of postcolonial critique. There she wrote, "I close the text where it should open, rewriting postcolonialism into globality through critical regionalism" (131). Spivak's decades-long mantric refrain of "critical regionalism" has remained provocative and invigorating for me, as have her well-adored innovations in poststructuralism, feminism, and class-conscious global critique.

In that essay from 1994, Spivak anchors the work of "critical regionalism" in the critical space of etymological language, which she terms "lingual memory." That the spirit of postcolonial critique should find a useful avenue for its future as "critical regionalism" in the recesses of "lingual memory" has helped drive my engagement with global or otherwise comparatist modernism through the particularities of (nativist/non-nativist) language and (nativist/non-nativist) cultural histories, negotiating universals and localisms at every turn.

- Press).
- Carens, James F. *The Satiric Art of Evelyn Waugh*. University of Washington Press: 1966.
- Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Trans. M. B. DeBevoise. Ed. Edward W. Said. Harvard University Press: 2004.
- Cheng, Anne Anlin. *The Melancholy of Race: Psychoanalysis, Assimilation, and Hidden Grief*. Oxford University Press: 2001.
- Clifford, James. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Harvard University Press: 1997.
- Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Ed. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins. University of Minnesota Press: 1998.
- Cunningham, Valentine. *British Writers of the Thirties*. Oxford University Press: 1988.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. University of Chicago Press: 2017.
- *Monolingualism of the Other; or, The Prosthesis of Origin*. Trans. Patrick Mensah. Stanford University Press: 1998.
- *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason*. Trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas. Stanford University Press: 2005.
- Diamond, Jared. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. W. W. Norton: 1997.
- Deviations: A Gayle Rubin Reader*. Duke University Press: 2011.
- Dimock, Wai Chee. "Deep Time: American Literature and World History." *American Literary History* 13.4 (2001) 755-775.
- Eliot, T. S. "Ulysses, Order, and Myth." *The Dial*: Nov. 1923.
- Ellmann, Maud. *The Nets of Modernism: Henry James, Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, and Sigmund Freud*. Cambridge University Press: 2010.
- Ellmann, Richard. *Eminent Domain: Yeats Among Wilde, Joyce, Pound, Eliot, and Auden*. Oxford University Press: 1967.
- Ericson, Joan. *Be a Woman: Hayashi Fumiko and Modern Japanese Women's Literature*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997.
- Esty, Jed. *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England*. Princeton University Press: 2003.
- *Unseasonable Youth: Modernism, Colonialism, and the Fiction of Development*. Oxford University Press: 2012.
- Esty, Jed and Colleen Lye. "Peripheral Realisms Now." *Peripheral Realisms*, special issue of the *Modern Language Quarterly*, edited by Joe Cleary, Jed Esty, and Colleen Lye. Vol. 73. No. 3. Sept. 2012. 269-288.
- Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. Columbia University Press: 1983.
- Fenollosa, Ernest and Ezra Pound. *The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry*. Ed. Haun Saussy, Jonathan Stalling, and Lucas Klein. Fordham University Press: 2008.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. Pantheon Books: 1978.

- Freud, Sigmund. *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement Between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. Trans. James Strachey (1955); orig. pub. 1913. ----- *Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays*. Trans. James Strachey (1939); orig. pub. 1939.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Planetary Modernisms: Provocations on Modernity Across Time*. Columbia University Press: 2017.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton University Press: 1957.
- Galvin, Rachel. *News of War: Civilian Poetry: 1936-1945*. Oxford University Press: 2017.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Common Cause: Postcolonial Ethics and The Practice of Democracy, 1900-1955*. University of Chicago Press: 2014.
- Hall, Stuart. *The Fateful Triangle: Race, Ethnicity, Nation*. Ed. Kobena Mercer. Harvard University Press: 2017.
- Harootyan, Harry. *Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Hastings, Selina. *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography*. Houghton Mifflin Company: 1994.
- Hayot, Eric. *On Literary Worlds*. Oxford University Press: 2012.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Extremes: A History of the World, 1914-1991*. Vintage Books: 1994.
- Horkheimer, Max and Theodor W. Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Trans. Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. Stanford University Press: 2002; orig. pub. 1944.
- Karatani, Kôjin. *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Trans. Brett de Bary. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993. [my reference to this being a work of 1970s Euro-American deconstruction comes from the fact that Karatani—in the book’s two afterwords—writes of its genesis at Yale in the 1970s, where he worked with de Man, J. Hillis Miller, etc.]
- Kenner, Hugh. *The Pound Era*. University of California Press: 1971.
- Konishi, Sho. *Anarchist Modernity: Cooperatism and Japanese-Russian Intellectual Relations in Modern Japan*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Lavery, Grace E. *Quaint, Exquisite: Victorian Aesthetics and the Idea of Japan*. Princeton University Press: 2019.
- Love, Heather. *Feeling Backward: Loss and the Politics of Queer History*. Harvard University Press: 2007.
- Martin, Benjamin G. *The Nazi-Fascist New Order for European Culture*. Harvard University Press: 2016.
- Matz, Aron. *Satire in an Age of Realism*. Cambridge University Press: 2010.
- Mackay, Marina. *Modernism and World War II*. Cambridge University Press: 2007.
- McCrea, Barry. *In the Company of Strangers: Family and Narrative in Dickens, Conan Doyle, Joyce, and Proust*. Columbia University Press: 2011.
- Miller, Tyrus. *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction, and the Arts Between the World Wars*. University of California Press: 1999.
- Modanizumu: Modernist Fiction from Japan, 1913-1938*. Ed. William J. Tyler. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008.

- Nairn, Tom. *The Break-up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism*. Verso: 1977.
- Patey, Douglas Lane. *The Life of Evelyn Waugh: A Critical Biography*. Blackwell: 1998.
- Perloff, Marjorie. *Wittgenstein's Ladder: Poetic Strangeness and the Language of the Ordinary*. University of Chicago Press: 1996.
- Pound, Ezra. *Literary Essays*. Ed. T.S. Eliot. New Directions: 1968.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth. *Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality*. Duke University Press: 2006.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. Routledge: 1992.
- Reed, Christopher. *Bachelor Japanists: Japanese Aesthetics & Western Masculinities*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books: 1978.
 ----- *The World, The Text, and the Critic*. Harvard University Press: 1983.
- Saint-Amour, Paul. *Tense Future: Modernism, Total War, Encyclopedic Form*. Oxford University Press: 2015.
- Scott, David. *Conscripts of Modernity: The Tragedy of Colonial Enlightenment*. Duke University Press: 2004.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. University of California Press: 1990.
 ----- *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Duke University Press: 2002.
- Sontag, Susan. *Against Interpretation and Other Essays*. Picador: 1966.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Other Asias*. Blackwell: 2008.
- Stonebridge, Lyndsey. *The Destructive Element: British Psychoanalysis and Modernism*. Routledge: 1998.
 ----- *Placeless People: Rights, Writing and Refugees*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Stopp, Frederick J. *Evelyn Waugh: Portrait of an Artist*. Chapman and Hall: 1958.
- Sykes, Christopher. *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography*. Little, Brown and Company: 1975.
- Symons, Arthur. *The Symbolist Movement in Literature*. Ed. Richard Ellmann. E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc. 1919; orig. pub. 1899.
- Trotter, David. *Literature in the First Media Age: Britain Between the Wars*. Harvard University Press: 2013.
- Walkowitz, Rebecca L. *Cosmopolitan Style: Modernism Beyond the Nation*. Columbia University Press: 2006.
- Waugh, Evelyn. *A Little Learning: The First Volume of an Autobiography*. Little, Brown and Company: 1964.
 ----- *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh [EAR]*. Ed. Donat Gallagher. Methuen: 1983.
 ----- *Evelyn Waugh: The Critical Heritage [CH]*. Ed. Martin Stannard. Routledge & Kegan Paul: 1984.
 ----- *The Letters of Evelyn Waugh*. Ed. Mark Amory. Ticknor & Fields: 1980.
 ----- *Men at Arms*. orig. pub. Chapman and Hall: 1952.

- *Officers and Gentlemen*. orig. pub. Chapman and Hall: 1955.
- *Put Out More Flags [POMF]*. orig. pub. Chapman and Hall: 1942.
[all citations in this chapter refer to Little, Brown and Company: 2012]
- *Sword of Honour Trilogy [SH]*. Little, Brown and Company: 1961.
[all citations in this chapter refer to this edition]
- *Unconditional Surrender*. orig. pub. Chapman and Hall: 1961.
- *Waugh Abroad: Collected Travel Writing*. Introd. Nicholas
Shakespeare. Alfred A. Knopf, Everyman's Library: 2003.
- White, Hayden. *Figural Realism: Studies in the Mimesis Effect*. The Johns Hopkins
University Press: 1999.
- Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. Fontana Press:
1976.
- *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford University Press: 1977.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *The Mythology in Our Language: Remarks on Frazer's Golden
Bough*. University of Chicago Press: 2017.
- *Lectures and Conversations: On Aesthetics, Psychology, and Religious
Belief*. Edited by Cyril Barrett. University of California Press: 2007.