

Atarashikimura: The Intellectual and Literary Contexts of a Taishō Utopian Village

Angela YIU

Sophia University, Tokyo

Atarashikimura, a utopian village founded by the Shirakaba-ha writer Mushakōji Saneatsu in 1918, continues to operate on its original principles—communal living, reduced labor hours, and the pursuit of art and culture. Relocated from Miyazaki prefecture to Saitama prefecture in 1939, today it has about twenty residential members. In this article, I examine the conceptual principles of this village in the context of utopian movements in late Meiji and Taishō, such as Tokutomi Roka’s cultivated aesthetic agrarian manner of life, Arishima Takeo’s farm emancipation, and Miyazawa Kenji’s Rasuchijin Association. I argue that the conception of Atarashikimura reflects the influence of three major intellectual and literary developments in late Meiji and Taishō. These include, first, the ideology of elite intellectual cultivation embodied in Taishō elite intellectual cultivation (*kyōyō shugi*) and its impact on Shirakaba-ha writers; second, Natsume Sōseki’s continuous exploration of the intersection of the private self and society and his role as a mentor to the generation of scholars and writers born in mid-Meiji; and third, the emergence of a completely self-oriented, intensely inward-gazing literary expression retroactively labeled the I-novel. This essay traces the development of Taishō utopian ideas in these intellectual and literary contexts.

Keywords: ATARASHIKIMURA, UTOPIA, MUSHAKŌJI SANEATSU, TAISHŌ KYŌYŌ SHUGI, NATSUME SŌSEKI, SHIRAKABA-HA, I-NOVEL, INDIVIDUALISM

“To him, the desire to pursue literature and the desire to create a new world happened around the same time. They are his twins.”

—Mushakōji Saneatsu, *Aru otoko* (1921–1923)¹

Introduction

Atarashikimura 新しき村, “New Village,” was founded by the Shirakaba-ha writer Mushakōji Saneatsu 武者小路実篤 (1885–1976, also known as Mushanokōji Saneatsu) in 1918. For the first twenty years, until it was largely flooded in a dam construction project



Fig. 1. A hand-drawn map of Atarashikimura that hangs in front of the canteen cum auditorium in Atarashikimura, Saitama prefecture. Photo by Angela Yiu. November 2007.

in 1938, the village was located in Miyazaki prefecture and called Hyūga Atarashikimura, Hyūga being the old, myth-laden name for Miyazaki prefecture. With compensation from the prefecture, a second village was set up in 1939 in the town of Moroyama in Saitama prefecture. From Tokyo, one can take the Tōbu Tōjō line from Ikebukuro to Sakado (fifty minutes), transfer to the Ogose line to Bushū Nagase station (twenty minutes), and walk for another twenty-five minutes to reach the village. It is not so remote by today's transportation, but the rural landscape in the western part of Saitama still bears a vestige of the old Musashi Plain, and it is easy to experience a time slip when one sees the old bungalow and hand-pumped well (neither any longer in use) upon entering the village. The village occupies about ten hectares of land roughly shaped like a gourd and bordered on one side by the single track of the Hachikō line. The villagers—about twenty live-in members, most of whom well above seventy years old and a few under forty—cultivate tea, shiitake mushrooms, organic rice, vegetables and fruits, while the primary source of income comes from the egg farm. There is also an art museum that doubles as a memorial library for the founder, a communal canteen cum auditorium, one atelier, and scattered living quarters. On a regular day, it is not uncommon to see nearby residents strolling in with their dogs to pick up a net of eggs or shiitake mushrooms, or the occasional visitor stopping by at the art museum and admiring peonies in bloom.

The village was founded on the ideal that each individual is to put in six hours of compulsory labor per day (a reminder of Thomas More's *Utopia*) and spend the rest of the time freely in the pursuit of truth, virtue, and beauty, be it in art, literature, or any form of personal interest that leads to the actualization of the authentic self. Villagers do not earn a salary but receive an allowance (currently 35,000 yen a month), while their daily necessities—from



Fig. 2. A disused hand-pumped well at Atarashikimura. Photo by Angela Yiu. November 2007.

food, lodging, clothing, to medical expenses—are covered under a collective and communal fund. A number of Taishō writers who came of age in the last decade of Meiji harbored visions of Utopia and created communities based on those wish-dreams. Among them, Arishima Takeo 有島武郎 (1878–1923) handed over to the tenants the land his father purchased for him near Mount Niseko at Kaributo, south of Sapporo, to be made into a communal farm (1922), and Miyazawa Kenji 宮沢賢治 (1896–1933) set up the Rasuchijin Association 羅須地人協会 (1926) in an attempt to improve the cultural life and livelihood of the local farmers in Hanamaki, Iwate prefecture. It is difficult to specify a single source for the utopian impulses of these writers; most likely they were fueled by a combination of Christian humanism, Buddhist benevolence, the humanistic ideas espoused by nineteenth- and twentieth-century Western writers, artists, and social reformers such as Tolstoy, Ruskin, Carpenter, and Morris,² and a reaction—albeit naïve and economically unsound for the most part—to the hardship and poverty of others in contrast to their own material comfort. Unlike the short-lived and ill-fated attempts by Arishima and Miyazawa, as well as many other utopian experiments in the rest of the world, Atarashikimura still exists and functions as a communal village nearly ninety years after it was founded, albeit in deep economic hardship in recent years.

The village appears to be many things at once: as a social, political, economic phenomenon, Atarashikimura seeks to address the social inequality sustained by an economic and social system that allows a privileged few to exploit the labor of the masses. As an intellectual entity, it is a reflection of the longing for liberalism and idealism embedded in an European-based elite education that formed the backbone of the ideology of Taishō *kyōyō shugi* 大正教養主義 (Taishō elite intellectual cultivation),³ a point that I will elaborate in a later section. As a literary production in the sense of translating art into life, it stands as a symbol of the Taishō literary imagination—a constant struggle to interpret the Meiji legacy of individualism, Romanticism, and Naturalism, as well as Mushakōji's personal ambition to literally

create a world out of his utopian and literary impulse. While it is important to situate the village in all these contexts, it is the intellectual and literary contexts that I will focus on in this paper.

In the autobiographical fiction *Aru otoko* 或る男 (A Certain Man, 1921–1923), Mushakōji insisted that the creation of literary art and that of a new world are twin desires that have long been lodged in his mind. Earlier on, he wrote in “Jiko no tame no geijutsu” (Art for Oneself, 1911), “I go all the way to create art for the sake of oneself” (MSZ 1, p. 400). In many ways, *Atarashikimura* can be seen as Mushakōji’s most invested work of art, a *sakuhin* that is created for maximum self-expression. While it is clear that an actual existing village is different from a literary work, the conception of the village nonetheless reflects the influence of three major intellectual and literary developments in late Meiji and early Taishō. These include, first, the ideology of elite intellectual cultivation embodied in Taishō *kyōyō shugi* and its impact on the Shirakaba-ha writers; second, Natsume Sōseki’s continuous exploration of the intersection of the private self and society and his role as a mentor to the generation of scholars and writers born in mid-Meiji; and third, the emergence of a completely self-oriented, intensely inward-gazing literary expression retroactively labeled the I-novel. While the European oriented elite education which formed the basis of Taishō *kyōyō shugi* fostered visions of liberalism among the Shirakaba group, Mushakōji took it a step further by incorporating and distorting ideas gleaned from Sōseki’s individualism to suit his I-novelist agenda of art as an ultimate form of self-expression. *Atarashikimura* is an I-novel written not in the pages of a book but in an actual geographical dimension, a blatant display of Mushakōji’s acts of reading and misreading. While it is important to note that *Atarashikimura* can also be contextualized politically and examined as a response to anarchy, Bolshevism and imperialism, this paper will be confined to the intellectual and literary contexts in which the village is engendered. To that end, I will begin with an introduction of the conceptual principles of the *Atarashikimura*, and the context of utopian movements in Japan in late Meiji and Taishō. This will be followed by a discussion of the village as an extension of an intellectual and literary response to a European-based elite education in the context of the Taishō *kyōyō shugi*, Sōseki’s larger-than-life influence, and the development of the I-novel.

The Conceptual Principles of *Atarashikimura*

The conceptual principles of *Atarashikimura* are closely tied in with certain elements in Mushakōji’s biography, which is no doubt already a familiar subject, but it is necessary to reiterate points that are relevant to the founding of the village. Mushakōji was the son of a viscount and one of the three surviving offspring among eight. His father Saneyo died of tuberculosis at the young age of thirty-six when Saneatsu was only two years old. In *Aru otoko*, Mushakōji wrote about his father’s supposed prophesy: “With proper education, this child will become one of his kind,” words that he took deeply to heart to mean that he was destined to be great (MSZ 5, p. 23). He attended the Peers School (Gakushūin) and became close friends with Shiga Naoya 志賀直哉, who was two years his senior but remained in Mushakōji’s grade due to poor academic performance. Together with other Peers School alumni—Arishima Takeo, his brothers Ikuma 有島生馬 and Satomi Ton 里見淳, and Nagayo Yoshirō 長与善郎—they founded the *Shirakaba* in 1910, a magazine that played an active role in introducing European art and literature to Japan as well as questioning the realistic

and anti-idealistic mode of Japanese Naturalism.

In 1903, when Mushakōji was eighteen, his maternal uncle Kadenokōji Sukekoto 勘解由小路資承 introduced to him the Bible and Tolstoy's newly translated *My Confession* (1882–1884) and *What I Believe* (1884), in which the writer criticized a class system that encouraged the exaltation of some at the expense of the abasement of the masses. Like the aristocratic-born Tolstoy, who put his own teaching into practice by leading a semi-rural life in Yasnaya Polyana, Kadenokōji was also leading an eremitic life in the Miura peninsular after a series of business failures. Encountering Tolstoy's writing proved to be a form of spiritual and intellectual baptism for young Mushakōji, and in later years he was to write, "My flesh and blood are drawn from the lives of many individuals, and Tolstoy for me is the earliest, greatest influence, as well as the strongest and dearest" (MSZ 3, p. 161). Though the Mushakōji family had long since fallen from fortune, for years he felt ashamed and guilty for living in relative comfort at the expense of the physical labor of others (MSZ 3, p. 158). Yet it was clear that he did not consider rejecting his family and his supposed destiny to be a leader as solutions to social inequality. The creation of a utopian village seems to be a logical outcome to years of desire and frustration to address the problem.

While I do not think that Atarashikimura is a direct response to economic conditions in the period from the end of the Russo-Japanese War to about 1920, a word about the economic background might be useful in understanding the proliferation of various utopian schemes in that period. In part, those aimed at addressing growing disparities in wealth and labor. Japan had to borrow heavily from abroad to pay military costs for its 1904–1905 war with Russia, and at the end, the national treasury was depleted and the economy exhausted. Full recovery did not come about until World War I, when Western colonial powers' preoccupation with the war in Europe left a vacuum in Asian markets, and Japan was able to take advantage of the opportunity. Between 1908 and 1917, Japan proper (not counting its colonies) experienced a 3.09% per annum economic growth, and between 1913 and 1922, it grew at a robust 5.21% annual rate. The World War years brought an economic boom, particularly profitable to large-scale banking, shipping, heavy industry, and colonial enterprises.⁴ Between 1916 and 1920, the period in which Atarashikimura was founded, Japan experienced a bubble economy that gave rise to a large number of wartime financial upstarts (*taisen narikin* 大戦成金) who had prospered in businesses such as shipping, pharmacy, metal, paper, rubber, textiles.⁵ This bubble economy served to fuel Japanese imperialistic expansionism in China and Korea. When China sought the return of former holdings in Shandong province, Japan responded with the Twenty-One Demands (1915) that pressured China into concessions in extended leases in Manchuria and joint control over China's railway and coal and iron resources, as well as policy matters regarding harbors, education and police. The bubble economy also created a great disparity in wealth, which gave rise to a general sense of social unrest and injustice. The "rice riots" of 1918 in particular alerted the general public to the hardships suffered by the farming population. In 1920, the economy experienced a serious bust after the boom, creating a new state of instability and discontent. It is amidst this volatile and changing economic background that a number of utopian schemes were conceived, and the conceptual principles of Atarashikimura in part responded to the background.

Mushakōji wrote numerous articles on the village after it was founded, but I will focus on the three dialogues on the village (*Dai'ichi no taiwa*, *Dai'ni no taiwa*, *Daisan no taiwa*,

1918) immediately preceding its construction in the same year.⁶ Written in Socratic form with an unnamed interviewer who addresses the Mushakōji stand-in as sensei, these dialogues emphasize the following goals in the conception of Atarashikimura:

1. To create a fair, reasonable society;
2. To address the injustice borne by laborers in modern society (especially the modern system of production and capitalism);
3. To create a communal life, especially communal eating for economic and community reasons;
4. To emphasize self (the ego [*jiko* 自己]), mankind (*jinrui* 人類), nature (*shizen* 自然), love (*ai* 愛), virtue (*zen* 善), beauty (*bi* 美), happiness (*fukai yorokobi* 深い喜び).

On labor. The redistribution and re-evaluation of labor lies in the center of actualizing the above goals. Mushakōji's view on labor can be summed up in the following quote: "As long as there remains one single person who toils for bread alone, then it is a sign that the world is incomplete."⁷ He is aware of the litany of social injustice in a capitalist society in which peasants and laborers are harnessed for their labor and deprived of a sense of pride. He insists that labor is sacred and laboring for money alone demeans the human spirit. In order to restore the dignity and sanctity to labor, one must be allowed to work in a fully human way. The village aims at shortening laboring hours to allow time for the pursuit of art and culture. It also emphasizes the recognition of one's natural gift (*tenshoku* 天職) in order to actualize one's potential in work.⁸

On money. In connection to the re-evaluation of labor, the village eliminates money as a payment for labor. As noted earlier, villagers do not receive a salary but receive a modest amount of spending money per month, while other expenses are covered by a communal village fund. However, for forty years, the village failed to become self-sufficient, and in 1924, the village even issued its own coupons (*mura no osatsu* 村のお札) for internal circulation. Self-sufficiency was finally achieved in the thirty-ninth year (1956), but the net income was only about 30,000 yen. The village was financed by Mushakōji's private income and income from his writings, especially in the wake of the *enpon* 円本 boom. There are two types of members: residential (*sonnai kai'in* 村内会員) and non-residential members (*songai kai'in* 村外会員). The non-residential membership was very broad, and their membership fees constituted a part of the income of the village, though very often members failed to pay. Occasional donations from Mushakōji's artist friends (e.g., Shiga Naoya, Satō Haruo 佐藤春夫) also helped to tie the village over hard times.⁹

On art. Even in its pioneering days, when the villagers were surviving on a barely subsistent diet, Mushakōji would splurge and purchase two sculptures by Rodin as a symbol of the dedication of the village to art. The adult children I spoke with remembered leading a threadbare existence but being surrounded with books and records, and many villagers would take time to create art (paintings, carvings, writing, pottery). At any moment in its history, except during the last years of World War II, the village always maintains one or two ateliers, and its in-house printing press (Kōyasha 曠野社) was always churning out magazines and paperback books (it was said that the village invented the *bunkobon* 文庫本).¹⁰ The village is an enclave for artistic pursuit, as well as an example of a writer's translation of art into life. In *Aru otoko*, Mushakōji had said that the creation of the village is an extension of his literary



Fig. 3. Replica of the earliest building in Atarashikimura (in Moroyama), constructed when the village relocated to its present location in 1939. The interior is approximately the size of two tatami mats. Photo by Angela Yiu, November 2007.

imagination:

In the beginning, when he was in his twenties, he wanted to write about a world in his dream. He thought it would be good to arouse the sympathy of those who shared the same dream. But as he started writing, he felt he had to become more involved. He also felt that it was not impossible to create that world. He became convinced that anyone could make that world come true through dedication and tenacity. If anyone could create that world, then certainly he would be able to do so too (MSZ 5, p. 65).

In the following sections, after a brief survey of other communes and utopian schemes in late Meiji and Taishō, I will examine the intellectual and literary contexts in which Atarashikimura was engendered, and argue that the village can be seen as Mushakōji's individual response to the intellectual and literary currents of his time.

Utopian Visions in Late Meiji and Taishō

A number of utopian schemes aiming at the betterment of personal life and society emerged in late Meiji and Taishō, and this discussion will be limited to those whose founders were also actively involved in literature.¹¹ These include Tokutomi Roka 徳富蘆花 (1868–1927), Arishima Takeo, and Miyazawa Kenji. These writers and Mushakōji shared a number of common social and spiritual backgrounds. All of them came from economically and socially privileged families. All underwent stages of religious conversion or awakening, and Roka and Arishima were under the influence of Tolstoy's spiritual and moral teachings. More-

over, they had either studied or traveled abroad, or possessed a great capacity to read foreign languages and literatures, which adds a cosmopolitan quality to their utopian dreams. All of them were recognized writers in their life time—included among their works are novels, poetry, essays, children's stories, I-novels—and their utopian schemes indicate a crossover from dreams and fiction to reality.

Tokutomi Roka and the “aesthetic farmer.” Born in Kumamoto, Roka was the second son of the Confucian scholar and educator Tokutomi Kazutaka 徳富一敬 (1822–1914) who studied under the famous scholar and reformer Yokoi Shōnan 横井小楠 (1809–1869). A member of the Kumamoto Band, one of the three initial groups of the Protestant church in Japan, Roka was to join the Dōshisha English School in 1876.¹² The Protestant groups in Japan were heavily under the influence of the American Puritanism of their founders, and the teachings of hard work, self-denial, and brotherly love paved the way for Roka's acceptance of Tolstoy.¹³ Among the earliest intellectuals to introduce Tolstoy to Japan was Roka's brother Tokutomi Sohō 徳富蘇峰 (1863–1957), whose three-part essay appeared in the magazine *Kokumin no tomo* 国民之友 (1890). Around the same time, the religious leader Uemura Masahisa 植村正久 (1858–1925), a member of the Yokohama Band, responded enthusiastically to Tolstoy's writings on nonviolent resistance, non-government, and the injustice of a class system that allows a privileged few to exploit the labor of the masses.¹⁴ Uemura praised the fact that Tolstoy put his teachings into practice by joining the peasants in their labor.¹⁵ Roka, who had been a reporter at *Kokumin no tomo* since 1889, was to pen the first biography of Tolstoy in 1897.¹⁶ Unlike the Japanese responses to Turgenev (1818–1883) inspired by Futabatei Shimei's translation and interpretation around the same time, the reaction to Tolstoy focused largely on his thoughts rather than his literary art, so that Tolstoy was for the most part evaluated and admired as a religious and moral leader, particularly after his non-fiction works *My Confession* and *What I Believe* became available in Japanese translation in 1902 and 1903 respectively.¹⁷ In principle, Roka was consistently critical of a government that fears the power and demands of socialism and anarchy, as evident in his famous essay “Bōhanron” 謀叛論 (On Insurrection, 1911) that protests against the execution of Kōtoku Shūsui 幸徳秋水 (1871–1911) and eleven other members involved in the Great Treason Incident (January 1911).¹⁸ In his personal incorporation of Tolstoy's philosophy in his life, however, Roka focused less on the potential anarchy in Tolstoy's challenges to state and established religion and more on his message of returning to till the earth. Roka's decision to pursue a semi-rural life (*han'nō seikatsu* 半農生活) in the outskirts of Tokyo came shortly after a visit to Tolstoy in Yasnaya Polyana in 1906.¹⁹ Roka purchased land in the still rural Kasuya (in the present Setagaya ward) and practiced ecological farming as a gentleman farmer, a manner of life well documented in his two-volume essay *Mimizu no tawakoto* みみずのたわこと (Idle Words of an Earthworm, 1912), in which he applied the neologism of “aesthetic farmer” (*biteki hyakushō* 美的百姓) to the narrator who stands in for himself. Roka can be regarded as a precursor in the search for personal or collective utopian schemes that combine culture and agriculture, as evident in the proliferation of utopian garden cities in literature and actual urban and suburban planning in Taishō.²⁰ His translation of selected ideas from Tolstoy into an individual utopia within the Japanese frame of reference was to influence Arishima, Miyazawa, and no doubt, Mushakōji in their respective visions of utopia.

Arishima Takeo and the Kaributo Farm Emancipation. Arishima was born in Tokyo as the eldest son of a bureaucrat of the then Ministry of Treasury. He entered the Peers School at

the age of ten and, as an indication of his air of refinement, was later selected to be one of the study companions for the crown prince. He graduated at the age of nineteen and entered the Sapporo Agricultural College, where the evangelical activities of William Smith Clark (1826–1886) had a lasting influence in spreading the Christian faith during his eight-month tenure as the head teacher (1876–1877). Directly under his influence were students who formed the Sapporo Band (1877) and became renowned Christian scholars and thinkers, such as the samurai-Christian preacher and pacifist Uchimura Kanzō 内村鑑三 (1861–1930) and the Japanese Quaker Nitobe Inazō 新渡戸稲造 (1862–1933). Arishima lodged with Nitobe and developed a close friendship with Uchimura's disciple Morimoto Kōkichi 森本厚吉 (1877–1950). He was baptized in 1901, the same year he graduated from Sapporo Agricultural College. From 1903 to 1907, Arishima studied abroad in the United States, where he encountered the socialist ideas of the Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin (1842–1921) and became ambivalent about the private ownership of property.²¹

The year after he returned from his sojourn in the United States, Arishima was made the landowner of a farm that his father had established in Hokkaido. From then on, the idealistic, Romantic quest for social emancipation of the writer Arishima would be in constant conflict with his status as a landowner. Tenants grew various crops in the Arishima Farm with poor yield, their straitened circumstances transformed into stark descriptions in Arishima's fiction *Kain no matsuei* カインの末裔 (The Descendant of Cain, 1917). Even though Arishima did not take over the management until a year after his father's death in 1916, he had long been contemplating renouncing ownership of the farm. "I have been thinking of discarding the farm as early as Meiji 40 (1907)" (ATZ 9, p. 372).²² In 1918, upon hearing that Mushakōji was planning to set up Atarashikimura, Arishima hinted at his own scheme in an open letter addressed to Mushakōji. "It may sound ludicrous to make a promise about what is yet to come, but when the opportunity arises, I hope to enact in one form or another something along the line of what you are planning. But I think it will most likely fail."²³ On 18 July 1922, Arishima gathered his tenants in a local shrine and made his famous speech of farm emancipation.²⁴ In it, Arishima announced that he would hand over the farm to the tenants for free, adding that they were not to split it up into private property but to co-own it and work on it in the spirit of mutual aid (*sōgo fujo seishin* 相互扶助精神). The next day, he left Kaributo, leaving the emancipated farm to the care of the farm manager Yoshikawa Ginno-suke 吉川銀之丞. In less than a year, in June 1923, Arishima was to commit double suicide with the journalist Hatano Akiko 波多野秋子 in his resort house in Karuizawa.

Arishima had wanted to call the emancipated farm a "communist farm" (*kyōsan nōen* 共產農園) or a "mutual benefit farm" (*kyōsai nōen* 共済農園), but since it was deemed unsafe to suggest an affiliation to communism, and "mutual benefit" was ambiguous in meaning, it was changed to Kaributo Kyōsei Nōdan 狩太共生農団 (Kaributo Cooperative Farming Organization).²⁵ Yet it was clear that despite his sincerity and goodwill, Arishima did not have a clear and directed vision about what he wished to accomplish, nor did he have the conviction and the Mushakōji-style of optimism to believe that his plan would work. Kropotkin's socialism and anarchism might have planted the seed of farm emancipation in his mind, but it was the quest for individual liberation that he perceived in Walt Whitman's poetry that drove him to free himself from his inherited status as a landowner. In January 1922, he expressed a profound pessimism in his much quoted "Sengen hitotsu" 宣言一つ (A Declaration) in any attempt on his part to speak for or start a movement for the so-called fourth

social class (laborers and peasants),²⁶ since he was born, bred and educated outside that class and would never be one of the members. Thus the farm emancipation that occurred half a year after “A Declaration” is an act of futility and romantic abandonment undertaken to partially liberate himself from the sense of guilt as a landowner. The scholar Itō Shinkichi pointed out if Arishima had a scheme for restructuring the farm in mind, he would not have used the word *bōki* 抛棄 (to abandon) in connection to his wish to give up ownership of the farm, since other words, such as *jōtō* 譲渡 (to cede) or *kaibō* 解放 (to emancipate), would have more positive connotations.²⁷ Yet for someone whose idealism is constantly paired with a tragic lucidity, Arishima was aware that a true liberation was not in sight for him.²⁸ While on a social and political level Arishima’s farm emancipation was a failed and immature attempt to create a more humanistic and egalitarian society, from a literary perspective it is a manifestation of the literary longings and influence that accumulated in him through the years—from his sympathy for the poor tenants in Tolstoy’s “Master and Man” (1895)²⁹ and his longing for personal liberation in Whitman’s poetry, to his compassion for the sufferings of the laborers and peasants in his own writings and his romantic longing for an idyllic rural community in his diary entries. Arishima’s farm emancipation is an enactment of a literary urge to translate a utopian impulse into reality, dissimilar in form and idea from Atarashikimura but similar in the permeation of literature and life.

Miyazawa Kenji and the Rasuchijin Association. Miyazawa was the son of a wealthy pawn shop owner in Hanamaki, Iwate prefecture. The story that he was raised in the deeply religious atmosphere of Jōdō Shinshū and was constantly pained by the suffering of the farmers who had to pawn their possessions to survive a poor harvest was familiar to all. In 1918, he graduated from the Morioka Agriculture and Forestry Higher School and continued on as a research fellow. From 1921 to 1926, he taught at the Hanamaki Agriculture School, after which he started the Rasuchijin Association to provide agricultural advice and foster art and culture in the rural community. He fell ill in 1931 and died of pneumonia in 1933 at the age of thirty-seven.

Parallel to Miyazawa’s training in agriculture and science was his prodigious contribution to literature, particularly in the area of children literature and poetry. His dual fascination with nature and literature and the arts no doubt inspired him to form the Rasuchijin Association to promote both agriculture and culture. Though some contemporary critics dismissed his attempt as “the pastime of a rich boy,”³⁰ and a local newspaper, the *Iwate nippō*, distorted it into a somewhat faddish and frivolous project pursued by members who longed for “rural life” and the “natural life of primitive people,”³¹ Miyazawa pursued his goals with single-minded devotion. In the area of agricultural reform, Miyazawa offered instructions to improve fertilizer and farming methods through individual counseling and regular lectures. In arts and culture, he formed an orchestra, held regular readings and discussions of literary works, and promoted peasant’s art and poetry.³² One member recalled that in those days they called the Association “Peasants’ Art School.”³³

The Rasuchijin Association came to an end with Miyazawa’s decline in health and death. Itō suggested that the Association was a form of non-institutionalized and non-political peasant movement that embodied the humanistic and fantastical elements characteristic of the utopian vision.³⁴ Ultimately, on top of the many practical actions aimed at agricultural reform and the betterment of peasants’ life, the Rasuchijin Association (the name itself a puzzle and a mystery) was distinguished by a certain dream-like and cosmic vision associ-

ated with Miyazawa poetry and fiction. To Miyazawa, art and literature is inseparable from the profound wonder and suffering associated with the land, and it is in understanding the connection that art can attain a breakthrough to reach what Miyazawa called “the fourth dimension,” a reference to the imaginary world of Ihatov that he created in his fiction. Esperanto for Iwate prefecture, Ihatov is a microcosm where humans and their mysterious counterparts—the mountain man, foxes and mountain cats, the wind sprite—learn to co-exist in a setting replete with the raw nature, myths, customs and history of Miyazawa’s homeland. In particular, *Gusukōbudori no denki* グスコーブドリの伝記 (Biography of Gusukōbudori, 1932) depicts the harnessing of volcanic energy for the benefit of agriculture, a wish-dream that can be translated into Miyazawa’s real life effort in agriculture reform. It will not be an exaggeration to say that the Rasuchijin Association grew out of the utopian impulse in Miyazawa’s fiction and poetry.

Taishō *kyōyō shugi* and the Shirakaba Group

It is necessary to situate the creation of Atarashikimura in the context of Taishō *kyōyō shugi* in order to understand the intellectual context to Mushakōji’s utopian impulse. In the broadest term, the concept of *kyōyō* refers to the reading and education that contribute to the cultivation of a person of learning, and the content of such humanistic training of course varies with each country and age. For example, in pre-modern China and Japan, the emphasis was on the Four Books and Five Scriptures as well as the poetry of the respective traditions. In Meiji Japan, the focus shifted to Western learning, and from 1894 to the end of the Pacific War, the higher schools (*kyūsei kōtō gakkō*) that served as preparatory schools for the universities provided an elite education modeled on the European curriculum, with an emphasis on the Humanities (philosophy, history, literature) and the sciences. Knowledge of German and English was indispensable. In Sōseki’s *Kokoro*, the young narrator, who graduated from the higher school to become a university student, is a typical *bungaku seinen* (literary youth) who expressed frustration at not being able to finish half of his summer reading list—the ritual of going to a cooler place in the summer to read being an indispensable part of the humanistic aspect of an elite education under Taishō *kyōyō shugi*. In particular, the so-called Number Schools established in the Meiji period—the First through Eighth Higher Schools—were known as the cultivating ground for governmental and intellectual elite. Taishō *kyōyō shugi* kept a distance from the proliferation of mass culture in Taishō society and was identified with the intellectual and social elite of the time.

The scholar Takeuchi Yō pointed out that the birth of Taishō *kyōyō shugi* can be traced to a new generation of teachers in the higher schools that replaced the old Confucian samurai type teachers.³⁵ This new generation of teachers included Doi Bansui 土井晩翠 (1871–1952), Takayama Chogyū 高山樗牛 (1871–1902), Nishida Kitarō 西田幾多郎 (1870–1945), Kuriyagawa Hakuson 厨川白村 (1880–1923), and Kuwagi Gen’yoku 桑木巖翼 (1874–1946). Nitobe Inazō taught in and later became the principle of the famous First Higher School in Tokyo, while Sōseki taught in the Fifth Higher School in Kumamoto (1896–1900), though Sōseki’s influence on the Shirakaba-ha dated from his relatively short teaching career at the Tokyo Imperial University, and his lasting influence was established largely through his writings. The generation who came of age under the influence of Sōseki—the Shirakaba group, Abe Jirō, Watsuji Tetsurō, Akutagawa Ryūnosuke—inherited the humanistic legacy

that formed the backbone of Taishō *kyōyō shugi*.³⁶ They also shared a proclivity for Western learning, and much of Mushakōji's endeavor to read and incorporate Western thoughts (Tolstoy, Maeterlinck, the Bible, etc.) in his own works reflects this tendency.

The scholar Sekikawa Natsuō pointed out that those born after Meiji 15 (1882)—gleaning the year from Sōseki's *Sanshirō* with reference to the restless and opportunistic character Yojirō—constituted a new generation of youth who were not raised on the Chinese classics (*kangaku*) but exposed to Western thoughts and literature like a blank slate.³⁷ This is the generation that saw the modern Japanese language (much of it heavily influenced by the translation of Western literature by Futabatei Shimei and Mori Ōgai) as their birthright, and exposed to the ideas of “self-orientation” (*jiko hon'i* 自己本位) and “individualism” (*kojin shugi* 個人主義) in Sōseki's writings and lectures. Mushakōji and nearly all the members of the Shirakaba coterie belonged to the Meiji 15 generation,³⁸ so did the poet and journalist Ishikawa Takuboku 石川啄木 (1886–1912) and the anarchist Ōsugi Sakae 大杉栄 (1885–1923).

A direct reflection of this intellectual milieu is the magazine *Shirakaba*, founded in 1910 by Mushakōji and friends and alumni of the Peers School. The distinguishing features of the Shirakaba group include, first of all, a deliberate selective incorporation and promotion of European thoughts and culture. Nihilism and Existentialism were rejected in favor of nineteenth century Romanticism, liberalism, and humanism, as gleaned from the works of Flaubert, Maupassant, Ibsen, Tolstoy, and the impressionist artists favored by the Shirakaba group.³⁹ Their enthusiasm for Western art attracted artists who formed a corollary circle of coterie around the Shirakaba group, reinforcing a certain spirit of highbrow Eurocentric cosmopolitanism that stand in opposition to popular culture and growing Americanism.⁴⁰ Second, the Shirakaba group was apathetic to left-wing ideology. Under the influence of Marx, Engels, and Kropotkin, the leftist movements in late Meiji ranged from the anarchism of Kōtoku Shūsui and Ōsugi Sakae to the moderate yet astute social criticism of Ishikawa Takuboku.⁴¹ With the execution of Kōtoku and eleven others in the Great Treason Incident, Japan entered the so-called winter of socialism (*fuyu no jidai* 冬の時代).⁴² Mushakōji in particular was critical and contemptuous of leftist and anarchist movements in Japan and spoke about their violent and self-destructive methods with great aversion, an intolerance that strongly suggests that Atarashikimura was an artistic creation that distanced itself from leftist ideology from the start, despite the fact that it bears traces of communist ideas in its conceptual principles. Third, the Shirakaba group emphasized the individual over family and society, as evident in the resistance of patriarchy in many Shiga stories, as well as in the single-minded celebration of the egotistical self in Mushakōji's writings, many of which reiterate the affirmation of the spiritual self (interiority) and the physical self (corporeality). Fourth, the Shirakaba group challenged the then dominant trend of Naturalism, a point so full of contradiction when it comes to Mushakōji's personal style that it requires further discussion in a later section. Overall, the group sustained a broad and vague sense of cosmopolitanism, humanism, Romanticism, decadence, rebellion against family and society, and the only thing that was clear was the relentless pursuit of the egotistical self in thoughts and artistic expression. Although Atarashikimura was not directly a product of the Shirakaba group as a whole, and with the exception of Kimura Sōhachi, none among the Shirakaba group joined the village as a residential or non-residential member, the village nonetheless expressed the self-oriented artistic proclivity of the group in general, and Mushakōji's reading and misreading

of his place in the literary context of his time in particular, a point that I will elaborate in the following sections.

Mushakōji Reading Sōseki

As I have pointed out in an earlier section, Sōseki's teaching career and writings led many to identify him as an important mentor in the context of Taishō *kyōyō shugi*, within which the Shirakaba group thrived, with Mushakōji as its de facto leader. Sōseki's emphasis on individualism, his questioning of patriarchy (*Sorekara* それから, 1909; *Michikusa* 道草, 1915), and his ambivalence over state policies such as *bunmei kaika* 文明開化 (enlightenment and civilization) were embraced by the Shirakaba group as their intellectual baptism and foundation. Sōseki's larger-than-life existence even in late Meiji and Taishō made him into a spiritual and intellectual *furusato* (home) for the Meiji 15 generation. A keen devotee and admirer of Sōseki's fiction in his college days, Mushakōji became increasingly disturbed by Sōseki's dark and bleak view of man's fate in the political and economic milieu of his time, and sought to rewrite Sōseki in his own optimistic way. Mushakōji sees himself as a second Sōseki in terms of their statuses as towering figures of culture and literature, only physically stronger, more action-orientated, and more messianic—an amalgamation of Sōseki and Tolstoy, his other spiritual and literary father. These two writers were important to Mushakōji not so much in terms of literary influence, but as two symbolic paths of dedication—one towards the skepticism and destruction of utopia, and the other towards the configuration and perpetuation of a utopian vision. Their polarized attitudes are revealed in the way they treat problems of modernization—urban alienation, social discontent, the loss of a sense of family, faith, and ideal, and the emergence of the modern egotistical self. Atarashikimura can be seen as Mushakōji's response to Tolstoy's Yasnaya Polyana, but above all it is Mushakōji's answer to the social, political and economic questions that Sōseki asked and left unresolved in his fiction, a point that I will elaborate shortly.

“Among the older generation of writers I love and revere Mr. Natsume most. I am fond of both Mr. Natsume and Doppo, but it is Mr. Natsume whom I respect” (MSZ 15, p. 694). “If I were to name one person in the *bundan* to whom I am indebted, it would have to be Mr. Natsume” (MSZ 9, p. 563). These quotes show Mushakōji's unequivocal devotion to Sōseki. Among the Shirakaba writers with whom Sōseki corresponded, Mushakōji apparently received or at least kept for posterity the largest number of letters (which was a total of five). His praise for Sōseki betrays the same streak of infatuation he had expressed for Tolstoy, Maeterlinck, Rodin, and other artists that had inspired him in different stages of his life. “Mr. Natsume's language is full of life (*seimei* 生命), sensitivity (*shinkei* 神経), and cultivation (*kyōyō* 教養)” (MSZ 9, p. 563), all of which resonate with Mushakōji's own ideal. He admired Sōseki's language for its naturalness (*jiyū jizai* 自由自在) and humor (*omoshirosa* 面白さ) (MSZ 9, p. 563). As a person, Sōseki is “intelligent, sensitive, honest, lively, learned, and full of a sense of justice and seriousness” (MSZ 18, p. 389). Mushakōji identified Sōseki as the only “man of character” (*jinkakusha* 人格者) among Japanese novelists of his time.⁴³ In reading Sōseki, Mushakōji selects ideas and phrases, sometimes out of context, to reinforce his own set of ideas on art and egoism.

Sōseki's individualism (kojin shugi) and Mushakōji's egoism (jiko shugi 自己主義). Sōseki's idea of individualism can be broadly categorized in two aspects: one concerns the freedom

of the individual artist in a *bundan* dominated by trends and cliques, and the other concerns the rights and duties of the individual amidst the rising power of the state. On the necessary self-oriented nature of the individual artist, Sōseki writes in “Dōraku to shokugyō” 道楽と職業 (1911) that, “Working for the sake of others can cost the artist a self, and an artist without the spirit of self is as worthless as a hollow cicada shell” (SZ 11, p. 315). He reinforces the idea in “Bunten to geijutsu” 文展と芸術 (1912), “Art begins with self-expression and ends with self-expression” (SZ 11, p. 389). As for the rights and duties of the individual, no other essay expresses it more clearly than “Watakushi no kojīn shugi” 私の個人主義 (1914), in which Sōseki emphasizes that individualism is not just a philosophy that “replaces cliquism with values based on personal judgment of right and wrong,” it is above all reciprocal in nature, in that it “advocates respecting the existence of others at the same time that one respects one’s own existence” (SZ 11:457).⁴⁴ In other words, the right to develop one’s individuality comes with the responsibility to respect the individuality of others.

Around the time that Sōseki was delivering public lectures on individualism, Mushakōji was developing his own doctrine and rhetoric of egoism (*jiko shugi*), a period that coincides with the start of the *Shirakaba* magazine. The essay “Kizoku shugi” 貴族主義 (The Aristocratic Doctrine, 1909) contains the core idea from which Mushakōji’s egoism develops.⁴⁵ In a rather disturbing manner, Mushakōji suggests the so-called aristocratic doctrine is a practical way of putting theoretical individualism (*kojin shugi*) in action. “I advocate individualism. At the same time, I also advocated humanism (*jinrui shugi* 人類主義), but in practice I advocate the aristocratic doctrine.”⁴⁶ Mushakōji believes in the supremacist idea that only a heavenly selected few are born with a superior, noble nature to rule and lead, so those who possess an inferior, common nature should respect the heavenly ordained ones as genuine teachers and leaders. He insists that “the advocate of the aristocratic doctrine does not recognize human equality.”⁴⁷ By implication, the Mushakōji-style individualism consists of expanding the ego of a selected few in order to rule the masses, an elitist idea that he carefully dressed in the rhetoric of love and salvation. “Those who rise above the common people to pity, love, and lead them are the genuine aristocrats of heaven.”⁴⁸ His idea of individualism focuses on the development of a supreme ego to patronize others and contrasts sharply with Sōseki’s democratic principle of mutual respect and reciprocity.

Mushakōji’s ideas on the development of the *jiko* (ego) can be traced in the collection of essays titled *Seichō* 生長 (*Growth*, 1910–1912).⁴⁹ The scholar Honda Shūgo 本田秋五 pointed out that around 1908–1909, as Mushakōji began to move away from Tolstoy (especially his idea of self-denial), his rhetoric on egoism underwent the transformation from *kojin shugi* (individualism) to *jiga* 自我 (self) and *jiko* (ego), and *Seichō* can be read as the growth or formation of Mushakōji’s egoism.⁵⁰ First and foremost is his outright assertion of his overwhelming ego and individuality. In the poem “Jiko to tanin” 自己と他人 (“Self and Other,” 10 May 1911), he proclaims,

I detest
 Having my actions measured by the same standard
 As others;
 Even if I do the same things as others,
 It only looks that way on the surface.
 I am not they (MSZ 1, p. 372).

This loud and proud assertion that he is different from others (*ware wa tanin ni arazu* 我は他人に非ず) leads to a full-scale development of self-affirmation and self-love. In an essay titled *Jiko no tame oyobi hoka ni tsuite* 自己のため及び他について (For My Own Sake and Other Things, 1912),⁵¹ he paraphrased Maurice Maeterlinck (1862–1949) and wrote, “Even if you were told to love your neighbor, you must first learn to love yourself. Moreover, it is not sufficient to love your neighbor as you love yourself. You must love yourself in others” (*tanin no naka no jiko o aisurunodenakereba* 他人の中の自己を愛するのでなければ) (MSZ 1, p. 427).⁵² This identification of oneself in others is consistent with the theme of self-aggrandizement throughout Mushakōji’s works, a form of imperialistic egoism that aims at eliminating the difference between self and others (“I am not they”) by expanding what he sees as elements of himself in others. From there on, Mushakōji self-assertion knows no bound. In himself, he sees the entirety of humanity and nature, as expressed in *Jiko no aru hito* 自己のある人 (“A person with an ego,” 1913), “If a person asserts the power of self but does not feel mankind and the will of nature in him, then that person is incapable of understanding the power of the genuine self” (MSZ 1, p. 549). In *Jiko to jinrui* 自己と人類 (“Ego and Mankind,” 1913), he writes, “Mankind is within one’s ego. Thus the consummate egoist incorporates the unhappiness of mankind and considers it his own” (MSZ 1, p. 550). Thus it seems by 1913, Mushakōji has developed a full-blown egoism that splits off entirely from Tolstoy’s self-denying ascetic self⁵³ and Sōseki’s emphasis on the civic rights and duties of the individual.

Mushakōji reading Sōseki’s fiction. Mushakōji willfully weaves together a reading of Sōseki to suit a particularly set of ideals within the comforting confines of liberalism and elite intellectualism, where the elite can assume the magnanimous role of a savior and a leader, economically, spiritually and culturally, if they desire. Mushakōji focuses on the aspects of cultivation and character in Sōseki’s stories and rejects Sōseki’s astute observations on society, politics, and the economy. It would not have occurred to Mushakōji to read Sōseki’s fiction as economic novels filled with the desperation of the social underclass and malcontents. Sōseki problematizes the Meiji 15 generation—not so much the privileged Meiji 15 youth who can afford to adhere to intellectualism and liberalism as their *raison d’être*—but the bastardized youth who were the products of the democratization of education and a mass consumption society, young men who were armed with intelligence and education and who covet material and spiritual fulfillment but were still consigned to the fringe of society.⁵⁴ These include Takayanagi in *Nowaki* 野分 (1907), Ono in *Gubijinsō* 虞美人草 (1907), Yojirō in *Sanshirō* 三四郎 (1908), Hiraoka in *Sorekara* それから (1909), K in *Kokoro* 心 (1914), and Kobayashi in *Meian* 明暗 (1916). All these characters are portrayed differently—some are opportunistic, some introspective, and some enterprising—but they share a sense of discontent and restlessness that borders on anarchy.⁵⁵ These social malcontents belonged neither to the third class (*daisan kaikyū*) of capitalists (which the Shirakaba group belonged) nor the fourth class (*daiyon kaikyū*) of the masses or the proletariat, according to the economist Kawakami Hajime’s classification in *Binbō monogatari* (A Tale of Poverty, 1916), but constituted a category in limbo, a bastardized category that did not belong anywhere, socially or politically. Sōseki’s sympathy lies in narrating their fate—their frets and struts and eventual exile or death—and his modernity is embodied in his ambivalence about any form of salvation or solution, an attitude that the young and optimistic Mushakōji cannot accept, no matter how much he revered Sōseki.

The typical Shirakaba-ha reaction to social and economic injustice was charity. As discussed in an earlier section, Arishima handed over his family farm in Hokkaido to the tenants and established the Kaributo cooperative farm. Shiga Naoya, Mushakōji's close friend and life-long supporter of Atarashikimura, in a story called *Kozō no kamisama* 小僧の神様 ("The Shop Boy's God," 1919), depicts a man of means secretly treating a shop boy to a fabulous meal of sushi as an anonymous act of philanthropy. Perhaps aware of the fact such an act of charity could only bring momentary satisfaction at best to the giver and receiver without truly addressing any social issue, Shiga elaborated on the uneasiness the rich man experiences after his act of generosity.⁵⁶

Mushakōji, on the other hand, had a plan so grandiose and visionary that he appeared not to have the capacity to experience the gnawing discomfit of doubts that plagued Arishima and Shiga. He would build a village to accommodate the bastardized sons and daughters of Taishō democracy where they will till the earth and share their dreams of liberalism and intellectual sophistication. In reality, it was the modestly educated young men that Atarashikimura actively recruited—not the educated elite and intelligentsia who had clear and stable career paths, but those who had a taste of culture and book-learning and who looked to the village as a stepping stone or as an enclave for more. They were, for the most part, young men and women, but mostly men, in limbo. Among the pioneering group to Hyūga Atarashikimura, Kawashima Denkichirō 川島伝吉 (1897–1955) and Himori Shin'ichi 日守新一 (1900–1959) would fit that category. Kawashima was Mushakōji's houseboy and an aspiring writer while Himori was a high school dropout who left home to join the village and eventually embarked on a relatively successful acting career.⁵⁷ Though Kawashima was one of the rare members who devoted his entire life to the village, and Himori stayed for a couple of years (during which he became one of the lovers of Mushakōji's first wife Fusako), the turnover rate for live-in members was rapid, with villagers staying for as short as a few weeks to a year or two. Among the pioneering members, only Kawashima had any knowledge or experience of farming, having come from a farming family. The scholar Ōtsuyama pointed out that, "most members had not finished higher education or even junior high, but most of them would have completed compulsory education, around twenty years of age, and to them the village is like a personal college (*watakushi no daigaku*) of sorts."⁵⁸

Mushakōji reviewing Sorekara. The Sōseki character closest to Mushakōji in age, social and economic status, education, idealism and Romanticism is Daisuke in *Sorekara* (1909), and it is a fortuitous coincidence that the first essay that Mushakōji published in the first issue of *Shirakaba* (1910) was a review of Sōseki's *Sorekara*. Thirty-year-old Daisuke is the prototypical *kōtō yūmin* 高等遊民 (upper class loafer) whose disgust with the expansionist, capitalist Japanese state makes him retreat into an aesthetic world of passive resistance, until the woman he loved came back into his life and pierced his self-contained bubble. Two critical essays in 1910, Ishikawa Takuboku's "Jidai heisoku no genjō" 時代閉塞の現状 ("The dead end of our time") and Mushakōji's "Sorekara ni tsuite" ("About *Sorekara*") reveal two different reactions to the Daisuke phenomenon and the malaise of the expanding Japanese empire. Takuboku argued that escalating nationalism, imperialism and the power of the state in the post Russo-Japanese War years have caused an entire generation of educated youth to react in the form of passive resistance, withdrawal and indifference. The tendency for youth to be introverted and self-destructive speaks clearly about the sorry state of lost ideals, a state he calls

a blockage or a dead end (*jidai heisoku*).⁵⁹ Takuboku, whose socialist thoughts were akin to those of the Russian anarchist Kropotkin, insisted that to breakout of the dead end, one has to recognize the oppression of the state and “think about tomorrow” (*asu no kōsatsu* 明日を考察).⁶⁰ Published posthumously in 1912, Takuboku’s piercing insights stimulated multiple ideas and movements that can be perceived as attempts to unplug the blockage, among them utopianism, anarchy, and Marxism.⁶¹

Mushakōji clearly recognizes a great deal of Daisuke’s ideas as his own, especially Daisuke’s views about work and society. Daisuke’s idea that “Man cannot work for bread alone” parallels Mushakōji’s view that “If there is even one person on earth who works only for the sake of bread (*kuu tame ni hataraku* 食うために働く), then it is a proof that our society is still inadequate (*kanzen de nai* 完全でない).”⁶² Mushakōji sympathizes entirely with Daisuke’s disgust at the post-Russo-Japanese War society, where wealth remained in the clutches of a handful of deft capitalists and politicians while ordinary citizens in a general impoverished state were persuaded to subscribe to the modern myths of nation building in order to foster Japan’s imperialistic and expansionist agenda. But Mushakōji rejects Daisuke’s passive resistance. “I cannot fully agree with Daisuke—my personality and circumstances are different from Daisuke’s, and I am younger than Daisuke. But I sympathize with many of his ideas” (MSZ 1: 329). It is significant that Mushakōji makes a personal comparison of himself to Daisuke, as though he feels he should rewrite Daisuke’s life with his own actions. And rewrite he attempted, indeed, in the form of creating Atarashikimura. Mushakōji had been developing his doctrine on egoism around the same time, and by 1916, he declared, “We need a new form of society.”⁶³

One aspect of *Sorekara* that Mushakōji failed to grasp was Sōseki’s ability to depict an entire political, economical and moral reality beyond the confines of Daisuke’s mind and perception. Daisuke’s utopia of nature and romance is disrupted repeatedly by the reality of the social malcontent and the bastardized offspring of *bunmei kaika*, to the extent that Daisuke is forced to emerge from the isolation of his spiritual and philosophical bubble to face the dirt and grit of society. Sōseki’s ability to address the intersection of the private self and society sets him apart from the self-fixated protagonists of I-novels who are confined to the hell or utopia of their own creation. That Mushakōji believes in creating utopia in response to Sōseki’s skepticism shows an unwillingness to recognize the forces of reality beyond his own ego.

Mushakōji and the I-novel

Mushakōji is known to have admired Sōseki and vehemently condemned the Naturalists for their lack of morals and ideals, but his own style of writing and the content of his fiction are strongly in the Naturalistic vein, so much so that in the 1920s, his novel *Omedetaki hito* お目出たき人 (A Blessed Man, 1911) and Tayama Katai’s *Futon* (The Quilt, 1907) were retroactively labeled as the first representative works of the I-novel,⁶⁴ a mode of writing stemming from the Naturalistic writings of not just Katai but also Shimazaki Tōson 島崎藤村, Tokuda Shūsei 徳田秋声, Masamune Hakuchō 正宗白鳥, Oguri Fūyō 小栗風葉, all of whom Mushakōji despised.⁶⁵ For a writer so engrossed with the rhetoric of truth, virtue and beauty, it is easy to understand Mushakōji’s opposition to the anti-idealistic and amoral stance of the Naturalists. His other objection to the Naturalists is their tendency to emphasize objectivity (*kyakkansei* 客観性). Writing in 1912, Mushakōji insisted that “In this age, we are

no longer satisfied with the objectivity of Naturalism. Writing is more personal (*kojinteki* 個人的)” (MSZ 1, p. 429). In saying so, Mushakōji posits a fictional world in which subjectivity and objective reality are mutually exclusive, a view that aligns him with the confession-oriented perspective of what comes to be identified as the I-novelists. In fact, the Japanese Naturalists never achieved the objectivity they professed and the subjective I-novel did in fact become their standard form of expression. The I-novelists posit a world that cannot exist beyond the feelings and perception of the individual, a world that is a projection of the mind. The I-novel that Mushakōji and other Shirakaba novelists practiced differed from the naturalistic I-novel in its positive, self-righteous and bourgeois spirit rather than the level of subjectivity, and is referred to by critics like Hirano Ken or Itō Sei as the “*shinkyō shōsetsu*.”⁶⁶ This strong undercurrent of subjectivity in modern Japanese fiction may have stemmed in part from traditional Japanese poetics in which the world is always presented through a poetic consciousness (*kokoro*) but does not exist independently beyond the mind. This self-oriented perspective contrasts markedly with the late nineteenth century Western orthodox novel, which posits a fictional world that possesses a self-contained external or objective reality existing beyond the confines of the narrator’s mind and perception. The sense of self in the Western orthodox novel is what Kobayashi Hideo is to identify as the “socialized self”⁶⁷—a self that is intensely aware of society and external reality existing independent of the individual’s feelings and perception, as well as the necessary interaction between self and society, in the form of resistance, acquiescence, or skepticism.

The consistent development of Mushakōji’s egoism leads to the espousal of a completely self-oriented artistic perspective, a mode of thinking that splits off entirely from Sōseki’s idea of the independent artist who defies cliques and the state. Mushakōji’s idea of “art for oneself” (*jibun no tame no geijutsu*) and “I will go all the way to advocate art for the sake of oneself” (1911) (MSZ 1, p. 401) prioritizes the expression and expansion of the self over any other kind of external reality. The ego becomes the ultimate authority in judging everything, since he believes that the ego contains the desires of his personal self as well as those of mankind and the world.⁶⁸

It is significant that the decade leading up to the founding and construction of Atarashikimura, from 1911 to 1921, coincided with two major developments in Mushakōji’s thoughts and works. One is the development of the doctrine of egoism, as evident in the essays collected in *Seichō* as discussed in an earlier section. The other is the production of fiction that precipitated the Japanese I-novel mode, with an overwhelming emphasis on the subjective perspective and an assertion of the ego as the ultimate source of reference and authority. These works include *Omedetaki hito* (1911), *Seken shirazu* 世間知らず (Greenhorn, 1912), *Yūjō* 友情 (Friendship, 1919), *Tochi* 土地 (Land, 1921), *Aru otoko* (1921–1923). These works are accompanied by semi-biographical fiction about spiritual and/or intellectual mentors who can also be read as Mushakōji’s alter ego, such as *Kōfukumon* 幸福者 (A Happy Man, 1919), originally titled *Jibun no shi* 自分の師 (My Teacher), and *Yesu* (Jesus, 1920). Furthermore, there are semi-autobiographical pieces about his life and utopian dreams, such as the play *Aru seinen no yume* 或る青年の夢 (*The Dream of a Certain Young Man*, 1917) which the famous Zhou brothers, Lu Xun 魯迅 and Zhou Zuoren 周作人, translated and introduced to China. Finally, there are numerous essays directly about Atarashikimura, including the three dialogues on Atarashikimura (1918). All these works address progressively

Mushakōji's agenda of "know yourself" (*jiko o shiru* 自己を知る) (MSZ 1, p. 683), "love yourself" (*jiko o ai suru* 自己を愛する) (MSZ 1, p. 427) and "assert yourself" (*jiko o shuchō suru* 自己を主張する) (MSZ 1, p. 400). Atarashikimura can be read as the continuous augmentation of an ego that seeks to make its impact felt not only on the pages of a book but literally on earth. The village, like his art, is created "for the sake of the self" (*jiko no tame*), and is thus the ultimate act of self-expression.

Conclusion

In writing about the social, political and cultural milieu of the 1920s, the critic Kawakami Tetsutarō 河上徹太郎 (1902–1980) offered the following succinct summary: "On the one hand, rigid left-wing ideology was loud in the air, on the other hand the contemporary lifestyle of sports, cinema, and Americanism occupied the popular imagination, and the world of thoughts was dominated by a chaotic state of liberalism."⁶⁹ Amidst that chaotic state, Atarashikimura is part of a constellation of utopian movements that marked that period, from the phenomenon of suburban living in the image of Tokutomi Roka's antimodern, semi-rural lifestyle and Arishima's and Miyazawa's attempts in agricultural reform, to the religious and socialist based projects such as Nishida Tenkō's religious commune Ittōen (The Community of One Lamp), Itō Shōshin's charitable organization Mugaen 無我苑 (The Community of Selflessness), and Kagawa Toyohiko's widespread cooperatives. Atarashikimura is one of the first of these movements and one of the few operating in more or less its original principle until today.

There are many perspectives to engage in utopian studies—socially, politically, historically, culturally—but in this paper I have chosen to discuss Atarashikimura as an extension of a literary phenomenon in the intellectual and literary contexts of late Meiji and Taishō. Since the etymological origin of the word utopia means "nowhere," what interests me is the process by which a physical reality emerges from abstract ideas; in other words, the process by which Mushakōji creates a utopian village out of ideas derived from his responses to his intellectual and literary contexts of his time. I have also argued that the village is a physical manifestation of a creative ego that eliminates the difference between self and others by subsuming others under an overpowering self. That strong sense of self also enabled Mushakōji to precipitate the I-novel mode of writing, a form of expression that uses the self as the ultimate reference and authority in interpreting and re-arranging external reality. Simultaneous to the creation of the village, Mushakōji bends over his manuscripts to finance his utopian project. They are indeed his twins, one existing as words and the other in physical reality, playing catch across a thin and permeable veil.

It is to his credit that Mushakōji remained dedicated to his utopian project. He lived in the Hyūga village for the first six years and continued to finance it with his writing. In 1916, he wrote that the highest form of "art for oneself" is "to dedicate oneself completely to art" (*jiko o sasagekireru geijutsu* 自己を捧げきれぬ芸術) (MSZ 3, p. 380), and he certainly invested continuously in the village, which to him is a form of artistic production. While other literary utopian schemes wilted in the shadow of skepticism and self-doubt, Mushakōji continued to nurture his with confidence and income from his prolific writing career. It took forty years for the village to become financially self-sufficient in 1958, and by the time Mushakōji died in 1976, there were forty-one live-in villagers (fourteen families) in the Saitama Atarashikimura

with a gross income of over 200 million yen (Watanabe 1999, p. 62). The infrastructure was more or less in place, including a small art museum, gathering halls, living quarters, ateliers, egg farms, and a mausoleum where Mushakōji and his wife Yasuko were laid to rest. As for the assessment of the village as a community, utopian or otherwise, there have been positive and negative appraisals since its initial conception, from the warm support of his artist friends to skepticism expressed by scholars and critics in literary, religious, political and social studies, and it is clear that a detailed assessment of the village that traces its historical development will be the deserving subject of a separate investigation. To Mushakōji, who did not live to see its graying population and financial decline after the village outlived its brief period of financial self-sufficiency in the 1970s and early 1980s, Atarashikimura remained a testimony of his optimism and indomitable will.

REFERENCES

Arishima 1954

Arishima Takeo 有島武郎. *Arishima Takeo shū* 有島武郎集. *Gendai Nihon bungaku zenshū* 現代日本文学全集 21. Chikuma Shobō, 1954.

ATZ

Arishima Takeo. *Arishima Takeo zenshū* 有島武郎全集. 15 vols. Chikuma Shobō, 1981.

Encyclopaedia Britannica 2007a

Ruskin, John. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved Nov 1, 2007, from Encyclopaedia Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article-215828>

Encyclopaedia Britannica 2007b

Morris, William. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved Nov 1, 2007, from Encyclopaedia Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article-5031>

Encyclopaedia Britannica 2007c

Carpenter, Edward. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved Nov 1, 2007, from Encyclopaedia Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article-9020456>

Encyclopaedia Britannica 2007d

Education, history of. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved March 19, 2007, from Encyclopaedia Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article-9105051>

Encyclopaedia Britannica 2007e

Kropotkin, Peter Alekseyevich. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved March 31, 2007, from Encyclopaedia Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article-3982>

Honda 1987

Honda Shūgo 本田秋五 “Mushakōji Saneatsu no jiko keiseiki” 武者小路実篤の「自己」形成期. In MSZ 1, 1987, pp. 709–741.

Ishikawa 2004

Ishikawa Takuboku 石川啄木. “Jidai heisoku no genjō” 時代閉塞の現状 [1912]. In Chiba Shunji 千葉俊二 and Tsubouchi Yūzō 坪内祐三, eds. *Nihon kindai bungaku*

- hyōronsen: Meiji Taishō hen* 日本近代文学評論選：明治大正編. Iwanami Bunko, 2004 [2003].
- Itō 1997
Itō Shinkichi 伊藤信吉. *Yūtopia kikō: Arishima Takeo, Miyazawa Kenji, Mushakōji Saneatsu* ユートピア紀行：有島武郎・宮沢賢治・武者小路実篤. Kōdansha Bungei Bunko, 1997.
- Kawakami 2004
Kawakami Tetsutarō 河上徹太郎. “Haikyū saretā jiyū” 配給された自由 [1945]. In Chiba Shunji and Tsubouchi Yūzō, eds. *Nihon kindai bungaku hyōronsen: Shōwa hen* 日本近代文学評論選：昭和篇. Iwanami Bunko, 2004.
- Kobayashi 1995
Kobayashi Hideo. *Literature of the Lost Home: Kobayashi Hideo—Literary Criticism 1924–1939*, trans. Paul Anderer. Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Kuyama 1956
Kuyama Yasushi 久山康. *Kindai Nihon to kirisutokyō: Meiji hen* 近代日本とキリスト教：明治篇. Sōbunsha, 1956.
- Maeterlinck 1899
Maurice Maeterlinck. *Wisdom and Destiny*, trans. Alfred Sutro. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1899.
- Mullins 1998
Mark R. Mullins. *Christianity Made in Japan: A Study of Indigenous Movements*. University of Hawaii Press, 1998.
- Mushakōji 1966
Mushakōji Saneatsu 武者小路実篤. *Kono michi o aruku* この道を歩く. Kadokawa Shoten, 1966 [1958].
- Mushakōji 1977
———. *Atarashikimura no sōzō* 新しき村の創造, ed. Ōtsuyama Kunio 大津山国夫. Fuzanbō, 1977.
- MSZ
Mushakōji Saneatsu 武者小路実篤. *Mushakōji Saneatsu zenshū* 武者小路実篤全集. 18 vols. Shōgakukan, 1987–1991.
- Nagami 1968
Nagami Shichirō 永見七郎, ed. *Atarashikimura gojūnen* 新しき村五十年. Atarashikimura, 1968.
- Natsume 1979
Natsume Sōseki. “Sōseki on Individualism: ‘Watakushi no kojinchugi,’” trans. Jay Rubin. *Monumenta Nipponica* 34:1 (1979), pp. 21–49.

Nozick 1974

Robert Nozick. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. Basic Books, 1974.

Ōtsuyama 1997

Ōtsuyama Kunio 大津山国夫. *Mushakōji Saneatsu kenkyū: Saneatsu to Atarashikimura* 武者小路実篤研究：実篤と新しき村. Meiji Shoin, 1997.

Piovesana 1964

Gino Piovesana. "Men and Social Ideas of the Early Taishō Period." *Monumenta Nipponica* 19:1–2 (1964), pp. 111–129.

SZ

Natsume Sōseki 夏目漱石. *Sōseki zenshū* 漱石全集. Vols. 1–16. Iwanami Shoten, 1975.

Sekikawa 2005

Sekikawa Natsuo 関川夏央. *Shirakaba tachi no Taishō* 白樺たちの大正. Bunshun Bunko, 2005.

Shiga 1999

Shiga Naoya 志賀直哉. *Shiga Naoya zenshū* 志賀直哉全集, vol. 3. Iwanami Shoten, 1999.

Suzuki 1996

Tomi Suzuki. *Narrating the Self: Fictions of Japanese Modernity*. Stanford University Press, 1996.

Takemura 2004

Takemura Tamio 竹村民郎. *Taishō bunka teikoku no yūtopia: sekaishi no tenkanki to taishū shōhi shakai no keisei* 大正文化 帝国のユートピア：世界史の転換期と大衆消費社会の形成. Sangensha, 2004.

Takeuchi 2003

Takeuchi Yō 竹内洋. *Kyōyō shugi no botsuraku: kawariyuku eriito gakusei bunka* 教養主義の没落：変わりゆくエリート学生文化. Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2003.

Tokutomi 1907

Tokutomi Kenjiro (Roka) 徳富健次郎(盧花). *Torusutoi* トルストイ. Min'yūsha, 1907.

Tokutomi 1976

———. *Muhonron, hoka 6 ben, nikki* 謀叛論・他6編・日記, ed. Nakano Yoshio 中野好夫. Iwanami shoten, 1976.

Tokutomi 1977

———. *Mimizu no tawakoto* みみずのたわこと. Iwanami Shoten, 1977.

Tolstoy 1984

Leo Tolstoy. *The Kingdom of God Is within You: Christianity Not as a Mystic Religion but as a New Theory of Life*, trans. Constance Garnett. University of Nebraska Press, 1984.

Yamamoto 1999

Yamamoto Kenkichi 山本健吉. “Mushakōji no joseikan: *Omedetaki hito no jibun*” 武者小路の女性観—お目出たき人の自分. In *Mushakōji Saneatsu tokuhon* 武者小路実篤読本 (*Bungei rinji zōkangō* 文藝臨時増刊號) (1955). Reprinted as afterword in *Mushakōji Saneatsu. Omedetaki hito*. Shinchōsha, 1999, pp.158–166.

Watanabe 1999

Watanabe Kanji 渡辺貫二. *Atarashikimura no hachijūnen* 新しき村の八十年. Kai-bisha, 1999.

Yanagi 1998

Yanagi Tomiko 柳富子. *Torusutoi to Nippon* トルストイと日本. Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1998.

Yiu 1998

Angela Yiu. *Chaos and Order in the Works of Natsume Sōseki*. University of Hawaii Press, 1998.

Yiu 2006

———. “Beautiful Town: The Discovery of the Suburbs and the Vision of the Garden City in Late Meiji and Taishō Literature.” *Japan Forum* 18:3 (2006), pp. 291–337.

NOTES

1 The name Mushakōji can also be read Mushanokōji. Both versions are accepted as correct, and library catalogs today generally give the longer one first, with the shorter as an alternative pronunciation. Saneatsu himself preferred Mushakōji. Persons I interviewed when preparing this article—from the residents at Atarashikimura and the staff at the Mushakōji Kinenkan (memorial museum) to his grandson Mushakōji Nobukazu—pronounced the surname as Mushakōji, and I have decided to follow their practice. I would like to thank the two anonymous referees for their valuable comments and suggestions. James Baxter and James Baskind at the Nichibunken have been supportive and encouraging throughout the revisions of this project, and to them I owe my thanks. My appreciation also goes to the people of Atarashikimura, who are always warm and helpful whenever I visit for research and interviews.

2 Leo Tolstoy’s (1828–1910) influence on Mushakōji will be discussed in a later section. John Ruskin (1819–1900), English art and social critic, was known for his aversion of industrial greed and pollution and his prophetic call for the return to nature or wilderness. He used his inheritance to promote idealistic social causes, “notably the Guild of St. George, a pastoral community first planned in 1871 and formally constituted seven years later” (*Encyclopedia Britannica* 2007a). The Tokutomi brothers’ (Sohō and Roka) interest in Ruskin was obvious; one produced a translation and the other a biography. Furthermore, there has been speculation that the “Rasu” of Miyazawa Kenji’s Rasuchijin Association came from Ruskin’s name (romanized as Rasukin). William Morris (1834–1896), English designer, poet, and early socialist, whose work generated the late nineteenth century anti-industrial Arts and Crafts Movement, was a visionary thinker who emphasized the relation between art and the environment (*Encyclopedia Britannica* 2007b). Edward Carpenter (1844–1929), English writer associated with the Arts and Crafts Movement, was a follower of Morris, Ruskin and Henry Thoreau and a prominent advocate of vegetarianism, clean air, and the value of manual labor (*Encyclopedia Britannica* 2007c).

3 For want of an appropriate English translation of Taishō *kyōyō shugi*, I have rendered it into the lengthy “Taishō elite intellectual cultivation,” with reference to the education reform in 1894 that created the elite higher schools (*kōtō gakkō* 高等学校) with a curriculum in the arts and sciences modeled after a European curriculum. Many graduates of the higher school went on to earn a university degree and launched themselves onto an elite career track in the government and various professions. This paper will adhere to the Japanese term, and a fuller explanation of the ideology can be found in a later section titled “Taishō *kyōyō shugi* and the Shirakaba group.”

4 Takemura 2005, p. 13.

5 Sekikawa 2005, p. 120.

6 Mushakōji 1977, pp. 42–112.

7 Mushakōji 1966, p. 27.

8 It is clear that Mushakōji harbors an unmitigated elitist view on the division of labor that was not uncommon in his time, in part as a response to Matthew Arnold’s and Thomas Carlyle’s theories on cultural elitism. Not only does he believe that a small minority of people are the chosen leaders of society (see “Kizoku shugi” 貴族主義 [1909], in Mushakōji 1977, p. 5), he also thinks that to create a “fair society” (*gōriteki shakai* 合理的社会), intelligent and “unintelligent” people ought to be educated differently, so that appropriate work can be assigned to different people according to their interests, personalities, and talents (see “Gōriteki shakai ni wa” 合理的社会には [1917], in Mushakōji 1977, p. 32).

9 In September 1929, Satō Haruo initiated the publication of a collection of works through Kaizōsha by 69 writers titled *Jūnen* (*Ten Years*) to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the village, and donated the royalty to the village (Nagami 1968, p. 122). It should be noted that very few of Mushakōji’s literary friends joined the village either as residential or non-residential members. Among the Shirakaba-ha coterie, Senke Motomaro experienced life in the village for a few days, and Kurata Hyakuzō joined as a non-residential member (see Ōtsuyama 1997, pp. 46–47).

10 Nagami wrote that in September 1925, the village purchased a printing machine and began publishing low-cost paperbacks based on the German Reclam series, which is said to be the beginning of the *bunkobon* (Nagami 1968, p. 76). This so-called “mura no hon” (the village book) is a significant topic that deserves full-scale treatment in a separate paper.

11 Among the religious activists, Nishida Tenkō 西田天香 (1872–1968) founded the Ittōen 一灯園 in Kyoto (1905), a mutual aid organization that emphasized communal living, and Kagawa Toyohiko 賀川豊彦 (1888–1960) founded the Kobe Cooperative (1918), the Friends of Jesus Association (1921) and the Japan Farmers’ Association (*Nihon nōmin kumiai* 日本農民組合) (1921). Mushakōji would have been aware of these movements and activities, and they would also form a substantial religious context to his own utopian village. But since the focus of this paper is on the literary context of Atarashikimura, the religious context will be discussed in a separate paper.

12 The three “bands” are the Kumamoto Band, the Yokohama Band, and the Sapporo Band. For a discussion of the three bands, see Kuyama 1956, pp. 43–54. The Kumamoto Band was founded by Captain Leroy Lansing Janes who arrived in Kumamoto in 1871 to teach English in the School of Western Learning (*Yōgakkō* 洋学校). In 1876, with the closing down of the Kumamoto school, thirty some students moved to Dōshisha to join the English school. See Mullins 1998, p. 16.

13 To examine the full range of Tolstoy’s thoughts and its impact on Japanese intellectuals in the diverse fields of literature, religion, politics, and philosophy will be beyond the scope of this paper. I will limit the discussion to how certain Japanese writers select a handful of appealing ideas (nonviolence, equality, the sanctity of labor) to cultivate a utopian vision. For a catalogue of scholarly responses to Tolstoy’s thoughts in late Meiji and Taishō, see Yanagi 1998, pp. 10–21.

14 In *The Kingdom of God is Within You* (1893), Tolstoy deplores the inequality founded upon exploitation: “every man of the present day knows that all men have an equal right to life and the good things

of life, and that one set of people are no better nor worse than another, that all are equal. Everyone knows this, beyond doubt; everyone feels it in his whole being. Yet at the same time everyone sees all round him the division of men into two castes—the one, laboring, oppressed, poor, and suffering, the other idle, oppressing, luxurious, and profligate. And everyone not only sees this, but voluntarily or involuntarily, in one way or another, he takes part in maintaining this distinction which his conscience condemns” (Tolstoy 1984, p. 116).

15 “Not only did Tolstoy speak out against the idle rich and wrote about the importance of equality, I heard he also went in among the peasants and lived in dirt and mud as he took up farming with his own hands.” (Uemura Masahisa, *Gyokusekishū* 玉石集 in *Uemura zenshū* 8, Uemura Zenshū Kankōkai 1934, quoted in Yanagi 1998, p. 18).

16 Tokutomi 1907.

17 Both translated by Katō Naoshi, *My Confession* is rendered as *Waga zange* (Keiseisha, 1902) and *What I Believe* is rendered as *Waga shūkyō* (Bunmeidō, 1903). See Yanagi 1998, p. 20.

18 Kōtoku Shūsui founded the Social Democratic Party in 1901 and denounced the Russo-Japanese War in 1905. The party was immediately banned, the newspaper closed, and Kōtoku jailed. He continued to be active in organizing workers in radical activities. In 1910, he was arrested for involvement in a conspiracy to assassinate the Meiji emperor and executed in 1911.

19 Yanagi 1998, pp. 18–20

20 For a discussion of utopian garden cities in Japan, see Yiu 2006, pp. 315–318. For a description of Roka’s semi-rural life, see p. 324.

21 See “Nōson kaihō tenmatsu” 農村開放顛末 (A Full Account of the Farm Emancipation, 1923) in ATZ 9, pp. 370–73. Arishima met Kropotkin in London on the way back to Japan and was greatly inspired by the experience. Kropotkin, born the son of a prince, advocated the theory of “anarchist communism,” according to which free distribution of goods and services will replace private property and unequal incomes. He also envisioned “a society in which people would do both manual and mental work, both in industry and in agriculture.” See *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 2007e. His influence in Japan was deep and widespread.

22 See “Nōson kaihō tenmatsu” (1923) in ATZ 9, p. 372.

23 “Mushakōji-kei e” (To Mushakōji) in *Shirakaba* (7 July 1918), collected in Arishima 1954, p. 206–210.

24 The speech, titled “Kosakunin e no kokubetsu” 小作人への告別 (Farewell to the tenants), was recorded in the magazine *Izumi* (October 1922), quoted in part in Itō 1997: pp. 87–90. The gist of that historical event was carved on the back of a monument called “Nōjōkaihō kinenhi” 農場開放記念碑 (Farm emancipation monument), see ATZ 9, p. 30.

25 For a detailed discussion of the legal problems involved in transferring the privately owned farm to the hands of the tenants, see Itō 1997, 101–117.

26 In 1916, the economist and Kyoto University professor Kawakami Hajime wrote *Binbō monogatari* (A Tale of Poverty), in which he coined the phrase “daiyon kaikyū” (the fourth class, which refers to the masses) before the term proletariat was widely used, in contrast to the first class (the royalties), the second class (the aristocrats), and the third class (the capitalists). He advocated a more humanitarian social system to distribute wealth in an egalitarian manner, and later devoted himself to the study of Marxism.

27 Itō 1997, p. 101. Arishima uses the words “hōki” and “nagedasu” 投げだす (to throw away) in “Nōen kaihō tenmatsu.” ATZ 9, p. 372.

28 In “Nōen kaihō tenmatsu,” he wrote, “I am definitely not optimistic about this cooperative farm. It will be a shame if it ends up being split into pieces and falls into the hands of capitalists, but I am resigned to it.” ATZ 9, p. 373.

- 29 Itō noted that Arishima had already read the Japanese translation of the story by 1908, under the title of *Chinushi no asa* 地主の朝. See Itō 1997, p. 68.
- 30 Quote in Itō 1997, p. 230.
- 31 Quoted in Itō 1997, p. 194.
- 32 Miyazawa wrote voluminously on peasants' art, among which *Nōmin geijutsu gairon* explored the various theories, production, and criticism of peasants' art, drawing from Goethe's and Tolstoy's definitions of art. See Itō 232 for a discussion of Miyazawa's writing on peasants' art.
- 33 Itō 1997, p. 236.
- 34 Itō 1997, pp. 192, 201, 237.
- 35 Takeuchi 2003, p. 39.
- 36 Takeuchi 2003, pp. 39–40.
- 37 Sekikawa 2005, p. 8.
- 38 Except for Arishima Takeo (Meiji 11, 1878) and Ōgimachi Kinkazu 正親町公和 (Meiji 14, 1881). See Sekikawa 2005, p. 9.
- 39 Takemura 2004, p. 126.
- 40 Among the Shirakaba group, Mushakōji introduced Rodin and Arishima Ikuma introduced Cezanne to Japan. This attracted artists such as Kishida Ryūsei, Bernard Leach, Senke Motomaro, Takamura Kōtarō, etc. to contribute writings or illustrations to *Shirakaba*. Kishida, Takamura, Kimura Sōhachi, etc. were members of the avant-garde art society Fusain, a group that maintained close contact with the Shirakaba group. Kishida went on to found the art coterie Sōdosha, while Takamura founded the art group Pan no kai with an anti-Naturalistic, decadent inclination.
- 41 Ōsugi Sakae published anarchist newspapers and led organized campaigns among social workers. He and his wife were murdered by the military police. Ishikawa Takuboku was a poet and social critic. One of his most famous essays was *Jidai heisoku no genjō* (The dead end of our time, 1910) in which he criticized the oppressive rise of nationalism after the Russo-Japanese War as the reason for the general state of passive disengagement among Meiji youth.
- 42 Piovesana 1964, p. 119.
- 43 Most likely Mushakōji was thinking of Sōseki's early works with strong moral closures, such as *Nowaki* 野分 (1907), in which the old didactic teacher Dōya (whose name means "the way") was designated as a *jinkakusha* and for whom the social malcontent Takayanagi sacrificed his meager funds and future. In the same essay praising Sōseki as a *jinkakusha*, Mushakōji mentioned reading *Nowaki* in one breath while burning literally with a 39-degree fever (MSZ 18, p. 564). For a discussion of *Nowaki*, see Yiu 1998.
- 44 The translation of "My Individualism" is taken from Natsume 1979, p. 26–46, esp. p. 42.
- 45 Published in the Gakushūin school magazine *Hojinkai zasshi* 補仁会雑誌, March 1909.
- 46 Mushakōji 1977, p. 4.
- 47 Mushakōji 1977, p. 5.
- 48 Mushakōji 1977, p. 5.
- 49 *Seichō* consists of essays published in *Shirakaba* from 1910–13, some of which Mushakōji excluded from the monograph. The collection of essays under the title *Shinben Seichō* (Seichō Revised) in vol. 1 of the MSZ includes essays that Mushakōji excluded from his initial selection.
- 50 Honda 1987, p. 736.
- 51 MSZ 1, p. 427–430.
- 52 The quote from Maeterlinck's *Wisdom and Destiny* reads, "You are told you should love your neighbor as yourself; but if you love yourself meanly, childishly, timidly, even so shall you love your neighbor. Learn therefore to love yourself with a love that is wise and healthy, that is large and complete. This is less easy than it would seem. There is more active charity in the egoism of a strenuous clairvoyant soul

than in all the devotion of the soul that is helpless and blind. Before you exist for others it behoves you to exist for yourself; before giving, you first must acquire.” (Maeterlinck 1899, p. 173).

53 In fact, by 1912, Mushakōji wrote that he felt he had “graduated from Tolstoy” (*Jibun no shinka* 自分の真価 [My Real Worth], MSZ 1, p. 420). Affirming the healthy appetites of the flesh (*nikutai*), Mushakōji disagrees with Tolstoy’s practice of vegetarianism and sexual abstinence. Moreover, though in principle Mushakōji stated his preference for eliminating the causes of military conflicts, he did not appreciate Tolstoy’s idea of passive non-resistance during wartime. See *Torusutoi shugi* (Tolstoyism), MSZ 15, p. 64.

54 Higher education in the Taishō period was no longer limited to the elite but became more accessible to the public. The Special Council for Education, established 1917, emphasized secondary and higher education. Secondary schools for boys, girls’ high schools, and vocational schools increased both in the number of institutions and in enrollment after World War I. As a result, secondary school education became more popular in nature as compared to the elitist nature in Meiji. In 1918, the University Order (*daigakurei*) approved the founding of private universities and colleges. See *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 2007d. Between 1921 and 1925, the number of students attending universities and high schools (*kōtō senmon gakkō*) grew from 86,000 to 126,000, while the number of students attending middle school, girls’ high schools and vocational schools nearly doubled from 445,000 to 744,000. The Meiji educated elite gave way to the Taishō salaryman society; high school and college graduates became salaried employees in big companies, contributing directly to the capitalistic economy and Japan’s advancement in the world scene (Sekikawa 2005, p. 272).

55 For a discussion of the social malcontents in Sōseki’s works, see Yiu 1998, pp. 13–41.

56 After his anonymous act of philanthropy, the rich man experiences a strange loneliness instead of satisfaction. “He was feeling a strange awareness for having done a good deed, and the criticism, betrayal, and ridicule of this by his true emotions was being felt as loneliness” (Shiga 1999, p. 250).

57 Himori was in many Ozu Yasujiro’s movies, starring in *Hitori musuko* (1936). He appeared in 198 movies between 1925–1959.

58 Ōtsuyama 1997, p. 80.

59 Ishikawa 2004, p. 168.

60 Ishikawa 2004, p. 171.

61 Though the approaches of utopianism, anarchy, and Marxism were different, they started with a common language of idealism, communism, egalitarianism, and minimal government. See Nozick 1974. Above all they honored labor and sought to restore the dignity and humanity to labor, especially to those who till the earth.

62 Mushakōji 1966, p. 27.

63 Mushakōji 1966, p. 17.

64 Yamamoto Kenkichi points out the similarity in style between Mushakōji’s unadorned language and the transparent, plain style that the Naturalists strived for. “In abandoning the idea of a stylized rhetoric (*bibun ishiki* 美文意識), Mushakōji was ahead of Tōson and Katai.” (Yamamoto 1999, p. 158). Tomi Suzuki points out that “Not only did the term *watakushi-shōsetsu*, or I-novel, not appear until 1920–1921, but the I-novel did not become a serious issue in literary circle until 1924. It was even later, between 1925–1935, that *Futon* and *Omedetaki hito* were retrospectively selected by critics as the ‘origins’ of the I-novel” (Suzuki 1996, p. 48).

65 See “Shizen shugi bungaku no zenseiki” 自然主義文学の全盛期 in MSZ 15, p. 566–567.

66 I am indebted to the anonymous referee for this insight and clarification.

67 Writing about French literature in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in “Discourse on Fiction of the Self” (1935), Kobayashi Hideo noted that “In France, too, it happened that as the Naturalist movement reached its own dominant phase, there arose a literary movement calling for a fiction

of the self. . . . [The writers of fiction of the self] were all motivated by the desire to regenerate a human nature rendered stiff and conventional by the pressures of nineteenth-century Naturalist thought. And they were not mistaken to undertake a literary investigation of the self to achieve this, because already by that time, their literary ‘I’ was a fully socialized one” (Kobayashi 1995, p. 69).

68 In “Jiko no tame oyobi hoka ni tsuite,” Mushakōji states that “jiko ijō ni ken’i no aru mono wa arimasen” 自己以上に権威のあるものはありません (there is no authority above the self) (MSZ 1, p. 429).

69 Kawakami 2004, p. 216.

要旨

大正ユートピア村「新しき村」の思想および文学背景

アンジェラ・ユー

本論文は、大正白樺派の作家、武者小路実篤により1918年に創立され、今日なお現存する理想郷「新しき村」の思想および文学的背景を考察する。まず、大正ユートピア運動を背景として、徳富蘆花の「美的百姓」、有島武郎の共生農園、宮沢賢治の羅須地人協会を検討する。新しき村のユートピア思想は、明治後期および大正における3つの思想および文学の動向と綿密に繋がっていることを論じる。(1) 大正教養主義の展開とその白樺派に及ぼす影響；(2) 夏目漱石の「個人主義」から武者小路実篤の「自己主義」への転換；(3) 私小説の発展と新しき村との関連性。本論文は大正ユートピア思想とその3つの動向との関連性を考察する。