Crossed Geographies:
Endō and Fanon in Lyon

The paths writers trace in the world tell as much about the geographies scholars give them as the geographies they lived. Figures of international repute pass each other unnoticed if the conventions under which we labor don’t allow a meeting. Once acknowledged, such encounters are an opportunity. Unexpected encounters reveal greater forces at work; new questions demand answers. Through crossed paths we can see the world in a different shape, but only if we are willing. In disciplinary and conceptual terms, we shy away from the leap of scale that making sense of an encounter between, say, a novelist from Japan and an anticolonialist from Martinique requires. It is easier to blow up or clone—to ”globalize” a national field or to deploy a theory anew—than to struggle toward a geo-historical problematic, a transnational frame for criticism, that would not reduce the unevenness and heterogeneity of the geography of lived experience to a comforting, because familiar, model. Two discomforting journeys may suggest the way.

In early 1943 Frantz Fanon, who later became famous for his writings on colonial psychology and the struggle against colonialism, dropped out of his lycée and took a boat from Martinique to Dominica, where he hoped to join the Free French army. He was sent home, but the following March, after Martinique rallied to Charles de Gaulle, he sailed for Morocco with some one thousand volunteers. Fanon told a teacher that when freedom was at stake, all were concerned—but only the officers and some of the noncommissioned officers onboard were white; the rest of the volunteers were black.1 In the training camp in Morocco, soldiers from Martinique and Guadeloupe (“old” French colonies) ate the same food and wore the same uniforms as white soldiers; they lived apart from recruits from Morocco,

---

Abstract: Textual evidence indicates that the novelist Endō Shūsaku read the anticolonialist writer Frantz Fanon in the early 1950s, incorporating Fanon’s arguments on color and colonialism into his depiction of Japanese subjects after 1945. Examination of that heretofore unnoticed encounter provides an opportunity to reconsider the paradigms by which each writer is understood today and the terms in which they imagined a world not ordered by empires, whether European, American, or Japanese. Representations 128. Fall 2014 © The Regents of the University of California. ISSN 0734-6018, electronic ISSN 1533-855X, pages 93–123. All rights reserved. Direct requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content to the University of California Press at http://www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintinfo.asp. DOI: 10.1525/rep.2014.128.4.93.
Algeria, and sub-Saharan Africa. Fanon and his friends quickly saw that the army that had been formed to fight fascism had a racial hierarchy: whites at the top, North Africans at the bottom, and black West Indians ambiguously above the African *Tirailleurs sénégalaïs* in the middle.¹ When Fanon’s unit decamped to Algeria in July, he discovered that the locals loathed black men. By the time he was fighting in France, in autumn, he was doubting his position between European soldiers and the *Tirailleurs*, because the black soldiers seemed to face the worst action. In January 1945 he wrote his brother that his reasons for joining up had been wrong; in April he wrote his parents the same.²

Fanon returned to Martinique in late 1945 and finished his baccalauréate. With funds provided for veterans’ education, he sailed late the next year for Paris, where he planned to study dentistry. He left Paris abruptly a few weeks after arriving there and went on to Lyon, where he enrolled in the Faculty of Medicine at its university, specializing in psychiatry. He read widely, attended classes by Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and gave some lectures of his own.⁴ In May 1951 he published “The Lived Experience of the Black Man” (“L’Expérience vécue du noir”), an essay on Antillean men’s discovery that in France they were considered to be black.⁵ He took a temporary post in Dōle while he finished his thesis, which he defended at the end of November. He spent several weeks in Martinique in February and March 1952, but, deciding against practicing there, he returned to France and took a post at the clinic in Saint-Alban run by François Tosquelles, where he developed the foundations of his social psychiatry.⁶ In February he published an essay on the psychosomatic illnesses of North African men in Lyon, “The North African Syndrome” (“Le Syndrome nord-africain”), and in June, *Black Skin, White Masks* (*Peau noire, masques blancs*).⁷ (“The Lived Experience of the Black Man” was its fifth chapter.) After another temporary assignment in 1953, he took a post in Blida in Algeria, where he moved in November, and began learning about the struggle against French rule; in 1955 he began his work with the anticolonial Algerian National Liberation Front. He never returned to Martinique.⁸

In June 1950, Endō Shūsaku, who later became famous for fiction about Catholicism, began a journey in a different part of the world that, like Fanon’s, took him to Lyon. The first leg was a fourth-class voyage from Yokohama to Marseille. As Endō observed in his diary, relations among the passengers were determined by wealth, race, and the hierarchies of Western colonialism.⁹ A group of African soldiers from the French colonial army shared his compartment. They were returning to Saigon after escorting war criminals to Japan.¹⁰ During several port calls, Endō, and other Japanese students too, were treated as war criminals by local authorities. In Manila they were assembled on deck, while Filipinos on the docks shouted “Murderers!”
In September Endō settled in Lyon, where he enrolled at the Catholic University and the University of Lyon’s Faculty of Letters to study French Catholic writers. In the streets Endō encountered plaques marking locations where fighters in the French Resistance had fallen; he also learned about a massacre of civilians by the Resistance in the town of Fons. His experiences on ship and the traces of the Resistance in France pushed him in the following years to write several stories, two novellas, and a novel about collaboration, resistance, and war crimes in France and Japan. Twice in 1952 Endō spent time in sanatoria in the Alps for tuberculosis. He moved to Paris in the autumn of that year and was hospitalized there in December. One of the patients in his four-bed room, a veteran, berated Endō with memories of his treatment by the Japanese army in Indochina. In January 1953 he departed Marseille for Japan because of his health. In 1954 he published a semi-autobiographical story called “As Far as Aden” (“Aden made”), about a Japanese student’s time in France, where he discovered he was un jaune, a yellow man, in the eyes of French whites.

In one of the lazy analogies often inflicted on non-European writers, the Catholic Endō is often characterized as a “Japanese Graham Greene.” Endō famously referred to his religion as an ill-fitting suit, however, and treated it less as doctrine than as a lens through which he could examine the world. Beginning with his first published pieces, “Gods and God” and “The Problem of the Catholic Writer” (“Kamigami to kami to” and “Katorikku sakka no mondai,” both 1947), he frequently raised the question of whether Christian principles, among which he counted the moral sense of sin, could be separated from the particularity of Europe and become truly universal. Van Gessel observes that Endō’s inquiry ultimately was more ethical than theological. His investigations produced a paradoxical view of Christianity—as universal de jure but not de facto, that is, universally true but not universalizable in practice. Although Endō took an increasingly culturalist approach to these questions from the 1960s onward, relying on phantasmatic contrasts between “Asia” and “the West,” in the first arc of his career he focused much of his attention on war and empire. In his early fiction and essays, beginning with pieces rooted in his experiences in France and culminating in the novel The Sea and Poison (Umi to dokuyaku, 1958), Endō addressed the morality of wartime collaboration and resistance, the
responsibility of individuals for the Japanese military’s actions in Asia, and the role of race in systems of domination before and after 1945.¹⁸

Resemblances in some of these early pieces to elements of *Black Skin, White Masks*—beginning with the parallel episodes of discovering one’s color in France—suggest that Endō discovered Fanon’s work around the time he was in Lyon, when both writers were all but unknown. In their early works, Fanon and Endō each wrote about colonialism and color, and in remarkably similar ways. Each used a critical phenomenology to contrast abstract conceptions of race and color with the lived experience of it, then went on to explore the psychological consequences of that experience for themselves and others. If the parallel might simply reflect the French intellectual milieu, such as a shared influence from Merleau-Ponty, close examination reveals other evidence that Endō was familiar with Fanon’s work. In several stories and essays from this time, moreover, Endō appears to be overtly elaborating on Fanon’s arguments—inserting the yellow man into Fanon’s dialectic of black and white and bringing the history of Japan’s wars in Asia and the Pacific to bear on Fanon’s arguments about race, colonialism, and liberation. Circumstances surrounding Endō’s time in Lyon explain how he could have learned about Fanon’s work and suggest reasons they might in fact have met. One needs a larger history, however, to understand why the encounter would have been consequential for Endō, and why he would have elaborated on Fanon in the way he did.

The signs that Endō crossed paths with Fanon in Lyon, intellectually or physically, have not been remarked by historians or scholars of literature. This is surprising and revealing. Endō and Fanon are figures of international standing; scholars have pored over their lives. Fanon’s anticolonial writings are known around the world, but those who write about Endō or postwar Japan aren’t concerned with Fanon (or anticolonialism). The same is true of Endō. Internationally he is among the best-known postwar Japanese writers, because his Catholic fiction has a crossover audience, but those who write about Endō or postwar Japan aren’t concerned with Fanon (or anticolonialism). The same is true of Endō. Internationally he is among the best-known postwar Japanese writers, because his Catholic fiction has a crossover audience, but those who write about Fanon or anticolonialism aren’t concerned with Endō (or postwar Japan). Language is not an issue: Endō’s early work only is available in Japanese, but there is substantial scholarship on Endō—including these early pieces—in European languages, while Fanon’s work has been available in Japanese since the late 1960s and is a frequent topic in prestigious journals in Japan, as elsewhere.¹⁹

That the signs have gone unnoticed is as much an analytical as an empirical failure. The histories that usually frame Fanon and Endō—the intellectual history of anticolonialism and decolonization in Africa and Asia for Fanon, of postwar Japan and the Cold War in East Asia for Endō—can accommodate only one or the other. Each history has an implicit geography within which its actors travel. Fanon easily fits into the intellectual history of
anticolonialism and decolonization, which after all is built partly around him. The dismantling of the Japanese empire and Japan’s informal colonization by the United States, however, rarely have a place in it. The intellectual and literary history of postwar Japan presents Endō and his peers as overwhelmingly preoccupied with the defeat in the Pacific War and Japan’s subsequent relationship with the United States. In this frame it is implausible that Endō or other Japanese intellectuals would have any concern with decolonization. Distinct as these two histories are, there simply is no place where an encounter between Fanon and Endō would be meaningful: their geographies don’t cross.

Yet the geographies of each writer’s lived experience are not as distinct as those in which scholarship presently confines them. The circumstances that shaped their writings on color and colonialism were at once personal and part of a history that encompassed both the Caribbean and East Asia. Reading Endō’s work through Fanon’s, and Fanon’s through Endō’s, reveals a mid-twentieth-century history of race and racialization on a large (I will not say global) scale. In this history decolonization and what should be called the de-imperialization of Japan by the victors in the Asia-Pacific War are entangled with the demise of the European empires and the rise of the American. The transformations coincided with manifold changes in the social meanings of black, white, and yellow and the rights associated with them. A history and a criticism in which this kind of encounter is plausible and meaningful must dismantle the analytically separate problematics of anticolonialism and decolonization, on the one hand, and of “postwar” and the Cold War in Asia, on the other. Reconstructing the history that connects Endō and Fanon does more than historicize these two writers’ early works. It suggests too what can be gained from an intellectual history and a criticism that ignores divisions more constructed than real while acknowledging, rather than trying to reconcile, the heterogeneous and sometimes contradictory qualities of the geography that results. Fanon and Endō brought different histories to Lyon and ultimately took different views of the future. Fanon saw anticolonial nationalism as a necessary passage to a world not ordered by empire, while Endō, one eye on Japan’s past, asked if such nationalism could offer a moral foundation for human relations. Their crossed paths and the routes they took before and after Lyon can inform problems in the present, not only those of academic relations between fields such as postcolonial studies and East Asian studies (the one having departed South Asia to become a traveling theory, the other comfortably immobile) but also those of historical responsibility and the philosophical foundations of oppositional politics. To begin to understand why, one might simply ask: what connects the experiences of becoming black and becoming yellow in the 1950s?
“As Far as Aden” opens in Marseille, where the narrator, Chiba, has traveled from Paris with a white French lover to board the ship that will take him back to Japan. After a scarcely emotional farewell he finds his way to the quay and his fourth-class compartment, where he discovers an African woman, obviously ill, stretched out in what is essentially a cargo hold. The ship, tellingly, is named the Madeleine. After its departure the narrative shifts between two planes, one the shipboard present, the other the past of Chiba’s remembered experiences in France. In the middle of the final segment, as the Madeleine passes through the Red Sea and the woman passes away, the entire narrative is revealed to be a diary. Chiba compares his present frame of mind to his attitude on the outbound journey three years earlier:

At that time I hadn’t given much consideration to being yellow. In my passport I wrote that I was Japanese, but that Japanese was a human that had the same reason and ideas as a white person. I had thought, like a Marxist, about class conflict and ethnic conflict but I had never considered the conflict of color. It might be possible to eliminate class conflict, but it is eternally impossible to erase the conflict of color. I am eternally yellow, that woman eternally white.20

“That woman” is a student named Maggie, who had shared a wall with Chiba in a Paris boarding house. His experiences with her instigated a transformation of sensibility whose profound nature is indicated by the contrast here with his earlier self. The temporal and spatial distance between his days on the Madeleine and those in France doubles as a critical distance from his experiences there, creating a narrative mechanism for the scrutiny of racism.21 (The effect is amplified by the assertion—implausible given the role of race in Japanese imperial ideology—that he had not thought much about color before going to France.)22 Through Chiba’s interaction with the dying African woman, Endō places these personal experiences in a broader and more complex history of race and racialization that includes not only European empires but also the former Japanese empire.

In his examination of Chiba’s subjective transformation in “As Far as Aden,” Endō drew on the conventions of the “I-novel” (shishōsetsu), a genre of autobiographical, often confessional fiction that emerged in Japan in the 1910s and dominated literary life until the 1930s. Contemporaries of Endō, such as Yasuoka Shōtarō and Shimao Toshio, revived it after 1945 and turned what had become a self-indulgent form into a means to depict the degradations of everyday life in Japan after the war.23 The I-novel’s first-person narrative frequently takes a self-lacerating perspective—as pitiless toward the narrator as toward others—which Endō signals with the first description of the ship: the black paint of the hull is peeling off “like a skin disease,” the white portions are stained with rust, and under the name Madeleine on the stern, a yellow, vomit-like liquid pours out of a pipe.24
genre’s line between narrator and author typically is indistinct. In the best I-novels, however, the ambiguity is a vehicle for moral and ethical reflection, and the faults and contradictions of the narrator, foregrounded and amplified, become a nexus for comment on the world.

Although Endō is considered part of the “Third New Generation” of Japanese writers (the daisan no shinjin), in many ways the work of Yasuoka, Shimao, and others in the group was focused more inwardly, on the individual experience of defeat and occupation, than was Endō’s. The usual explanation is that Endō’s Catholicism attracted him to topics such as the morality of collaboration. Perhaps for this reason too Endō’s attention to race in early pieces like “As Far as Aden” is sometimes reduced to his Catholicism, in proleptic readings meant to predict novels such as Silence (Chinmoku, 1966), on the problem of apostasy. The eminent Endō scholar Kasai Akifu, for example, insists that race is a proxy for religion in “As Far as Aden,” although the story never mentions religion explicitly. In Kasai’s view, Chiba’s split with his girlfriend and departure from France reflect Endō’s disappointment with French Catholicism.25 Viewed through the lens of Endō’s encounter with Fanon, however, these early pieces show Endō writing not about the degrading everyday, as his contemporaries were, or about problems of religion, as scholars like Kasai would have it, but about the position of a post-imperial Japanese subject in a world passing from a colonial to a Cold War order.

As Chiba’s reflections on his outbound journey suggest, in “As Far as Aden” and other works from the time, Endō approached this transition in terms of race—or more properly, in terms of the experience of color. The social and subjective experiences of color in “As Far as Aden” are intertwined. Several months into Chiba’s relationship with Maggie, she takes him to Lyon, her hometown, where she introduces him at a party as her fiancé. He recalls the host scrutinizing him “like an object” (ikko no buttai no yō ni), then presenting him to the guests with the air of a museum guide. As their gazes bear down, he reads the words passing silently among them: “A jaune who got engaged to a white!” “Unheard of!” “A jaune with a white girl . . .” “Look, that guy’s got his arms around her, like he’s really something.” He muses that whites would let him wear their clothes and drink their wine, even love a white woman, but their self-esteem would never permit a white woman to love him.26

Although Maggie is convinced that love between them is enough, Chiba experiences their relationship differently. On the same trip he catches sight of them in the mirrored door of an armoire, lying side by side. At first he doesn’t recognize himself, because he considers himself handsome as a Japanese man. “What was reflected in the mirror was something different than that,” he recalls:
Next to the radiance of the shoulders and breasts of the woman, which shone pure white in the room’s light, my flesh sank into a lifeless, dark yellow hue. And in the two colors that the woman’s body and mine tangled together there was not a shred of beauty, no harmony. On the contrary, it was revolting. It brought to mind a grub the color of yellow dirt clinging to a pure white petal. The color itself reminded me of bile or some other human secretion. I wanted to cover my face and my body with my hands. I turned off the light, out of cowardice, and tried to lose my own flesh in the darkness.  

If we follow the phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty, whom Endō read closely, we can see Endō presenting Chiba’s social experience of color—with Maggie’s friends, for example—and his subjective experience of it, in and through the body, as seamlessly joined. With no line between perception of the world and perception of self, he now perceives his body, and his place in the world, differently: dirty yellow in a world of white.  

Maggie’s insistence that their love is enough reveals her privileged position in the world, Chiba ultimately concludes. “You can love me,” he tells her, “because you are white. But my yellow anguish doesn’t cause you pain, does it? It can’t, can it?” Willful illusions aside, their relationship is closer to master and slave than to that of equals, a reality brought home when Maggie, in the throes of passion, commands him to be her slave. Chiba confesses to feeling pleasure in his debasement before a white women, but there is as much Hegel as von Masoch at work here. Love always would be on Maggie’s terms, or as Chiba puts it, he knows that if he continues to love her, he “would always have to live bearing the dull, feeble-hued face” of a yellow man. Realizing that he would always be “for her”—slave to her master and yellow to her white—he decides to leave France. The phrase “bear the face,” kao o seou, is an obvious allusion by the Catholic Endō to the burden of “bearing the cross,” jūjika o seou. Given Endō’s phenomenological perspective, however, it seems also to invoke the facticity of color, in phenomenological terms, its contingent concreteness preceding socially ascribed meaning. The meaning given to color—not color itself—confined Chiba to a stalled dialectic in which the struggle to achieve true subjectivity was impossible. Characters such as Chiba confront the facticity of color as a cross they must bear in a racist society.  

Events onboard ship frame Chiba’s memories of France and expand the problematic from a strictly personal trauma to a more complex view of the relationship between color and colonialism. A white doctor puts Chiba’s black cabin companion, who is dying of jaundice, in his care. Chiba looks at the woman as “an object”—ikko no buttai, the same objectification he had experienced at the party in Lyon—but in doing so does more than reproduce a white gaze. He discovers his own self-loathing in his contempt for her: “Black is ugly. And muddy yellow is even more pitiful. This black woman and
I belong to ugly races,” he writes. Neither will be able to forget their “wretchedness” and “feelings of inferiority” before people with white skin.32 One evening the doctor, drunk, visits the compartment. Although silent up to now, when the doctor touches her the black woman exclaims, “Leave me like this! I want to be like this,” and adds, when he tries to force a thermometer into her mouth, “I’ve been like this all along, so I want to lay like this from now on too.” The doctor slaps her repeatedly and leaves a yellow powder for Chiba to administer three times a day. When they are alone she mutters, “It’s fine like this. Black people are all fine like this.”33

Chiba’s response to the woman’s mixture of defiance and abasement underscores his ambiguous position in the ship’s racial hierarchy. When she refuses the medicine—saying again, “Black people are fine this way”—he slaps her too, feeling “a craving in his eyes” as he swings.34 Chiba’s blow is identical to the doctor’s, but he no more simply assumes the doctor’s position of power than he earlier had reproduced the doctor’s gaze. Considering the sense of guilt he finds in her words, and the depths of his self-contempt, one might say Chiba administers the punishment that he imagines the woman desires. Expanding on Freud’s analysis of masochism (where the fantasy “my father is beating a child” is succeeded by “I am being beaten by my father”), one might say that Chiba is hitting himself in hitting her.35 He can do so because he is yellow and she black, which is to say he exploits and reproduces the hierarchy of white domination for his own subjective ends. Chiba is both observer and participant in this system, which one should note is not binary but tripartite: black, white, and yellow. In a phrase from Jean-Paul Sartre familiar to both Endō and Fanon, he is “situated.”

He is situated historically as well. At the party in Lyon, a well-meaning liberal tells him that “you all” are not that different from “us,” face and physique included. Seized by “a desire for self-abuse and an urge to destroy,” Chiba identifies himself as a “Jap” with “that barbaric custom hara kiri.” Japanese and their faces are “barbaric”; their country staged a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, used suicide bombers, and surely the young man must know what it did in Nanjing. The would-be antiracist mumbles feebly that those acts showed “courage.” Chiba recalls being at a loss for a reply. He can return hostility with hostility, but can only respond with anger to the young man’s compassion and charity, born from his sense of superiority and covered in a “treacly veil” of platitudes. As he says to himself, “Why doesn’t he judge me?”36 In the confrontation Endō joins history and ontology. The soft racism that withholds judgment, only possible for someone on the winning side of the war, is just another way of foreclosing the struggle necessary to achieve subjectivity.

Chiba is trapped between an unresolved imperial past and a present ordered by the hierarchies of colonial racism, a situation that Endō presents
as the predicament of a postimperial Japanese subject. In “As Far as Aden” he went out of his way to depict this as a historical form of subjectivity rather than as what might today be called a postcolonial condition. The withholding of judgment for the creation of the Japanese empire and the fifteen-year war to protect it contributes to Chiba’s in-between position on the Madeleine. His position between white and black is granted by the ship’s doctor, to whom he poses no resistance. He is moreover unable to establish relations with the black woman except through the doctor’s mediation. This is not to exculpate Chiba: indeed his inability to do so is the story’s strongest moral theme. It is to say, however, that Endō regarded the suspension of moral judgment on the war, which was not simply imposed but also willingly pursued by people in Japan, as an obstacle to achieving an autonomous subjectivity—and collectively, a geopolitical independence—in the postwar era.

Endō’s arguments in “As Far as Aden” and other pieces from the 1950s find many similarities in Fanon’s Black Skin, White Masks. Some might be called “analytical” similarities—similar frames of analysis—while others are close textual parallels. Although unremarked to date, taken together they suggest that Endō was familiar with Fanon’s book at a time when it was scarcely known. The analysis of race in Black Skin, White Masks, like that in “As Far as Aden,” hinges on a contrast between the Antillean man’s intellectual understanding of color while in the islands and the lived experience of it when he confronts the white gaze in France. (The contrast itself relies on a rhetoric of displacement—spatial and temporal—apparent also in the frame of “As Far as Aden.”) The center of “The Lived Experience of the Black Man”—and one of the best-known passages of Black Skin, White Masks—relies on a phenomenological argument, characteristic of Fanon’s early work, that is evident too in Endō’s. On a train in Lyon, Fanon was interpellated (in the Althusserian sense) by a white child with the exclamation “Look, a Negro!” (Tiens, un nègre!). His sense of his body suddenly collapsed. Casting an objective view on himself—which is to say, now seeing himself as an object—he discovered his “blackness,” which consisted of “tom-toms, cannibalism, mental deficits,” and other clichés that he nonetheless felt to be true. His body was returned to him “stretched out, disjoined, resurfaced.” In the introduction to Black Skin, White Masks, Fanon described this kind of reaction as the “epidermization” of inferiority. That is, as another reader of Merleau-Ponty, Fanon considered the experience of color to change the perception of the body itself: to be treated as a dirty black was to be dirty, and black. Like Endō too, Fanon foregrounded the physical juxtaposition of white and colored bodies in the experience of blackness. “Negroes are comparison,” requiring the presence of white Others to
evaluate themselves, Fanon said. He gave special attention to the desire for sexual recognition, which he described as narcissistic “body-to-body combat” to prove one’s self-worth.40

The parallels continue in Endō’s depiction of Chiba’s failed ontological struggle. For Fanon, the experience of color led to an ontological impasse. The black man cannot be anything other than black, but cannot be so without the intermediation of the white man. He may only experience “being for” in the Hegelian sense as being for the white man, but he poses no ontological resistance for the white man, and receives none in return. Existence then is always on the white man’s terms, as it is on the white girlfriend’s terms for Chiba. A proper ontological struggle for subjectivity is foreclosed.41 The ontological impasse, as in Endō’s story, has social origins. Fanon observed caustically that the white man wants labor, not recognition, from the black man; they are not truly the master and slave of the Hegelian dialectic. Even outside a system of chattel slavery, moreover, the black man cannot escape the facticity of color, to which social meanings attach: “I am not the slave of the ‘idea’ that others have of me, but of my appearing.”42 Color is the point at which history inescapably informs ontology, a situation we have seen Endō describe as the burden of bearing the cross of a colored face. Analytically, then, one can observe several ways in which Endō’s positions in “As Far as Aden” parallel Fanon’s: the contrast between understanding and experience, supported by a rhetoric of displacement; attention to the role of the body in subjectivity; use of the vocabulary of slavery to describe an ontological bind of social origin; and acute attention to the psychological consequences of color, however factitious color itself may be.

Further similarities can be found in other pieces inspired by Endō’s time in France, most notably the story “Coleridge Hall” (“Kōridji kan,” 1955) and the essay “The Colored Races and the White Colored Race” (“Yūshoku jinshu to hakushoku jinshu,” 1956), whose title itself calls into question the analytical universalization of whiteness. In “The Colored Races” Endō repeated the assertion that he had little sense of race before arriving in France and recounted his experiences of racial interpellation in the trams, trains, shops, and restaurants of Lyon.43 Echoing scenes from “As Far as Aden,” he castigated the pushy camaraderie of white antiracists, saying they could never experience the “anguish of the skin.”44 Most of the essay is devoted, however, to Endō’s observations of African, North African, and Asian students at meetings of a group called the Society of Friends of International Students. Endō set up the discussion by quoting several lines from “Black Orpheus” (“Orphée noir,” 1948), Sartre’s preface to Léopold Senghor’s anthology of the poetry of nègritude, where Sartre argued that the problem of race could not be separated from the problem of class. (The
former is concrete and particular while the latter is general and abstract, according to Sartre.) *Black Skin, White Masks* quotes the same passage at greater length.\(^4\) Like Fanon—who responded caustically—Endō found Sartre’s position lacking. Endō recalled that the students of color at meetings of the group craved the attention of white attendees and directed their behavior toward whites rather than each other, just as Fanon had remarked that the black man desired the recognition of the white.\(^4\) The resulting rivalry bred a psychological enmity among the students.\(^4\) In Endō’s view they had accepted the white person as a standard for matters from physical appearance to language and cultural achievement, and even accepted the association of blackness with sin, all assertions Fanon also made in *Black Skin, White Masks*.\(^4\) He described the attitude as “white-person standard-ism” (a phrase no less ungainly in Japanese—*hakujin hyajun shugi*—than in English).\(^4\)

Endō argued in “The Colored Races” that the internalization of standards was the source of a “complex”—a term he shared with Fanon—that manifested itself in myriad ways.\(^5\) Japanese in France were not immune to its effects, but, while they were able to escape it on returning to Japan, black students, by contrast, were not, because they could not pass a day unaware of the history of slavery that their bodies bore.\(^5\) To illustrate the consequences of the complex for them, Endō quoted from *The Respectful Prostitute* (*La Putain respectueuse*, 1947), Sartre’s play about the Scottsboro Boys, in which a black man finds himself unable to shoot whites intent on lynching him. As in the case of “Black Orpheus,” *Black Skin, White Masks* quotes the same passage at greater length.\(^5\) Meditating on how he and other Japanese writers might respond, Endō argued against the impulse to escape the predicament of African and North African students by departing into idealism and abstraction. It is socially and aesthetically irresponsible to try to become an “abstract human being.”

Every person must instead bear the cross of his spirit and body.\(^5\)

In contrast to those in the essay “The Colored Races,” the parallels with Fanon’s work in Endō’s story “Coleridge Hall” are narrative and allusive. The story—which is presented as an unsent letter to a Moroccan student, Pôran—is set in a Lyon dormitory where the narrator, again named Chiba, is the sole foreigner until Pôran arrives. On his own arrival, Chiba had been greeted with hostility as a *jaune* and up to this point had built unsatisfying friendships by offering coffee to a trio of moochers, humoring their praise for the Japanese military (which they thought would be useful in Indochina) and, on the eve of Pôran’s arrival, acquiescing in their greater racism toward blacks. (He describes his acquiescence as his first betrayal of the Moroccan student.)\(^5\) Although he might have welcomed Pôran’s presence, he resists the impulse to greet him, and, as in *Black Skin, White Masks* and “Coleridge Hall”’s companion works, they soon compete for the attention of their white housemates. Their attitudes toward each other are unsympathetic. On the
first evening Pôran assumes the tone of a French colonial functionary as he questions Chiba about Japan. They quarrel over whose country is more civilized. Gesticulating as he dismisses the possibility that Tokyo could have a subway like the one planned for Casablanca, the backs of Pôran’s hands shine a reddish black. His palms were white, Chiba recalls. Returning to his room, Chiba holds his own hands to the dim autumn light. “Pôran, though not so much as yours, white was creeping into the inner sides of mine too, while the coarse backs were tinged lifeless yellow,” he writes. The tense relationship comes to a climax when a white student’s room is burgled. Chiba initially takes the blame, and although he knows the thief was another white student, he doesn’t think he would be believed, on account of his color, if he tried to defend himself. The thief soon accuses Pôran, whose darker color makes him more culpable. Unwilling to face the consequences of defending him, Chiba stands by as the white students sack his room in retaliation, a second betrayal driven by cowardice. The story shares with “As Far as Aden” its dramatization of many of the points made in expository form in “The Colored Races” and shares, too, their parallels to Black Skin, White Masks. Most striking, however, is the witty allusion to Fanon’s title, which acknowledges and extends his argument: the colored hands, white on the palms, working against each other to the benefit of the white-colored race.

Although Black Skin, White Masks received scant attention when it was released, there are reasons Endô could have become familiar with Fanon’s work while he was in France. Endô was an avid reader of the leftist Catholic journal Esprit, which published “The Lived Experience of the Black Man,” “The North African Syndrome,” and a later essay by Fanon, “Antilleans and Africans” (“Antillais et Africains,” 1955). Esprit’s publisher was Seuil, which published Black Skin, White Masks in June 1952. It was Esprit’s deputy editor, Jean-Marie Domenach, who gave Fanon’s manuscript to Francis Jeanson, editor of Seuil’s Esprit book series. Beginning in December 1951 and until his departure from France in January 1953, Endô was in contact with Domenach about translating articles from Esprit and launching a Japanese edition. He visited Seuil’s offices several times. Endô could easily have learned about Fanon’s work through Esprit or his contacts at Seuil. There are also reasons to wonder if Endô learned about it from the author himself. Fanon’s and Endô’s sojourns in Lyon overlapped by at least a year. One of Fanon’s biographers estimates that there were only around four hundred university students in Lyon at the time, and just a small percentage of foreign students. Like Endô, Fanon attended the meetings of foreign-student groups, which one can assume were intimate affairs. While the circumstantial evidence is suggestive, however, documents have not been found that show Endô discovered Fanon’s work through such a personal encounter.
Rooted in personal experience as “As Far as Aden,” “Coleridge Hall,” and “The Colored Races” are, it is possible that Endō reached his conclusions about the phenomenon of color independently from Fanon. Some of these works’ similarities to Black Skin, White Masks, such as the shared rhetoric of displacement, are not unusual in themselves. The ideas of Merleau-Ponty and Sartre, too, were part of the intellectual milieu of any aspiring intellectual in France. The use of Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology to analyze the experience of color, however, was not something Endō would easily have found outside of Black Skin, White Masks or “The Lived Experience of the Black Man,” the central chapter published in Esprit. The repetition of not one but two quotations from Sartre, moreover, is an unlikely coincidence. Finally, the images of the brown and yellow hands in “Coleridge Hall” seem an open acknowledgment of the title and arguments of Black Skin, White Masks. Taken together, the evidence is strong that Endō had read Fanon by the time he wrote “As Far as Aden” and the subsequent works.

Throughout these early pieces, however, Endō did not talk about the relationship of white and yellow alone, as if in a simple parallel to Fanon’s examination of black and white. Overt references to Fanon such as the allusion in “Coleridge Hall” announce a critical elaboration of Fanon’s arguments on race, colonialism, and subjectivity. Endō inserted the yellow man into the relations of blacks and whites and called the reader’s attention to subaltern rivalries that he thought blocked projects of liberation from racism, individual or collective. Here what compels attention is not so much how Endō learned of Fanon’s work but rather how the path Endō took to Lyon, the history he brought there, shaped his engagement with it. The histories that Endō and Fanon alike brought to Lyon are more entangled, the geographies in which they unfolded less disconnected, than they might first appear. In reconstructing them the experiences of becoming black and yellow emerge as contrasting outcomes in a heterogeneous geography shaped by multiple imperial histories—not only European and American but also Japanese—in which anticolonialism and decolonization coincided with the very different phenomenon of de-imperialization and a critique of anticolonial nationalism in the era of its ascendance.

Endō’s account of being treated as a war criminal during port stops in Manila and Singapore provides an opportunity to begin thinking through the connection between the experiences of becoming black and becoming yellow in the 1950s, because it illustrates how different Endō’s position in France and the world was from Fanon’s. Endō arrived from a country whose empire had recently been taken by other countries still holding onto their own, whose pre-1945 leaders had been put on trial by those same countries, and which was quickly becoming an Asian bastion in the capitalist side of the
Cold War. The reasons Endō’s position was not Fanon’s opened different possibilities for his writing on color and colonialism, and imposed a different political burden.

Japanese war crimes in East and Southeast Asia were prosecuted in the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, held in Tokyo from May 1946 to November 1948, and in secondary tribunals in Japan and elsewhere in Asia and the Pacific. Eleven countries participated in the trials of “Class A” suspects in Tokyo: Australia, Canada, Republican China, France, India, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Each supplied a judge and a prosecutor. (The Philippines, independent in July 1946, was included by the United States. India was added at the insistence of Britain; it was not independent until well after the trials began.) The Tokyo Trials (as they are commonly known) were modeled after the Nuremberg Trials of 1945 and 1946, with similar goals of identifying responsible individuals, establishing a historical record, and ultimately transforming a society. 62 Twenty-eight defendants were charged with crimes against peace, crimes against humanity, and conventional war crimes. All of the twenty-five who remained by the end of the proceedings were convicted on various counts. (Two died and one was removed for reasons of mental illness). The judgment, however, was divided. Only seven judges joined the majority opinion finding all the men guilty. The tribunal’s president, William Webb of Australia, concurred but wrote an opinion critical of the trial and judgment. Henri Bernard of France dissented on the grounds that the tribunal was so poorly run that a verdict was impossible. Radhabinod Pal of India argued that the trial relied on ex post facto legislation and that Japan’s wars in Asia were justifiable self-defense, rendering the defendants entirely innocent. The Netherlands’ representative, B. V. A. Röling, objected to several of the convictions but upheld others.63

Both the Nuremberg and Tokyo Trials have been criticized as victor’s justice. Crimes against humanity had no legal existence before Nuremberg, while crimes against peace, or “aggressive war,” had not been clearly defined. The defendants thus were tried for some acts that had not been legally considered crimes when they were committed. No one from the Allied countries was tried, moreover, despite evidence of war crimes on the winning side.64 The trials represented victor’s justice in another way relevant to Fanon and Endō. Three of the four judges in the Nuremberg Trials were from colonial powers: France, the United Kingdom, and the United States. In the Tokyo Trials, four of the eleven judges were from colonial powers, and three more from settler societies dominated by people of European extraction. They were judging acts for the most part committed in colonies that Japan took from their masters after 1941, something that India’s Pal
alone considered relevant. Japanese policy in the “legitimate” colonies of Korea and Taiwan was excluded from the trials, no doubt because of the attention it would direct toward the conduct of Britain, France, the Netherlands and the United States in their own colonies. Considerations of postwar US power drove other decisions. Japan’s emperor was not prosecuted because the United States thought immunity would aid the occupation; the conduct of Unit 731, Japan’s organization for medical experimentation and biological weapons, was kept out in exchange for the United States’ receipt of its research; and a second round of Class A trials was cancelled when conciliation of the new Japanese government, as a capitalist ally in East Asia, looked advantageous. (One of the men charged but released, Kishi Nobusuke, later became Prime Minister.) It is conventional now to call trials of this kind “transitional justice,” aimed as they are at creating a postconflict social order. The label is doubly apt for the Tokyo Trials: they sat on the cusp between the imperial internationalism of the heyday of European imperialism and the Cold War expediency that was the rule after 1945. The contradiction of the trials’ moral universalism was hard to miss.

The Tokyo Trials were one piece of what should be called the decolonization of Japan. It had a complex relationship to decolonization in Asia. Japan carried out its invasions in East and Southeast Asia, bloody for local peoples as well as Europeans and Americans, in the name of liberation. Pace Endō’s claim that he hardly had a sense of race before going to France, the conflict was propagandized in Japan and the empire through inclusionary racism meant to mobilize the colonized to the Japanese cause. The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere would return Asia to Asians. The fall of European and US colonial regimes in Southeast Asia was an opportunity for anticolonialists, whatever they thought of Japan’s brutal, exploitative rule. In Indonesia Sukarno worked with the Japanese regime, which promised independence after the war; Ba Maw and Aung Sang cooperated with Japan in the early years of the occupation of Burma, which was nominally independent after 1943. Lee Kuan Yew credited the fall of Singapore with smashing the myth of British superiority and awakening him to the possibility of revolutionary change. Subhas Chandra Bose proclaimed a Provisional Government of Free India aligned with Japan and based in Singapore. Bose’s rival Jawaharlal Nehru rejected the idea of a Japanese-led Asia, but he too saw the war as an opportunity to rid it of Europeans. While the Japanese occupation suppressed anti-French movements in Indochina because the Vichy regime, nominally in power there, was an ally, the Viet Minh took advantage of the chaos after the Japanese surrender to seize major cities and towns and proclaim the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

In autumn 1945 it looked as if the end of the inter-imperial war might have the opposite result. Korea, Taiwan, and the occupied parts of mainland
China were liberated from Japanese rule, but Indochina was returned to France, Malaya and Burma to Britain, Indonesia to the Netherlands, East Timor to Portugal, and the Philippines to the United States. The Pacific islands that Japan occupied during the war—many of which had been German colonies until World War I and quasi-colonial League of Nations mandates afterward—were distributed to the victorious powers as United Nations trusteeships; Japan’s own mandate went to the United States. Members of Bose’s Indian Independence League and Indian National Army were tried for collaboration. (Bose died in August 1945 while fleeing to Japan.) Nonetheless, resistance to the reimposition of European authority was immediate. With no apologies for acts of the Japanese state and military, the de-imperialization of Japan, carried out in the terms of imperial internationalism, was a critical phase in the decolonization of this part of the world. As many have observed, decolonization followed a westward path from Southeast Asia, a fitting inversion of translatio imperii.  

The de-imperialization of Japan was also its colonization, in a new mode. Although the six-year occupation resembled a colonial viceroyalty, Japan emerged from it as a redoubt in something different: the informal US empire of the Cold War. The San Francisco Peace Treaty ending the occupation and the US-Japan Security Treaty, which granted military bases to the United States, were signed on the same day in 1951. A reracialization of the Japanese population accompanied the transformation from imperialist to subordinate anticommmunist. (I use “racialization” in Patrick Wolfe’s meaning of the withholding of rights on the grounds of putative racial characteristics.) In the early twentieth century, the Japanese state won agreements from the United States and Britain not to interfere in its colonization of Korea so long as they had a free hand in the Philippines and Burma and India, respectively. Arguing for the agreement with the United States, Theodore Roosevelt said that Japan “played the game of civilized mankind.”  

Japanese imperial privileges were recognized, with limits; in imperial politics Japan was not-white but more-than-yellow. After 1945 it was yellow anew, reracialized in the sense that allegedly innate qualities legitimated the withdrawal of rights—and responsibilities—previously held. The Tokyo Trials were emblematic: twenty-five Japanese were convicted for acts in extremis, while some seventy-two million were left not so much innocent as irresponsible. Political expedience is the real answer to Chiba’s question “Why doesn’t he judge me?” in “As Far as Aden.” Far more valuable to the occupation than establishing responsibility was cultivating a reliable client state. (Rather than the barbarous monkey man of wartime propaganda, the occupation’s operating cliché was the malleable oriental, ready to be taught the ways of capitalist democracy.) A convergence of geopolitical changes, then, was behind the discovery by Endō and his protagonists that
they were yellow in the eyes of French whites. The reracialization of Japan coincided with the beginnings of decolonization and the Cold War, the demise of one mode of empire and the rise of another.

In his work on race and colonialism, Fanon too reported a change in the meaning of color driven by events in World War II. For four years after the fall of the French Third Republic, Martinique was under the Pétainiste dictatorship of Georges Robert, an admiral loyal to the Vichy regime, as were many of the civilian administrators of other French colonies. In Fanon’s account, the occupation was a turning point in Martiniquan history. Before 1939 French West Indians denigrated Africans and blackness. Even if Antilleans could not deny the color of their skin, the conviction remained that “the Antillean was a black, but the nègre was in Africa,” as Fanon put it. In all, Antilleans had more in common with Europeans. Robert, who was in Martinique to safeguard a portion of France’s fleet and gold, brought with him thousands of white French sailors who conducted themselves as “authentic racists.” Through the sailors’ presence racial lines sharpened and residents of African descent embraced the blackness championed by the poet of Négritude Aimé Césaire in ways they had not before. Rejecting the racism they associated with Vichy, they forced Robert to relinquish power and rallied Martinique to the side of the Free French.80 Fanon’s presentation of the Robert era interestingly resembles the central anecdote in Black Skin, White Masks: a population recognizes its blackness when confronted with white racism. Historians attest, however, to the role the era’s exacerbated racism played in Martiniquan opposition to colonial rule.81

The changing meaning of color in Martinique was one facet of the collapse of the French Empire during and after the war. De Gaulle’s gestures toward self-governance at the war’s height, like the Atlantic Charter’s pledge to restore sovereign rights to those who had been deprived of them, would not easily go back in the bottle.82 The results, however, were no more clear-cut than was the transition of empire in East Asia. In newly assertive Martinique, transformation of the island into a French département, rather than independence, was regarded as the proper path to self-government. Championed by a figure no less eminent than Césaire, departmentalization was to end despotic direct rule by the French head of state. In metropolitan France, the departmentalization of Martinique was meant to serve different ends: protecting the French presence in the Caribbean against US designs.83 This ambiguous sort of decolonization—some might say colonialism without a colony—was coeval with anticolonialism elsewhere in the empire, from the Viet Minh insurrection in Indochina—sped by the Japanese invasion—to the Algerian struggle to which Fanon devoted himself.

If we step back, then, we can place the time Fanon and Endō spent in Lyon—and their experiences of becoming black and yellow—in a period
that begins in the late 1930s, continues through the de-imperialization of Japan, and leads on to the end of the European empires and the rise of the American. The change in the meaning of color that Fanon’s path through the era illustrates, a change in attitudes that contributed to the end of the French empire, was quite different from that illustrated by Endō’s path, which witnessed the imposition of the racial terms on which the Japanese empire in Asia was dismantled and the United States’ empire founded. Yet clearly these two transformations were linked by the convulsions of empire in the middle of the twentieth century. This is not to say that Fanon’s and Endō’s analyses of color had a single origin, but rather that they shared a ground, a geography of twentieth-century imperialism and colonialism that was variegated and irregular. Distinct forms of empire existed coevally: the direct colonization that was the dominant mode of the European empires and the “anti-imperialist” Japanese, existed side-by-side, and frequently at odds, with the informal domination that characterized the American. A variety of forms of accumulation were at work, from direct exploitation of colonial labor and imperial monopolies to the neocolonial extraction of value. Multiple modes of racialization operated simultaneously. Endō’s encounter with Fanon’s early work provided elements of an analytic and a vocabulary to describe transformations in one part of it, as Fanon had described transformations in another. Although the histories that usually frame Fanon and Endō exclude one or the other, perhaps the signs that Endō was reading Fanon should be an occasion to read them together: Fanon had much to say to Endō about the position of de-imperialized Japanese subjects in the world of the 1950s, but Endō would have had much to say to Fanon too about Japanese responses to European and US imperialism.

Accounting for Fanon’s and Endō’s crossing of paths provides an opportunity not only to consider the terms of the geographies of their lived experiences but also to recover a different sense of what was at stake in their examinations of color and its relationship to imperialism. It is an opportunity to reconsider their senses of the present but also their imaginations of the future. Reading their work together reveals the critical importance given at the time to overcoming the mediating role that European, US, and, not too long previously, Japanese empires played in relations among humans in the uneven geography of colonialism. Endō evocatively illustrated the challenge in “As Far as Aden.” By introducing the yellow subject into the dialectic of black and white—and by the same token the black subject into that of yellow and white—he effectively changed the terms for escaping the ontological bind at the center of Black Skin, White Masks. When Chiba recognizes his own self-contempt in his contempt for the black woman in his care,
Endô implies that recognizing one’s color in the eyes of the white Other alone is not sufficient for overcoming the psychology of colonialism. Black, brown, and yellow people cannot find a way out of the forms of domination rooted in colonialism without addressing their relationship with each other; only in this way can they finally relinquish their desire for white recognition and their fear of doing anything that might diminish it. Until then whites will continue to regulate their relations, as they confine themselves to their separate dialectical prisons.

In the Hegelian and phenomenological terms at work here, one could say that freedom from the desire for, and dependence on, white recognition was a defining element of Fanon’s and Endô’s imaginations of a world after empire. This is not to reduce anticolonialism to a quest for psychological liberation (which in this case would be to ignore most of Fanon’s later work). Nonetheless, the ideal of transverse relations among people of colors other than white was part of the vision of the future—the “horizon of expectation,” in Reinhart Koselleck’s terminology—of mid-twentieth-century anticolonialism. For Koselleck, a horizon of expectation is shaped by the “space of experience” of those imagining the future, by conditions in their present and their sense of the past.84 Considering the ways that Fanon’s and Endô’s spaces of experience were connected by the geography of colonialism, one could approach Endô’s encounter with Fanon as an occasion to excavate the “futures past” of anticolonialism, as David Scott has done for C. L. R. James.85 As important as such a project is, it should not be restricted to lessons about the setbacks of postindependence states. Endô and Fanon were each greatly concerned with the philosophical foundation for relations among humans after empire and the obstacle that anticolonial nationalism per se could pose to it.

The legitimacy of imperial justice deteriorated rapidly after 1945, and with it the unassailability of European moral universalism, which had a dependent relationship with imperial power. The moral and ethical basis for relations not regulated by Europe or European philosophical norms, which had been debated by figures like Okakura Tenshin and Rabindranath Tagore since the early twentieth century, was now a critical issue. The foundations of international governance after the era of the European empires were at stake. The United Nations, where the balance of votes in the General Assembly had not yet been changed by the influx of new members in the 1960s, was viewed with suspicion as a tool of the United States and Europe. (As Mark Mazower has shown, the United Nations was designed to protect imperial interests.)86 The urgency and optimism surrounding the Conference of Asian and African Nations convened in Bandung in 1955 attest to the importance given to finding an alternative basis for relations.87 Endô’s and Fanon’s responses, each with its own limitations, again illuminate each
other. Both confronted the question of whether nationalism directed against European and US imperialism—which was propelling anticolonial struggle in Africa and Asia as it had propelled the creation of the Japanese empire—could provide principles to replace the European universalism that buttressed colonialism. While Fanon was relatively sanguine on this point, seeing anticolonial nationalism as the prerequisite for an internationalism that would follow, Endō’s examination of wartime behavior in Japan left him pessimistic. Differences in their spaces of experience supported different horizons of expectation: to the forward-looking project of liberation associated with Fanon, Endō attached a burden of dealing with the past.

It is well known that in *The Wretched of the Earth* (*Damnées de la terre*, 1961), Fanon predicted that a post-European humanism would emerge after decolonization. By this time Fanon had set aside the phenomenology that informed *Black Skin, White Masks*, but his engagement with Sartre continued. In an argument modeled on Sartre’s analysis of anti-Semitism, Fanon argued that colonialism created the colonized and therefore the colonized per se would disappear with decolonization, to be replaced by “new men” and a “new humanity.” “This new humanity, for itself and for others,” Fanon wrote, “cannot help but define a new humanism. This new humanism is prefigured in the objectives and methods of the struggle.”

As his remarks suggest, Fanon saw a precise correspondence between culture (in the sense of arts and letters) and the fight against colonialism. The latter could only succeed on a national, as opposed to pan-African, footing. Culture too is “first of all national,” Fanon argued: only on a national scale can it achieve the fecundity, homogeneity, and density it needs to flourish and make its essential contribution to liberation. Fanon’s main target was the literature of négritude, although he warned too against the temptation to embrace a “universal” culture, behind which lurked the self-universalization of Europe. The new humanism would have a different foundation. Because a nation that has liberated itself is both for itself and for others, national and international consciousness go hand in hand. A truly national culture is “permeable” by other national cultures and able to influence and “penetrate” them in turn. That is, the new humanism would not be founded on a single universal culture but on a multiplicity of national cultures open to each other. National cultures nonetheless would have “universalizing” values, the first of which, one assumes, would be mutual recognition of the national right to exist.

Benita Parry observes a dissonance in Fanon’s work created by affirmations of the immediate need for an insurrectionary subjectivity and predictions of a future in which the colonized and all that had been necessary to free him would be replaced by something new. Nonetheless, there is
a consistency in Fanon’s arguments that reflects an era when the nation-form was the foundation of most political thought. Although Fanon’s new humanism would manifest universalizing values, it would be an ecumenical inter-nationalism fundamentally different from the universalism of the European Enlightenment. Even in its openness to others, each national culture would remain distinct and for itself, preserving its particularity. The proposition relies on what elsewhere I have called a “relativizing universalization” of the concept of nation. In contrast, for example, to the generalizing universalism of the Enlightenment concept of civilization, which was presumed to have the same characteristics anywhere, from the nineteenth century onward “nation” was universalized as category but not content. Every inhabited place “had” a nation, but every nation was unique. Such relativizing universalism had ethical dimensions for Fanon: it was the basis both for his critique of colonial domination and for his prediction of an equitable world to follow.

The pages Fanon filled in *The Wretched of the Earth* outlining the transition from nationalism to internationalism testify to his concern about the vicissitudes of nationalism. His warnings about the obstacles to liberation posed by national bourgeoisies and the danger that national parties may devolve into tribal dictatorships underscore the worry. Nationalism would lead to an impasse if not enriched and transformed into social and political consciousness and thereby a new humanism. While Fanon’s qualms speak to the hazards of nationalism within nations, however, they say little about relations between them or their respective national subjects. As a fundamental value, mutual recognition among nations is only seemingly Kantian. Fanon presents it as an imperative for nations, but he says nothing of “universalizing” values that would apply to individuals. Instead, the argument relies on a conflation of individual history and national future that is typical of the discourse of nationalism. In the fight for independence, individual and nation will merge, Fanon says; individuals will reach the new era only as members of nations. Inter-nationally, nations will behave as putatively unified quasi-individuals; actual humans will interact through their nationalities. By this argument, subjects of different nations that are simultaneously for themselves and for others will coexist peacefully. It was precisely on the dangerous identification of individual and nation, however, that Endo’s attention to the past could speak to Fanon’s view of the future.

In Endo’s work nationalism is not ecumenical. Given its role in Japan’s invasions in Asia and war against the Allied countries, Endo was deeply suspicious as to whether a nationalism founded on opposition to imperialism could provide individuals with a moral basis for resistance—not to the imperialism of other states but to the demands of one’s own. As noted, Endo began exploring these issues in a series of works on collaboration, resistance, and
war crimes that he began while in France. While judgment of wartime behavior factors into Chiba’s ontological predicament in “As Far as Aden,” many of these works rely on more blunt comparisons of the moral motives for collaboration and resistance in France and Japan. (The paired novellas White Man and Yellow Man [Shiroi hito, Kiiroi hito, 1955] contrast the active evil of Nazi collaborators in France with the moral listlessness of those mobilized for compulsory labor in Japan.) This portion of Endō’s oeuvre culminated in The Sea and Poison, a concerted examination of obedience to the state.

*The Sea and Poison* is based on a program of medical experiments conducted on American prisoners during the Asia-Pacific war. In the novel, the Imperial Army asks rival surgical teams to carry out vivisections to determine the internal injuries a soldier can sustain before dying. Some doctors and nurses agree enthusiastically, others reluctantly, but none refuse. The reasons vary but are notably unrelated to the national cause: the desire to revive a faltering career, hope for a promotion, love (of a nurse for a doctor), procrastination, and the fact that it is easier to comply than to resist.99 With one exception—Suguro, a doctor who freezes in the operating room but does nothing to stop the experiments—the hospital staff scarcely recognizes the white prisoners as human beings. Whether or not their nation is both for itself and for others, as Fanon’s postliberation nations would be, the national subjects in *The Sea and Poison* cannot recognize difference in the form of the nationally different Other, that is, the prisoners. In contrast they readily recognize sameness that is simply in the guise of difference: the nationally identical Other, that is, other Japanese. Recognition of such pseudo-difference is another version of being simply for oneself, and ultimately, for the state that establishes and enforces the terms of national difference. The nationalism that rallied millions to contribute to the Asia-Pacific War, Endō found, gave them no basis for judging the demands of the state.

Looking at the present, Endō saw little change. In his diary and published work, Endō observed the blithe attitude of the United States toward Asian objections to Japanese rearmament, in contrast to the intense debate over the rearmament of Germany, and wondered why people in Japan were in favor of rearmament while Germans were opposed.100 Chiba’s plaint in “As Far as Aden” notwithstanding, moreover, no one was asking to be judged. In Endō’s view, Japanese seemed ready to think they had atoned for the past by signing a peace treaty and adopting a constitution that banned offensive war. Those acts had done nothing, however, to diminish the vengefulness in the eyes of the officials who boarded his ship in Manila harbor.101 Whether or not the immediate origins of Endō’s yellow subjects’ ontological impasse—and political passivity—lay in the United States’ rehabilitation of Japan after 1945, escaping it would require a full reckoning with Japan’s “anti-imperialist” past in Asia.
The themes of *The Sea and Poison* reflect a negative culturalism on Endō’s part that was the inverse of Fanon’s more positive view of nations. Rather than a Christian sense of guilt, the doctors and nurses experience fear that their violation of professional norms will be publicly known, a concern with shame that Endō presents as typically Japanese. Suguro, the most tormented character, admits to himself after the war that in a similar situation he probably still would not resist. Endō took the distinction between cultures of shame and guilt from Ruth Benedict’s *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (1946), based on Benedict’s work for the US Office of War Information, whose influence in de-imperialized Japan speaks to the ease with which one ideology may invert into another. While reductive at best, this kind of culturalism was important for Endō historically and politically. Measuring the conduct of the Japanese state and the populace of the archipelago against a moral standard focused on the sense of guilt, Endō consistently found them wanting. Given Endō’s doubts about whether a non-European Christianity was possible, the standard was provisional at best but offered Endō a critical perspective for asking why there had been no resistance in Japan to the invasions of Asia, and why people were so ready after the war to cooperate in US-led anticommunist campaigns there.

To be sure, Endō’s method of critique posed structural obstacles to a forward-looking response. His early work on race did not move far beyond the impasse of recognizing one’s own racism. Formally and thematically, “As Far as Aden” and “Coleridge Hall” end with the unhappy consciousness typical of autobiographical fiction in Japanese. *The Sea and Poison* does not see a way for an individual to escape the confines of national culture, only a way to recognize them. After these works Endō’s attention to problems of color and colonialism faded. Historically, much of his interest shifted to the sixteenth century, when Catholicism was introduced to Japan. Analytically, he remained in a position of counteridentification with respect to Europe, in contrast to a disidentification that would have relinquished Europe as a point of reference. Nonetheless I would caution against discarding Endō’s skepticism. It may deepen rather than diminish the moral dimension of anticolonialism. At a time when Fanon, in one part of their shared geography, was hopeful that anticolonial nationalism would produce an era of peaceful internationalism, Endō, in a different part, was assessing a history with the opposite results, in which the Japanese state’s response to European and US colonialism resulted in brutal oppression of the inhabitants of East and Southeast Asia. That is, one part of this geography seems to say to another: national mobilization alone cannot provide the philosophical foundation for a world after colonialism.

It is no coincidence that Endō’s encounter with Fanon’s work was consequential for his early fiction and essays. If Endō took from Fanon a means
to address the situation of a Japanese subject in the 1950s—de-imperialized by powers intent on protecting their own empires, reracialized in reflection of the country’s subordinate position, burdened with a past whose resolution was blocked by geopolitical expedience—it was because the conditions behind Fanon’s arguments in Black Skin, White Masks, “Antilleans and Africans,” and other early works were connected to those Endō confronted in the mid-twentieth-century geography of colonialism and color. The histories they brought to their work shaped their arguments about their shared, heterogeneous geography, from the situation at hand to the way out of it. It is from this point of view that, reading them in the present, Endō’s work speaks to Fanon’s as Fanon’s spoke to Endō’s. The richer and more textured understanding of midcentury responses to colonialism that results would not be possible were they to remain confined to the geographies to which they are customarily accorded.

Placing Endō’s and Fanon’s arguments on their world into the geography that connected them should also illuminate problems in ours. It would be meaningless simply to project the terms of their encounter forward, concluding—for example—that Endō, deeply suspicious of nationalisms founded on opposition to colonialism, anticipated the problems of postliberation regimes in Africa and Asia. Their troubles cannot be traced simply to the failure of anticolonial nationalism to produce the new humanism that Fanon imagined. Endō’s observations on the racism behind the withholding of judgment for Japanese conduct in East and Southeast Asia—inspired by Fanon’s observations of the ontological impasse of the black man—can, however, help one see the lasting consequences of the abrupt de-imperialization of Japan in 1945 in a different light. Endō noted that the withholding of judgment abetted an attitude that all responsibility for the conduct of the empire had been resolved. Reading sixty years later, one may observe not only the well-known consequences for politics in Japan but also how the withholding of judgment placed former colonial subjects in their own impasse—the perpetuation of anticolonialism directed at the Japanese regime—resulting in the endless politics of apology in East Asia and allowing the Chinese state, in particular, to make anti-Japanese nationalism a pillar of its legitimacy.

Reading Endō and Fanon together, in their era, may also illuminate some of the challenges people today face in opposing regimes of exploitation. Each wrote about the problem of establishing relations unmediated by European, US, or Japanese empires with a fundamental conviction that the terms for such relations would be national. The nation-form was critical to their understandings of the unevenness of the geography in which they lived. The existence of nations was a given, the establishment of sovereign national states was a self-evident goal, and “transversal” relations unquestionably would be relations between nation-states and national subjects. The
world of the early-twenty-first century has changed significantly, most nota-
bly through the emergence of post-Fordist regimes of accumulation and an
accompanying system of multinational economic institutions in which the
self-evidence of the nation-state has waned. The importance that Fanon and
Endō placed on the problem of relations-in-opposition remains, but the
relations to be established now are not between national peoples but
between locations in these transnational economic and political regimes.

None of the perspectives on the past and present to be gained by placing
these writers in a shared geography would be possible, however, if they were
kept apart. Fanon and Endō are only two among many who wrote about the
problems of colonialism and color, and while portions of their work speak to
each other, their paths after Lyon differed greatly, Fanon helping to change
the colonized world and Endō settling into a position of skeptical critique.
Their encounter is emblematic in the present because the paradigms that
dominate postcolonial and East Asian studies say it should not have hap-
pened. If bringing Endō and Fanon together allows one to see their present
and ours differently, perhaps the greatest lesson to be gained from their
encounter is the meaningfulness of the seemingly impossible.
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