

FROM THE BRAZILIAN *SENZALA*  
TO THE JAPANESE *BURAKU*:  
NATURALISM, STIGMA, AND THE RISE  
OF HUMAN RIGHTS DISCOURSE IN  
ALUÍSIO AZEVEDO AND SHIMAZAKI TŌSON

134 Roberto Pinheiro Machado  
*Tufts University*

This article proposes a comparative analysis of Brazilian and Japanese Naturalism with a focus on two seminal novels, *O Mulato* (1881), by Aluísio Azevedo (1857-1913), and *Hakai* (1907), by Shimazaki Tōson (1872-1943), which are regarded as each country's starting points for Naturalism. These novels gave rise to conflicting critical interpretations, being charged both with reproducing the biases of social Darwinism and Eurocentric scientificism, and with voicing the condition of oppression in authoritarian societies. This article discusses both sides of the debate and reads these foundational works based on the concepts of *stigma* and *abjection*. Such a reading will suggest that what the detractors of Naturalism perceived as its prejudiced stance, identified in its crude descriptions of social pathologies, could in fact be interpreted as a portrayal of social injustice and a call for social change. This article's reading of Naturalism that recognizes it as socially progressive gives rise to a discussion of the relation between its aesthetic innovations and the rise of human rights discourse in Brazil and Japan, approached from the standpoint of the political and intellectual implications existing between Naturalism and Abolitionism in Brazil, and between Naturalism and the Buraku Liberation Movement in Japan.

The cases of Brazilian and Japanese Naturalism show a common path towards modernity in two societies generally understood as heavily authoritarian and as peripheral in relation to the North Atlantic cultural, political, and military predominance in the late nineteenth century. Comparison between them thus reveals

common patterns and allows a broad perspective that appreciates difference while still recognizing common intercultural and transcontinental models, arrangements, and values. The specific case of Naturalism provides a lever to surmount possible charges of incommensurability meant to invalidate the relational study of distinct and apparently unrelated societies such as Brazil and Japan. In its global process of reception, Naturalist aesthetics presents a common ground not only to understand differences and similarities, but also, and above all, to comprehend similarities *in* difference.

Charges against Naturalism appeared in Brazil even before the genre was actually adopted in the national literature. In the 1870s, novelist and essayist Joaquim Maria Machado de Assis published a severe critique of Portuguese writer Eça de Queirós based on the latter's adoption of what Assis perceived as a Naturalist aesthetic. In more recent times, detractors of Naturalism reemerged among critics such as Flora Sussekind and Antônio Cândido. In *Tal Brasil, Qual Romance?* Sussekind perceived Naturalism as an ideological feature of Brazilian literature that reappeared several times throughout Brazil's literary history with the hidden aim of reinforcing power structures and concealing social contradictions. According to Sussekind, the movement's initial moment in the last quarter of the nineteenth century reproduced the contents of patriarchal ideology by means of clinical case studies and the pathologizing of certain forms of human behaviour. From a different argumentative perspective but a similar oppositional view, Cândido perceived Brazilian Naturalism as derivative of its European counterpart, and in his article "De cortiço a cortiço," he dismissed Aluísio Azevedo, the main author of the Brazilian Naturalist movement, as "mediocre" (125).

135

Against such critique, Eva Paulino Bueno offered a different viewpoint in *Resisting Boundaries: The Subject of Naturalism in Brazil*. Bueno's view of Naturalism considers the genre's portrayals of segregated and debased individuals not as a derogatory disclosure of pathologies but as the granting of a voice to the socially discriminated against and politically oppressed. The subaltern voices of blacks, mulattoes, women, and homosexuals were for the first time heard in Brazilian literature, and the harsh attitude of doctrinal Positivism was modulated within the literary expression of Naturalism. Bueno's positive appraisal of Naturalism is reinforced by critic Rildo Cosson in the article "O Naturalismo na década de 70—O realinhamento do cânone" (2001), which regards the exclusion of Naturalism from the Brazilian literary canon as a result of the national elite's failure to recognize the country's true countenance (Cosson 163).<sup>1</sup>

In Japan, the critical history of Naturalism begins with Shimamura Hōgetsu, who perceived Japanese Naturalism as a necessary development from the European movement and pointed to the necessity of clearly understanding the relation between Naturalism and Romanticism in order to reach a better understanding of the former.<sup>2</sup> Hōgetsu's criticism is grounded in historical analysis: for Hōgetsu, Naturalism was a special part of Realism, albeit one that held independent philosophical and aesthetic

principles. Such principles refer to a further difference in degree regarding the level of objective description employed in the process of writing. Realism would still be caught in a subjective perspective, while Naturalism would be relatively free from the uncertainty of opinionated appraisals of reality. According to Hōgetsu, Naturalism adopts the goal of rendering truth itself through literary description (310).

A second relevant evaluation of the movement among Japanese critics appeared in 1926 with the work of Kimura Ki, this time with a focus on the social dimension of literature and the role of the literary arts in the development of the Buraku Liberation Movement.<sup>3</sup> In the chapter “The Suihei Buraku Liberation Movement and the Literary Arts,”<sup>4</sup> Kimura provides a comparative historical analysis of socially engaged novels starting with Ivan Turgenev’s *Diary of a Superfluous Man* and Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, listing these works as portrayals of class struggle against serfdom in Russia and slavery in the United States. He cites Shimazaki Tōson’s *Hakai* as a fulfillment of and response to Lafcadio Hearn’s call for a literature engaged in consciousness raising. Kimura points to *Hakai*’s effectiveness in raising empathy towards the oppressed, a value that is enhanced by realist description and its capacity to disclose social injustice (“Suihei” 57).

In his subsequent work, *Meiji Bungaku wo Kataru*, Kimura remarks that Naturalism arose in contexts of persecution and oppression, suggesting the movement’s counter-hegemonic disposition. Alongside Shimazaki Tōson, he lists Tayama Katai, Kunikida Doppo, Tokuda Shūsei, Masamune Hakuchō, and Mayama Seika, as well as Shimamura Hōgetsu and Hasegawa Tenkei, as representatives of Japanese Naturalism. The influence of Russian literature, especially of Dostoevsky, on Tōso’s *Hakai* closes Kimura’s argument on the socially progressive character of Japanese Naturalism (*Meiji* 76).

As Anne McKnight has noted, since the 1930s Tōson’s *Hakai* has become the preferred starting point for young literary critics (69). Under this tendency, a critical interpretation of the Naturalist movement, and particularly of *Hakai*, appeared in the works of Hijikata Tetsu. Unlike the writings of Kimura Ki, Hijikata’s work belongs to the line of literary criticism that sprang directly from within the *burakumin* milieu and underwrote much of *buraku* activism in the second half of the twentieth century. The critic perceived the logic of Tōson’s novel—whose protagonist recoils from social activism in regard to his condition as former outcast and his subsequent decision to emigrate from Japan—as implying the acceptance of defeat in face of prejudice and exclusion. According to Hijikata, who defended the struggle for recognition attempted by the Buraku Liberation Movement, *Hakai* offered a feeble response to what otherwise required energetic political action and direct defiance. Hijikata criticized *Hakai*’s Naturalist technique for producing a distorted and prejudiced image of the *burakumin*, with Tōson’s exacting descriptions of his protagonist’s body temperature and of the *burakumin* villagers’ limited intellectual capabilities seen as unrealistic and discriminatory. After the Second World War, Hijikata led a movement against the republishing of *Hakai*.

Hijikata's critique of Tōson's novel points to the distinction between insider and outsider in the analysis of works involving fundamental rights and social struggle. This variable perspective suggests that what may generally appear to general readers as a literary standing against social injustice may conversely seem a form of stereotyping among members of the social group depicted. Hijikata's critique of *Hakai* has a striking parallel in the historical reception of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in the United States, with James Baldwin's criticism of Stowe's novel similar to Hijikata's perspective on *Hakai*,<sup>5</sup> as both Baldwin and Hijikata perceived a strong tendency toward superficial and discriminatory descriptions in these works.

Hijikata's charges against *Hakai* have been reinforced with recourse to some assertions Tōson made in reference to the *burakumin*. He is known to have professed the existence of a distinction between high- and low-class *burakumin*, a perspective that has been stressed by critics in order to support the claim that Tōson himself regarded the minority he depicted in his novel with prejudice (see Bourdaghs, "Disease" 652). Following Hijikata's critique of *Hakai*, Nakagami Kenji, also of *burakumin* origin, strongly repudiated Tōson's novel, regarding its protagonist as a defeatist, and his flight from Japan as precluding crucial social engagement and civil rights activism. From the late 1970s, Nakagami's criticism gave rise to a heated debate among Japanese scholars about the value and place of *Hakai*. More recent discussions of the novel and the theme of *buraku* activism have brought together Nakagami and important writers and critics such as Karatani Kōjin and Noma Hiroshi.<sup>6</sup>

137

In contrast to Hijikata and Nagakami, Kawabata Toshifusa takes a position closer to those of Hōgetsu and Kimura Ki, perceiving Tōson as a champion of social awareness and human rights conscience in Japan. In *Shimazaki Tōson no ningen kan* (*Shimazaki Tōson's Perception of Humanity*, 2006), Kawabata asserts that Tōson was capable of producing works of remarkable universality and that we should constantly revise the important questions he posed in his novels in face of the demands of the present time (*Shimazaki 2*). Kawabata also argues for the existence of a direct link between *Hakai* and the rise of human rights discourse in Japan. In *Hakai to jinken* (*Hakai and Human Rights*, 2003), Kawabata cites Tōson's protagonist's call for the recognition of his own humanity as the straightforward voicing of a human rights demand.<sup>7</sup>

It should be noted that much of the complexity of criticism of *Hakai* in Japan has to do with the novel's distinctive place in the history of Japanese letters, recognized as central both to the mainstream canon of *kokubungaku* (National Literature) and to the canon proposed by Kimura Ki as *buraku mondai bungaku* (Literature on the Burakumin Problem). *Hakai* also occupies a key place in the tradition of Japanese Naturalism, generally considered its foundational work. From a broader perspective, *Hakai* belongs to what McKnight calls the four nodes of linguistic sovereignty that established long-term reference points in *buraku* activist movements: the 1871 Emancipation Edict that abolished the outcast groups in Japanese society; the criticism of *Hakai*; the Suiheisha Manifesto of 1922; and the language of activ-

ism employed by *burakumin* liberation organizations against discrimination. For McKnight, these efforts to shape and exert linguistic sovereignty configure a unified set of strategies for rhetorical activism (39).

The above discussion provides evidence for the open-text nature and capacity of Brazilian and Japanese Naturalism for polysemic interpretation. Regarded as a historical/literary text with important sociopolitical dimensions, the movement lends itself to multiple and contradictory analyses. Whether following the lead of Sussekind and Hijikata and pointing to the existence of prejudiced views underlying the works of Brazilian and Japanese Naturalists, or otherwise accepting the readings of Paulino Bueno and Kawabata and perceiving a socially inclusive project motivating these writers, it is in great part the work of choosing perspectives. The following section proposes a reading of Brazilian and Japanese Naturalism that sustains its positive interpretation in terms of consciousness-raising regarding social injustice and in terms of its role in the emergence of a human rights discourse in each of these societies. It argues that, at least epiphenomenally, Naturalism had a positive effect on the building of a more inclusive notion of the human being and in the establishment of citizenship in Brazil and in Japan. The fundamental historical transformations that underlie the appearance of Naturalism lay the groundwork for the possibility of reading it as a catalyst for the promotion of humanistic ideals in two countries that are often regarded as late starters in human rights recognition and activism. More than simply the result of a European literary and artistic movement transplanted to the world's periphery, the emergence of Naturalism in Brazil and in Japan both reflected important changes and urged new forms of perception and behaviour. Engaging some of the developments occurring in the sciences, Naturalism portrayed deterministic aspects of human reality grounded in oppressive social arrangements while simultaneously denouncing these arrangements, using realist descriptions to uncover the human condition in the face of despotism and oppression.

## PERIPHERAL NATURALISM AND THE QUESTION OF ITS ORIGINALITY

The fact that Naturalism is primarily a European idea needs hardly be disputed. However, how it was adapted to the realities of Latin America and Japan, the extent to which it was original, and what it came to represent in each respective region in terms of changes in mentality and the transformation of institutions calls for a deeper examination. The question of originality is central to the purpose of this article because it reveals the distinct import assumed by Naturalism in Brazil and in Japan in comparison with the European original movement. Above all, it provides the link between the movement and the rise of human rights discourse in the societies in question.

In "The Travels of Naturalism and the Challenges of a World Literary History,"

Christopher Hill discusses Naturalism as a world literary phenomenon, by observing the distinct patterns of reception of the movement in Latin America and Asia. Hill notes that the Brazilian and Argentine movements developed from contact with French currents, and also in connection with the works of Spanish writers such as Benito Pérez Galdós and Emilia Pardo Bazán in Argentina, and Portuguese writers such as José Maria de Eça de Queirós in Brazil. Such a peculiar pattern of reception, according to Hill, accounts for a significant difference between the European and the Latin American movements (1199).

The transmission of Naturalism in East Asia involved both direct contact with French literature and a detour through English literature. The fact that Shimazaki Tōson was fluent in English, and learned French only later in his life, suggests the role of the English language, and of translation, in the emergence of Naturalism in Japan.<sup>8</sup> Naturalism in East Asia began in Japan and then progressed to China and Korea (Hill 1205).

A concise and very informative account of Naturalism's trajectory within Japanese letters appears in the work of Tōson's biographer, William E. Naff: 139

In the turn-of-the-century Japan in which Tōson was coming of age, these European movements—Romanticism, Realism, and Naturalism, the successive products of a century of evolution in their home territory—were all on stage at once, and Tōson was actively involved with all three. The late arrival of Romanticism and the absence of any precise analogy to nineteenth-century European beliefs in scientific determinism blurred this sequential relationship in Japan. (19)

Naff's account of the blurring of the sequential relationship between Romanticism, Realism, and Naturalism in Japan corroborates with Hill's suggestion that the introduction of elements of Romanticism and Modernism into Naturalism accounts for the peculiarity of Naturalism outside of France (Hill 1207). In Brazil, the classification of Aluísio Azevedo's *O Mulato* as a hybrid of Romanticism and Naturalism (Estramano de Almeida 20; Werneck Sodré 176) also coincides with the idea of a peripheral Naturalism whose originality would be based upon its capacity to combine different schools and styles into a diverse aesthetic composite.

The argument for the movement's originality in terms of its distinct aesthetic characteristics in comparison with the European model is valid from the point of view of how ex-centric writers adopted foreign styles in their works. It can be suggested, however, that this originality can be appraised not only from intraliterary factors, notably the mixture of aesthetic elements into a hybrid form, but also from extraliterary ones such as the social and historical conditions under which they appeared, and the role they came to play, in their respective countries. In other words, the specificities of Brazilian and Japanese Naturalisms are also due to the local realities writers faced in their realistic social portrayals, notably slavery in Brazil and the *buraku* question in Japan. By observing the social conditions underlying the works of Aluísio Azevedo and Shimazaki Tōson, we can better appraise the originality of their Naturalisms, and the role of Naturalism in the general advancement of social equality and in the

development of human rights discourse.

## FROM SENZALA TO BURAKU: BRAZIL AND JAPAN IN THE 1870S

140 The 1870s were an era of significant political transformations both in Brazil and in Japan, that served as a breeding ground for Naturalism in both countries' societies and literary traditions. In Brazil, 1870 marks the formal start of the Republican movement with the publication of Quintino Bocaiuva's *Republican Manifesto of 1870*. Naturalism first appeared in Portugal eight years later with the appearance of Eça de Queirós's *Cousin Basilio* (1878), which had important repercussions for Brazilian criticism.<sup>9</sup> In Japan, the 1870s marked the first years of the Meiji Restoration (1868) and the sudden influx of foreign literature into the country. Naturalism would emerge in the next decade, influencing the *genbun-itchi* movement that began in the 1880s (Amano 57). A major difference between the patterns of circulation of Naturalism in each country lies in the fact that in the early 1880s Brazilians were reading the French Naturalists, Zola in particular, in the original, while the Japanese had to wait for translations to appear. Zola's works made their way into Brazilian theatre as early as 1880, with adaptations of *Thérèse Raquin* and *L'assomoir* staged in Rio de Janeiro in 1880 and 1881, respectively (Faria 264; Mérian 187). In Japan, the first translation of Zola was Miyazaki Koshoshi's 1893 version of *La faute de l'abbé Mouret* (1875), titled *Bokuken* in Japanese, a translation that seems to have been made via an 1882 American version (Morita 124). Thus, where Aluizio Azevedo's *O Mulato* marked the beginning of Brazil's Naturalist movement in 1881, Kosugi Tengai's *Hatsusugata*, published in 1900, is considered a forerunner of Japanese Naturalism, and the movement would finally take shape with Tayama Katai's *Futon* (1906) and Tōson's *Hakai* (1907).

In spite of the late start of the Japanese movement and the significant aesthetic particularities that resulted, what is of interest here is how deeply rooted both movements are in the social and political transformations of the 1870s. In Brazil, the rise of the Republican movement paved the way for a new form of political critique. The Republicans' attacks on the monarchy, which had long been regarded as an instrument of the continuity of the European colonial rule evoked at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and thus as a guardian of the principles of the Holy Alliance, soon attracted the sympathy of the Naturalists:<sup>10</sup> the Brazilian Naturalist writers, such as Julio Ribeiro, Adolfo Caminha, Aluizio Azevedo, and Euclides da Cunha, were all Republicans. It should be noted that although the Republican movement itself did not take a uniform position on the question of slavery, all the Naturalist writers were combative abolitionists (Mendes 115).

Here lies the gist of Brazilian Naturalism's role in the rise of social awareness and human rights sensibility. The Republican movement's primary demand was the

establishment of provincial autonomy with regard to the central administration of the imperial court in Rio de Janeiro. Its liberal program was primarily political and economic, reflecting the long-standing dispute between centralization and decentralization discernable since Brazil gained independence from Portugal in 1822. In its claim for autonomy, the movement included provincial landowners who owned slaves and who were unwilling to free them anytime soon. The Naturalists opposed such provincial landed gentry, thus appearing at the vanguard of Republicanism; they enlarged the movement's scope into the realm of the social and worked to bridge the Abolitionist and Republican movements.

Abolitionism had a long history in Brazil, one that was initially unrelated to Republicanism. The movement is generally considered to have begun with José Bonifácio's denunciation of the system's immoral nature in the Constitutive Assembly of 1824.<sup>11</sup> It was only in the late 1870s, however, that a strong movement for the abolition of slavery took shape and gathered momentum. Two members of the intellectual elite, Joaquim Nabuco and José do Patrocínio, established the Brazilian Society against Slavery in 1880, and Nabuco's important book against the institution of slavery, *O abolicionismo*, appeared in 1883. The movement then began to gather significant support from politicians and intellectuals,<sup>12</sup> with the emblematic case that of Naturalist novelist Adolfo Caminha and his native state of Ceará. Brazilian literary historian Alfredo Bosi has called attention to the thriving literary environment existing in the city of Fortaleza in the late nineteenth century, where the Academia Francesa, founded in 1872, brought together a group of writers and intellectuals who fought for the abolition of slavery and the establishment of a republic (*História Concisa* 206). Although Caminha's first work would appear only in 1886 in the poetry volume *Voos Incertos*, the facts that Ceará became the first province to abolish slavery (in 1884), and that Caminha would become one of the paragons of Naturalist and anti-slavery literature,<sup>13</sup> most notably from the publication of his *Bom Crioulo* in 1895, suggest an engagement between Republicanism and Naturalism taking place in his province at the turn of the 1880s.

If the 1870s represented a moment of major political changes in Brazil, this was even more true of Japan, when in 1871, the Meiji government issued what came to be known as the *Eta Kaihō-rei*, the emancipation act that went hand in hand with the abolishment of the strict *shi-no-ko-sho* class system established in 1590 by Toyotomi Hideyoshi. Although this order merged the former *eta* and *hinin* outcasts with the general population, severe forms of discrimination against such former outcasts would continue, and even the new name for them, *shinheimin* (new commoners), still bore the trace of stigma. The *Kaihō-rei* would have important effects on literature, giving rise to what came to be known as *burakumin bungaku* (Burakumin Literature).<sup>14</sup>

Naturalism would come to play a major role in the establishment of the new Japanese self-identity starting in the 1870s. The Meiji Revolution touched upon various aspects of society, marking a rupture with what were now seen as evil customs from the past;

the pursuit of knowledge in a context of new social mobility and Westernization was expressly ordered in the *Gokajō no goseimon* (Oath in Five Articles), promulgated at the enthronement of Emperor Meiji in 1868. The abolition of the *han* feudal system in 1871 altered the power structure of the provinces and of its officials, an event that would be described in detail in Shimazaki Tōson's *Yoakemae* (*Before the Dawn*, 1929). The Meiji Constitution, conceived in Bismarckian fashion, was promulgated in 1889, the same year as the establishment of the Brazilian Republic, guaranteeing freedom of religion and the right to petition. Its design was influenced by the *Jiyū Minken Undō* (Freedom and People's Rights Movement), a political association established in the 1880s under the leadership of Itagaki Taisuke to fight for democracy. Literature was caught up in this revolutionary frenzy and soon explicitly separated itself from previous forms and styles.<sup>15</sup>

142 Tsubouchi Shōyō's *Shōsetsu Shinzui* (*The Essence of the Novel*, 1885) defended the treatment of the novel in aesthetic and artistic terms, rejecting what he perceived as a Manichean and utilitarian approach prevailing in the Edo period. He called for the objective description of social conditions and for narrative realism, using the concept of "transcriptive realism" or *shajitsu shugi*. His work is considered highly influential in the establishment of modern Japanese literature, and his analytical perspective, together with the incoming influence of Émile Zola, would inspire authors such as Kosugi Tengai and Nagai Kafū.<sup>16</sup>

Meiji's reforms would transcend the realms of politics and literature to reach language itself. In 1889, Yamada Bimyō published his "Outline of *Genbun-itchi* Theory," which identified the need to bring the written language close to the spoken one (Suzuki 44). Such a need would become the goal of the *genbun-itchi* movement, which would extend the idea of unifying written and spoken Japanese from Yamada's discussion of writing in general to all areas of literary production, including poetry. The movement also played an important role in the rise of Naturalism in Japanese literature. As Massimiliano Tomassi remarked, the surge of a strong Naturalist trend touched all areas of literature, and Naturalism's denunciation of traditional literary conventions and its call for a plain and direct mode of expression would become a breeding ground for *genbun-itchi* (127).<sup>17</sup> More recently, Seth Jacobowitz has shown how technological development influenced the process of the unification of speech and writing, offering a new perspective on how transcriptive realism influenced the making of modern Japanese literary styles.<sup>18</sup>

Embedded in the political, social, and linguistic revolution that began in the 1870s, Naturalism's call for objectivity and for a direct connection with reality would bring about a literature laden with strong social connotations, contributing to the rise of human rights sensibility and to the establishment of a discourse on equality that was previously unknown in either Japan or Brazil. If Naturalism transcended Machado de Assis's Realism in Brazil, outgrowing that author's emphasis on the psychological description of the country's upper class and incorporating new social types and subject matter, in Japan it moved beyond the Manichean approach of the Edo period

noted by Tsubouchi Shōyō and incorporated the new social, political, and linguistic aspects of the Meiji Restoration into an expression that included the plight of those who, until then, had remained at the margins of history and society. In legal and social terms, the parallel between the Japanese *Kaihō-rei* and the Brazilian Abolition, both occurring in the late nineteenth century, reveals the similar social contexts in which Naturalism emerged in both countries. The new *shinheimin* class in Japan bore significant similarities to the mulatto class of Brazil in terms of social stigma, with corresponding reactions discernible in each nation's literature.

## THE FACES OF STIGMA AND ABJECTION IN ALUÍSIO AZEVEDO AND SHIMAZAKI TŌSON

Aluísio Azevedo's *O Mulato* tells the story of Raimundo, a man who returns to his hometown of São Luís, in the northeastern Brazilian state of Maranhão, to sell the properties of his deceased father and then move south to settle in the capital, Rio de Janeiro. Raimundo is returning from his studies in Europe, where he had obtained his Law degree, something that was not unusual for upper-class Brazilian men during the nineteenth century. The protagonist is introduced as the epitome of charm and elegance, bearing the signs of a classic romantic hero, with the fair complexion of his father. Upon arriving in São Luís, he lodges in his uncle's house, where he becomes romantically involved with his cousin Ana Rosa. After asking his uncle for Ana Rosa's hand, he is rejected because he is a mulatto. Only then does he learn that his mother was a black slave with whom his father had had an affair. The novel ends with the tragic death of Raimundo and with the unrestrained triumph of evil, establishing a break away from the traditional Brazilian novel and producing a narrative laden with social criticism.

143

If Aluísio Azevedo fiercely condemns the irrational racial prejudice and the distorted values of northeastern Brazilian society in *O Mulato*, Shimazaki Tōson is no less critical of Japanese society in *Hakai*. His protagonist, Segawa Ushimatsu, is a former *eta* who manages to conceal his origins from his fellow workers in order to maintain his position as a teacher in a country school. Ushimatsu had promised his father never to reveal the secret of his origin, lest he meet with a disgraceful fate. He continuously witnesses prejudices against the *burakumin* in his workplace and in society at large, but he manages to remain faithful to the vow he made to his father. However, feeling a strong admiration for Inoko Rentarō, a successful writer and *burakumin* rights activist who openly defied social prejudice and embraced his *buraku* identity, Ushimatsu begins to sense the burden of a moral call to confess the truth about his background. Unable to bear the reproaches of his conscience, he finally confesses to his students the secret he had been keeping from them about his identity. After losing his teaching position, Ushimatsu emigrates to the United States to work in the Texas cattle industry, thus assuming a profession that marks his origin and of

deterministic faith as a *burakumin*.

The similarity between the two novels lies not only in the triumph of prejudice at the end of both, as Raimundo is murdered and Ushimatsu is forced to emigrate, but also in the lack of any discernible physical features that can account for the protagonists' social stigma. Just as Raimundo's race becomes an issue only after he is identified as the son of a black slave—in other words, just as his physical appearance per se is not a source of alienation in his life—Ushimatsu cannot be distinguished from his countrymen by physical signs. Raimundo's and Ushimatsu's fates issue from a peculiar sort of blemish that cannot be identified at first sight, but that still places upon them the mark of absolute personal undesirability and outright social unacceptability. Their stigma thus originates in something more profound than a general mark of aversion that is objectively distinguishable, but in a deep-seated and historically constructed negative evaluation of a specific social group from which extrication is impossible. Unlike a novel such as Zola's *Germinal* (1885), for instance, **144** in which social determinism and prejudice are directed against individuals who are immediately identifiable in their cultural context, specifically poor coal miners in northern France, in neither *O Mulato* nor *Hakai* can any noticeable signs of social discrimination be found.

Raimundo's and Ushimatsu's status signals a discrepancy between their virtual and their actual social identities. Erving Goffman's foundational work *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (1963) distinguishes between virtual and actual social identities. Actual social identities are the categories and attributes that an individual can be proved to possess, while virtual social identities are characterizations made in potential retrospect (Goffman 2). The incongruity between Raimundo's and Ushimatsu's virtual and actual identities disclose ingrained forms of social prejudice existing in their social sphere, under which their imputed virtual identities appear unblemished until information about their origins is disclosed; their actual identities, however, in so far as their moral reliability and physical features are not altered, remain unchanged. Goffman explains how a stigma constitutes a special discrepancy between virtual and actual social identity:

While the stranger is present before us, evidence can arise of his possessing an attribute that makes him different from others in the category of persons available for him to be, and of a less desirable kind—in the extreme, a person who is quite thoroughly bad, or dangerous, or weak. He is thus reduced in our minds from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one. Such an attribute is a stigma, especially when its discrediting effect is very extensive; sometimes it is also called a falling, a shortcoming, a handicap. It constitutes a special discrepancy between virtual and actual social identity. (3)

The shift in Raimundo's and Ushimatsu's virtual identities when they are found to belong to the categories of mulatto and *burakumin*, results from a complex misconstruction of the meaning of their backgrounds carried out in the context of a heavily discriminatory society, rather than from factual information about their identities. The disclosure of their background information and the ensuing virtual identity shift

denounces an ingrained prejudice of origin at work, recalling the notion of abjection as outlined by Julia Kristeva in *Powers of Horror: An Essay in Abjection* (1980). Upon being recognized respectively as mulatto and *shinheimin*, Raimundo and Ushimatsu are immediately identified as undesirable, filthy, and socially unacceptable. Their outward appearances, however, have not changed; nothing in their behaviour or personal presentation indicates any sort of debasement that might justify their exclusion from society. According to Kristeva, it is “not lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite” (4).

Once their origins are disclosed, Raimundo’s and Ushimatsu’s very subjectivity is subdued, and they become the object-other that fails to meet society’s established and idealized self-image. Even to themselves they become unacceptable: Raimundo abstains from social contact and withdraws to a country house, while Ushimatsu confesses his reiterated lie about his background and emigrates. The system they disturb is one that perceives the slave and the outcast as the fearful other, the being by which one defines oneself negatively, or as the very condition from which one should perennially attempt extrication, which Kristeva calls the abjection of self:

145

If it be true that the abject simultaneously beseeches and pulverizes the subject, one can understand that it is experienced at the peak of its strength when that subject, weary of fruitless attempts to identify with something on the outside, finds the impossible within; when it finds that the impossible constitutes its very *being*, that it *is* none other than abject. The abjection of self would be the culminating form of that experience of the subject to which it is revealed that all its objects are based merely on the inaugural loss that laid the foundations of its own being. (Kristeva 5)

For Raimundo and Ushimatsu, the abjection of self confirms the prejudice ingrained in their social milieu as an all-encompassing fear of falling: the stigmatized, abject self recognizes its own otherness and its perpetual sense of non-belonging. The falling perceived by society at large is that of the other’s condition: the debased *senzala* and *buraku* are the spaces of the abject, the territories of avoidance where falling into would mean retreating into self-loathing and abjection. Azevedo warns readers and characters alike about the danger of ever acquiring the status of a slave. After Raimundo’s father’s wealthy and racist wife Quitéria discovers that the black slave Domingas is the mother of her husband’s son, she orders Domingas to be punished in the *senzala*, the slave quarters:

Lying on the ground with her feet tied to a trunk, her head shaved and her hands tied at her back, Domingas stayed quiet, completely naked and with her genitals scorched by burning iron. At her side, the three-year-old son, screaming as if possessed, was attempting to hold her but was being constantly shoved by the whips of two blacks at the orders of Quitéria. The wicked one, standing up, terrible, intoxicated with ire, laughed, cursed all sorts of obscenities, howling in flagrant spasm of hatred. Domingas, almost dead, moaned, writhing on the ground. The chaos of her words and gestures already denoted the symptoms of madness. (Azevedo 53)

The cruelty towards Domingas demonstrates the abjectness of the *senzala*, which Azevedo describes as the locus of evil and wicked transgression:

The hut's interior had a repulsive aspect. Elongated spider webs hung sadly in all directions as if they were curtains made of decomposing fiber; the rain water, tinged in red earth, had left long bloody tears dripping from the walls and curling amidst the lizard's nests; in one corner one could see the abominable instrument of torture: it was a trunk of black wood with circular wholes used to fasten the arms, legs and necks of the slaves, showing still sinister bluish marks. (214)

Azevedo's late nineteenth-century denunciation of the *senzala* as a place of horror and atrocity parallels Tōson's early twentieth-century description of the *buraku* as a locus of abjection. The old *burakumin* custom of not serving tea to a visitor who was not a fellow outcast reveals the belief that a *burakumin's* house was an inherently polluted environment. In *Hakai*, Tōson depicts this reality by shifting the narrative to the impressions of Segawa Ushimatsu's *burakumin* aunt, who receives a guest in her

**146** house during Ushimatsu's absence:

The aunt then explained to Rentarō about the death of Ushimatsu's uncle. The flames in the fireplace burned intensely. As the water in the iron kettle began to boil, she started preparing the tea in a gentle, hospitable manner. Suddenly she realized the strangeness of remembrances, and a long forgotten habit came to her mind: the rule of an eta's house was to never offer tea, or even light the cigarette, of a visitor who was not himself an eta. Since the Segawas used to follow rigorously this custom, she realized that this sort of exchange, breaking with the old rule, started only after they moved to Himekozawa. (73)

The tenth chapter features a harsher description of the *burakumin* situation as Ushimatsu visits a slaughterhouse and sees the stigma embodied in the appearances of the young *burakumin*:

The ten or so young men employed here as slaughterers are all unmistakably *shinheimin*. They all have that sort of disagreeable appearance, with the peculiar color of their skin being particularly noticeable. One could say that in their reddened faces is imprinted the mark of stigma. Inside are also those that bear the stupid look of the low class *shinheimin*. Some of them look in our direction; others simply recoil in shame as if they were confessed criminals. (103)

Here the negative and immediately distinguishable features of the *shinheimin* contrast with the absence of these very features in Ushimatsu. The description itself lends further strength to the absurdity of Ushimatsu's persecution: were he to possess the identifiable features of an undesirable, the social prejudice directed towards him might be more understandable. By bringing the abject outside of his space of decay and by making him circulate within untainted society, Azevedo and Tōson denounce their social orders' entrenched prejudice in a time when severe social and political transformations were taking place in their countries. Remarkably, hardly any explicit examples of this sort of criticism can be found in mainstream Brazilian and Japanese literature before the advent of Naturalism and the foundational novels of Azevedo and Tōson.<sup>19</sup> It is also not surprising that, in the case of Japan, Tōson's *Hakai* is con-

sidered to be the starting point of both Naturalism and of *burakumin* literature.<sup>20</sup>

## LITERATURE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The general relation between literature and human rights has been given considerable attention in the past decade.<sup>21</sup> In *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (2007), Lynn Hunt argues for the existence of a direct link between the novel as an art form and the rise of human rights. Such a link would have originated with the novels of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and would operate by means of empathy, the humanitarian feeling brought about through engagement with the literary work. Hunt's argument focuses on Rousseau's epistolary novel *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* (1761), which she perceives as the point at which novels began to arouse a feeling that is conducive to human rights awareness:

Novels like *Julie* drew their readers into identifying with ordinary characters, who were by definition unknown to the reader personally. Readers empathized with the characters, especially the heroine or hero, thanks to the working of the narrative form itself. Through the fictional exchange of letters, in other words, epistolary novels taught their readers nothing less than a new psychology and in the process laid the foundations of a new social and political order. (Hunt 38)

147

Hunt's argument is especially relevant for this article because it draws important connections between the political events that shaped modernity, the sensibilities that shaped politics, and the literary developments that shaped sensibilities. She highlights the eighteenth century as the moment when modern empathy arose through the act of reading novels in Europe. Novels awoke new sensibilities and called individual consciousnesses into autonomy and mutual recognition. Personal autonomy, which sustains the moral capacity necessary for human rights endorsement, is seen as the result of cultural practice, and not as the product of an idea that can be simply instituted by law. According to Hunt, human rights depend on empathy, and empathy follows from the recognition that others feel and think as we do, that our inner feelings are fundamentally alike. Empathy, in turn, only develops through social interaction, and in the eighteenth century, readers of novels learned to extend their purview of communion and interaction with the other: through reading, they empathized across traditional social boundaries (Hunt 40).

Hunt's theory on the relation between the novel and the rise of human rights is based on the role of the Enlightenment and of the North Atlantic historical process in the shaping of a human rights sensibility that springs from engagement with novels. She points out that ancient Babylon, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam also contributed to the development of human rights, but suggests that those rights crystallized in Europe at the end of the eighteenth century (24), as a result of empathy born from literature crossing over to a series of political declarations of principles.

However, Hunt's theory overlooks developments in the relation between the novel

and the rise of human rights that occurred outside of the North Atlantic tradition. By focusing primarily on Rousseau's epistolary novel and on the historical role of the Enlightenment in the emergence of the three declarations that supported the building of the legal canon of human rights in the West—the American Declaration of Independence of 1776, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of 1789, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948—she reproduces the mainstream narrative of human rights as a product of North Atlantic history and values, only adding the psychological dimension induced by its particular literary tradition. Without considering the specifics of distinct geographical and literary realities, we are left with only a partial view of the relation between the novel and the emergence of human rights discourse and sensibility. Without disavowing the role of the Enlightenment in this relationship, an analysis of the peculiar routes through which such relation emerged in peripheral societies is essential in order to achieve a deeper understanding of how novels awoke sensibilities across cultures and different types of social arrangements. These routes may have been traversed with the baggage of original philosophical, social, and historical elements proper to the societies in question.<sup>22</sup> Thus, an inquiry that is not limited to a single geographic area, and that promotes a more inclusive understanding of the connection between the novel and human rights discourse is warranted.

148

A note regarding the relation between literature and the Enlightenment in Brazil and in Japan may help clarify the connection between the rise of human rights and the novel in these societies. This relationship has enjoyed a longer history in Brazil than in Japan. Enlightenment ideas played an important role in the political developments that led to Brazil gaining independence from Portugal in 1822, and poetry was interlinked with movements of liberation since the revolts of Minas Gerais in 1789 and Bahia in 1798. Up to this point, however, Enlightenment ideas worked more towards the promotion of national independence than to the advancement of individual rights. Much as the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of 1789 in France was concerned more with the rights of the bourgeoisie to own property than with individual human rights per se, Enlightenment ideas adopted by the colonial Brazilian liberation movement and its literature had a feeble connection with the concept of universal human freedom; the question of the abolition of slavery, for instance, was still left as a matter of debate in the political and literary movements of the period.

Signs of a strong understanding of human rights and of a call for the abolition of slavery became discernible in literature only in the late nineteenth century, notably in the poetry of Antônio Frederico de Castro Alves, whose *Vozes d'África* (1880), *O Navio Negreiro* (1880), and *Os Escravos* (1883) earned him the title "The Poet of the Slaves," and in Naturalist novels. Only then did Enlightenment ideas come to acquire the dimension of social critique that allowed human rights discourse and sensibility to emerge in poetry and the novel.

In his article "As ideias fora do lugar" ("Misplaced Ideas," 1973), Roberto Schwarz

examined the extent and feasibility of the adoption of Enlightenment ideas in Brazil.<sup>23</sup> Schwarz perceived Latin America as “peripheral” with regard to the central cultural locus from which Enlightenment ideas originated and were subsequently exported to marginal areas. The reception of these allegedly foreign ideas in Latin America would have involved unavoidable distortions, making opposites such as Liberalism and Marxism questionable in terms of local applicability.

Although it is obvious that the Enlightenment did not start in Brazil and that its main ideas were, to a certain extent, “received” in Latin America, Schwarz’s analysis overlooks an important cultural continuity existing between the latter and Europe. More precisely, the extent to which the Enlightenment could be considered foreign in a country such as Brazil, whose dominant culture was Portuguese and hence European, is doubtful. Since the Enlightenment also did not start in Portugal, should it be considered equally foreign in the latter, or more broadly in the Iberian Peninsula as a whole? Schwarz’s discussion hinged upon an emphasis on the Enlightenment as the product of a bourgeois society that could only be received awkwardly in what he perceived as non-bourgeois societies such as Brazil and Russia. But if that were the case, then would Portugal and Spain be bourgeois enough to be “Enlightened” according to Schwarz’s view?

149

Schwarz’s claim that “Latin Americans are condemned to ‘copying,’ that is, to thinking equivocally, using categories inevitably ill-suited to the reality they intend to represent” (Palti 152-53) can be refuted by observing the fissure between the Iberian Peninsula and Northern Europe, which was reproduced in the Americas and relativizes the idea of the “peripherality” of the American continent’s Latin portion. Similarly, why would Latin America be ill-suited for Enlightenment concepts while North America would, presumably, be not? Was the latter more “bourgeois” than the former at the end of the eighteenth century when Enlightenment concepts began to circulate? And if slavery was a measure for the local unsuitability of those concepts, what made Brazilian slavery more inadequate than its American counterpart? In sum, what made Latin America “peripheral” and North America “central” if both are non-European countries distanced from the Enlightenment’s original breeding ground? Schwarz’s argument stems from the Marxist perception that capitalism is a system based on exploitation, and that as such it necessarily produces a “centre-periphery” polarization internationally. He then transplants this economic view directly to the realm of culture, assuming that a clear relationship of domination exists between the opposites involved. As a result, the dominated periphery appears unfit to adopt the dominant centre’s ideas and concepts. Under this perception, the Enlightenment emerges as bourgeois/capitalist culture’s ideological arm.

In Palti’s terms, “the observation of ‘local distortions’ generated by the transposition to the region of discursive forms, ideas, and institutions originally alien to local reality does not allow one to draw the conclusion that ideas are always well placed in Europe and always out of place in Latin America, as Schwarz’s definition of the concept of ‘misplaced ideas’ may suggest” (162). Moreover, the “transposition”

in question must be qualified in light of the evident continuity of Western culture and civilization in the Americas. Finally, Schwarz's analysis appears dated and enmeshed in a Cold War mindset in which Latin America was constructed as *other* and *non-Western* by a Marxist ideology issued from the Soviet Union with the aim of extending its scope of influence over the region. How much Marxist scholars in the United States and Europe subscribed to this view is a question that transcends the scope of this article, but a naïve reading of Schwarz's text should, in any case, be avoided.

While the idea of the peripherality of Latin America in regard to the Enlightenment becomes compromised in view of the latter being part and parcel of a Western Culture that includes, in varying degrees, the Greek, Iberian, Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Turkish, Scandinavian, African, and other cultural traditions, a look at Japan, or, more generally, at East Asia, will provide a more viable example of otherness and peripherality in relation to the Enlightenment and its ideas. More specifically, if it is inadequate to speak of Latin America as *other* in regard to Western Culture, this may not be the case for East Asia. If we accept Schwarz's notion that Latin Americans cannot but "distort" Enlightenment concepts, how should the adoption of those same concepts in East Asia be regarded?

Students of Japanese history usually learn that Enlightenment ideas were introduced after the Meiji Restoration of 1868. Among scholars who challenged this notion, Timon Screech demonstrated that the Edo period was "absolutely shot through with foreignness" (Lippit 212).<sup>24</sup> Screech noted that a "mythic overlay" attempting to emphasize Japanese unity and uniqueness helped to produce the image of an Edo period free from foreign contact. How much influence from that contact can be discerned in Edo literature and culture is a matter of debate, but European ideas in nineteenth-century Japan must have been perceived as much more foreign than they were in Latin America. The question thus becomes how much the classification of *other* can be ascribed to Latin America when compared to East Asia. Should we allow a discussion of different *degrees* of otherness? In comparison with East Asia, is Latin America really culturally *displaced* in relation to Europe and North America?

From a strictly literary perspective, the transmission of Enlightenment ideas to Japan may be demonstrated by the influence of Rousseau on Shimazaki Tōson. If Tōson's *Hakai* is the foundational work of Japanese Naturalism, it could be seen as a Japanese version of Rousseau's *Julie*, which would corroborate with Hunt's theory. In its peculiar subject matter, however, and its underlying philosophical principles that were primarily absent from mainstream European philosophical tradition at the time of its composition, such as the Buddhist worldview in which the protagonist is immersed throughout the novel, *Hakai* suggests an original development in the relation between the novel and the rise of human rights awareness, one that, albeit influenced by Enlightenment ideas and ideals, cannot be dissociated from Buddhist or other original Asian philosophical underpinnings. In any case, it is important to note that Tōson demonstrated a stronger identification with Rousseau's *Confessions*

than with his novels.<sup>25</sup>

In *Human Rights, Inc.: The World Novel, Narrative Form, and International Law* (2007), Joseph Slaughter suggests a strong connection between human rights law and the *Bildungsroman*. Slaughter intentionally refrains from offering “an euphoric celebration of human rights; or a defense of the sentimental power of literature to arouse sympathetic understanding for the other” (6). Proceeding in a different direction from Hunt, he focuses on the relation between the individual and the nation state, with the insertion of the former in the latter a demand both of human rights discourse and of the *Bildungsroman*. Slaughter questions some of the formal shortcomings of human rights discourse, contending that its principles and language, as they appear in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, reach a high level of generality and practically dissolve into a non-referential form of pure rhetoric, inducing a fracture between the ideal and the real.

Much of Slaughter’s criticism of what he dismisses as the industry of human rights appears as a reenactment of the old critique of German idealism, here regarded in collusion with the ideological dimension of the *Bildungsroman*. The narrative of an individual’s coming of age and taking his/her correct place in society appears as part of the same ideological teleology that underwrites both the human rights rhetoric of individual autonomy and the *Bildungsroman*’s call for conformity with European values and its civilizational perspectives. The relation between human rights and the novel is thus no longer regarded in terms of the arousal of subjective feelings, but as the ideological component of human personality development under the aegis of the national state. The novel becomes the instrument of a civilizational endeavour that defines the human in its correct and idealized form, thus granting upon the subject a set of universal rights. However, the paradox that results is that for all its alleged universality, human rights depend on citizenship, and thus on the national state, for enforcement and realization. The exclusion implicit in the very concept of the foreigner defies the claim of universal human rights.

In Slaughter’s argument, the Kantian idea of the Enlightenment as intellectual autonomy appears imbricated in an ideological intent issued from a power centre whose aim is to impose its own values and way of life upon society at large, and hence exert control. Cultural forms such as the novel cooperate with human rights to establish a Gramscian sort of hegemony in favour of those very Enlightenment values and ideals. The *Bildungsroman*, with its idealist-ideological teleology, is thus a novelistic wing of human rights: its civilizational rhetoric of human development and subject formation supports the maintenance of the national state, which markets itself as the only possible form of human social arrangement.

Slaughter allows enough room in his discussion to rescue the *Bildungsroman* from dismissal as a mere ideological product. He explicitly remarks that “any particular *Bildungsroman* may be affirmative or critical (or both) of dominant social formations and of the discourse of development, but in this engagement, it is never indifferent to matters of human rights” (28). The type of *Bildungsroman* that carries the capacity

for effective social criticism in regard to the general ideological corporate dimension of human rights is called the *dissensual Bildungsroman*. It cosigns the ideal of the egalitarian imaginary while exposing eventual disparities and paradoxes that arise from specific instances of institutionalization. A further examination of the genre reveals the difference between the *affirmative* and the *idealist Bildungsroman*. The former “is the liberal public sphere’s most favored novelistic form for plotting human personality development and the acquisition of civil and human dignity as the normative story of modern socialization, liberation, and emancipation,” while the latter “naturalizes the discursive operations of hegemony as Gramsci described them; [it] plots the course of the individual’s socialization, tracing the path by which, in modern democracy, the particular comes to partake in, or to become itself an instance of, the sociohistorical ‘universal’” (Slaughter 146).

152 What is of interest here is the possibility of reading Azevedo’s *O Mulato* and Tōson’s *Hakai* as instances of a dissensual or affirmative *Bildungsroman*. The stories of both Raimundo and Ushimatsu involve a coming of age in the sense that both protagonists realize their unfavourable standing within societies that do not fully recognize their basic rights to autonomy and citizenship. Where Raimundo learns about his slave origins and about a racial configuration that he had never perceived as his own, Ushimatsu realizes that it is meaningless to continue hiding his identity as *burakumin*, because this identity will forever remain a source of social constraint. Both characters go through a process of self-discovery in which liberation is precluded in the face of severe social pressures. According to the laws of their countries, both are considered free men, but their path towards autonomy is obstructed in spite of the laws that allow them liberty: Raimundo never accomplishes his initial goal of selling his properties in his native Maranhão and then moving to Rio de Janeiro, and Ushimatsu never achieves full citizenship in his own country, opting instead for emigration to the United States.

Regarding Tōson’s *Hakai* and the relation between the individual and the Meiji State, Anne McKnight notes that the novel possess the important dimension of placing confession in the public sphere of the Meiji-era schoolroom: “With its imperial portraits, patriotic songs, and national holidays, *The Broken Commandment* [*Hakai*] is deeply concerned with how the sovereignty of the imperial state is exercised in small-scale routines of the daily lives of its characters. Sovereignty is strongly linked to a confession the main character, Ushimatsu, makes” (42). As the new Meiji-era citizenship was being constructed on the basis of imperial and linguistic power structures, former outcasts were hobbled in their path to achieve the recognition of a citizenship that was dictated by law. The disparity between the very commandment imposed by the 1871 Emancipation Edict (*Kaihōrei*) that abolished the denominations of “*eta*” and “*hinin*” and ordered the social integration of the outcast groups, and the reality of Ushimatsu’s social destitution discloses the novel’s dissensual *Bildungsroman* dimension. The “broken commandment” suggested in the English translation of the title might be understood as the breaking of the very law that commands acceptance,

a breakage that is confirmed in Ushimatsu's confession and subsequent emigration. The link between the State and the individual, or between the law and its subject, is exploded while the protagonist is only set free by the loss of his own citizenship.

From a broader perspective, the technical literary turn of Naturalism can be said to have allowed the engagement of the theme of shattered citizenship and human rights in *O Mulato* and *Hakai* both by fostering a feeling of empathy in the reader towards the protagonists, corroborating with Hunt's reading of the relation between the novel and human rights, and by depicting individuals whose path towards autonomy is frustrated and whose relation to the state involves a challenge in the fashion of a dissensual *Bildungsroman*, thus agreeing with Slaughter's interpretation. That technical turn, following Shimamura Hōgetsu's argument, defines itself in terms of Naturalism favouring truth over reality. Naturalism's preference for the depiction of realistic, and perhaps even sordid, detail allowed the themes of stigma and abjection to emerge in the narrative, disclosing the pathos of protagonists such as Raimundo and Ushimatsu. Sensing the constraints of stigma and abjection, the reader is expected to empathize with these characters who are precluded from achieving personal autonomy in spite of having passed the test of their respective countries' master narratives of citizenship: Raimundo has become a lawyer after studying in Europe, and Ushimatsu has become a school teacher upon succeeding in the required training system established by the laws of his country. Their debacles go against the very rules and expectations set in motion by society and the State.

153

In *Fighting Words: Polemics and Social Change in Literary Naturalism* (2013), Ira Wells reveals the sense of social and political engagement assumed by Naturalism in America. Authors such as Frank Norris and Richard Wright are read from the perspective of the aggressive controversy that underlies Naturalist writing. Wells regards polemics as the primordial impulse and the very essence of Naturalism, and the element that marks Naturalism's departure from Romanticism and Realism. Naturalism, according to Wells, has always been much less a unified "school" or movement than a polemical construct, and while naturalists were above all polemicists, they attempted to appeal to their readers' passions by using narrative devices such as melodrama and journalistic sensationalism. The fact that most American naturalist writers also worked in the press media accounts for their continuous attempts to bring together the discourses of the novel and the polemics of headline news. The imperatives of the Naturalist novel are therefore the imperatives of journalism (Wells 6).

As Naturalist writers used polemics and sensationalism to encourage social awareness in their readers, they also contributed to the fostering of consciousness that underlies the recognition of individual rights. This process, however, was not without contradiction. As Wells notes, the naturalists were products of their time. Most of them were proponents of eugenics and "racial hygiene," and the language of "fitness" and "defectiveness" or "superiority" and "inferiority" structures much of their thinking on race, criminality, nationalism, and social class (Wells 10). The Naturalists'

acceptance of racist and sexist ideologies, however, does not erase the fact that the true significance of Naturalism resides in the genre's very tendency to collapse the genteel opposition between art and politics (Wells 7). Although that collapse was made possible by sensationalism, melodrama, and journalistic overstatement, it did usher in social change, and the theme of social justice entered the domain of the novel with a new polemical vein.

Wells's attention to the American Naturalists' bridging novel-writing and journalism corroborates with Aluizio Azevedo's work as a cartoonist for newspapers that defended the cause of Republicanism, often ridiculing the royal family and the Brazilian empire, during the second half of the nineteenth century. Shimazaki Tōson also drew on local news about the treatment of *burakumin* when writing *Hakai*. Melodrama and sensationalism are present in both *O Mulato* and *Hakai*, and the rhetoric of polemics clearly underlies their depictions of characters who are prevented from achieving full citizenship. Polemics can thus be regarded as a major force

**154** Azevedo and Tōson used to call attention to their protagonists' unjust situations.

If the journalistic, sensationalist, and melodramatic dispositions that Wells identifies as major aesthetic constituents of Naturalism occur in the American, the Brazilian, and the Japanese versions of the genre, the ideology of racism and sexism perceived in American examples is less easily discernible among their Brazilian and Japanese counterparts. The connection of Brazilian Naturalism to Abolitionism and of Japanese Naturalism to Buraku Liberation make the case for reading the movement as socially progressive.

## NATURALISM AND THE BIRTH OF HUMAN RIGHTS DISCOURSE IN BRAZIL AND JAPAN

The political role of Naturalism in Brazil and in Japan, together with its capacity to awaken social conscience, can be estimated from the intersection between the literary movement and Abolitionism in Brazil and the *Buraku Kaihō Undō* (Buraku Liberation Movement) in Japan. Whereas Naturalism and Abolitionism went clearly hand in hand in Brazil, however, the connection between Japanese Naturalism and the Buraku Liberation Movement is less direct. This connection must be understood from the perspective of a historical process that includes the rise of social criticism in Japan during the Meiji era, the opening of a general discussion about new-comers at the turn of the twentieth century, the emergence of Naturalism and the publication of *Hakai* in 1906, and the founding of the National Levelers Association (*Zenkoku Suiheisha*), the precursor of the Buraku Liberation Movement, in 1922.

Although the Buraku Liberation Movement itself did not appear until the end of the Second World War, its precursor, the *Suiheisha*, established a new discourse on human rights in the period known as Taishō democracy.<sup>26</sup> In its founding assembly in Kyoto on March 3, 1922, the Association adopted the Suiheisha Declaration, a doc-

ument on individual freedom and social equality that was presented as Japan's first declaration of human rights.<sup>27</sup> The Movement was a bearer of Enlightenment ideals with a strong socialist inclination.<sup>28</sup> The general idea of a defence of human rights in Japan, however, dates back to the 1880s, when Meiji journalist, political theorist, and statesman Nakae Chōmin demanded the recognition of human rights and wrote one of the first articles that was sympathetic to the plight of the *shinheimin* (Leaman 428; Neary 39, 236). Nakae wrote discussions of democracy and critiques of the Meiji government, and published a translation of Rousseau's *Social Contract* in 1881 (Naff 614).<sup>30</sup> Given Tōson's interest in Rousseau since his teenage years, we can presume an influence of the *Social Contract*, and of Nakae's translation, on his intellectual formation, although Tōson appears to have identified more strongly with the *Confessions*.

The above discussion shows the connection of human rights discourse in Japan to the *burakumin* question. Tōson's work brought this question to the forefront of Japanese mainstream culture, and lent it enough heft to allow for the diffusion of *burakumin* literature as a special genre within the Japanese literary tradition.<sup>31</sup> Although the direct link between Naturalism and *buraku mondai bungaku* is not universally accepted in criticism, it is accurate to assert that the work of writers of *burakumin* origin such as Saikō Mankichi and Nakagami Kenji received a strong impulse from Tōson's Naturalist novel.<sup>32</sup> The understanding of the relation between Japanese Naturalism, Tōson's *Hakai*, and the *Suiheisha* Movement also supports the claims of Japanese critics such as Kimura Ki and Kawabata Toshifusa about the place of Tōson in the development of social criticism and human rights discourse in Japan.

155

In Brazil, the trend towards social criticism and human rights recognition found in Aluísio Azevedo's *O Mulato* in 1881 was carried into the period of the First Brazilian Republic (1889-1930). If slavery was the target of the Naturalists during the final part of the Brazilian Empire (1822-89), the harsh reality of the lives of the peasantry and the cruelty of the Republic's military forces in suppressing the rebellion of Canudos (1896) became the theme for Euclides da Cunha's *Os Sertões* (1902). Brazilian Naturalism thus entered the twentieth century with the same capacity for inducing human rights awareness that Aluísio Azevedo's works prompted in the late nineteenth century, as Eva Paulino Bueno remarks:

Brazilian naturalists were the first group of writers to turn to a de-centered, or ex-centric, gaze at the totality of the Brazilian society of their time, and to attempt to represent it as a whole composed of contradictory parts, each highly intensified and exacerbated, consisting of blacks, mulattoes, masculinized women and homosexuals or feminized men. (363)

If the strong connection between Naturalism and the development of human rights awareness in Brazil reveals itself from the perspective of the genre as the starting point of literary social engagement in the history of the Brazilian novel, this is also true in Japan, where Tōson's *Hakai* brings the *burakumin* question into the open in a way that was unprecedented in the history of Japanese letters. Both Tōson's *Hakai* and Azevedo's *O Mulato* suggested paradoxes and anxieties about the human condi-

tion, and thus opened the way for a new discourse on individual rights and on justice that established an original relation between the novel and human rights in their respective societies.

## NOTES

- 156
1. Cosson's analysis is based on a comparison between Sussekind's and Bueno's appraisals of Naturalism. Cosson takes the latter's side and points to an ideological and elitist predisposition running underneath the conformation of the Brazilian literary canon. Those critics responsible for the establishment of the canon would, in general, belong to an elite that favoured idealized depictions of the national reality, a current that was opposed by Naturalism's crude depictions of the country's marginalized populations.
  2. Hōgetsu's article "Bungeijō no Shizenshugi" appeared in the January 1908 edition of *Waseda Bungaku*. Hōgetsu traces the origin of Japanese Naturalism to Kosugi Tengai, author of the novel *Hatsusugata* (1900). Tengai is described as an avid reader of Émile Zola, and his novel, a story about a geisha and her relationships with men from various social strata, is considered a forerunner of the Japanese movement. Hōgetsu divides the history of Japanese Naturalism into two stages, one beginning around 1900 with Tengai's novel and the influence of Zola, and a later one represented by writers such as Shimazaki Tōson, Tayama Katai, Masamune Hakuchō, and Tōkuda Shūsei. For a detailed discussion of Hōgetsu's analysis of the history of Japanese Naturalism, see Suzuki (79). Naturalism, however, may have had an even more pervasive influence on Japanese letters than the one perceived by Hōgetsu in 1908. Already in the 1880s, the European current appears to have influenced the *genbun-itchi* movement, and in turn the work of poets such as Ishikawa Takuboku (see Ueda 100-03). Karatani Kōjin discusses the relationship of the *genbun-itchi* movement to Japanese Naturalism in *The Origins of Japanese Literature*, while a newer perspective on the subject appears in Indra Levy's *Sirens of the Western Shore*. Levy emphasizes the role of Western works and their translation into Japanese as central to the emergence of the *genbun-itchi* style. Massimiliano Tomasi examines Hōgetsu's naturalist literary theory and its import in the development of Japanese modern poetry in "The Rise of a New Poetic Form: The Role of Shimamura Hōgetsu in the Creation of Modern Japanese Poetry."
  3. The term *burakumin* refers to the outcast individuals who were left out of the so-called *shi-no-ko-sho* social system established in Japan in the late Muromachi period (1333-1573). The system established a division of four classes with limited social mobility. For a detailed discussion of this subject, see Amos, *Embodying Difference*. Amos notes that *burakumin* is essentially a twentieth-century Japanese term used to categorize a number of diverse socially distinct populations into one common group.
  4. Originally published in Japanese as *Suihei burako kaihō undō to bungei*, in *Bungei Tozai Nanboku*.
  5. James Baldwin's critique of Stowe appears in his 1949 essay "Everybody's Protest Novel," collected in *Notes of a Native Son*.
  6. For a detailed analysis of the contemporary debate on *Hakai* and Nakagami Kenji's views on the novel, see McKnight, *Nakagami, Japan*.
  7. Kawabata Toshifusa is one of the leading Japanese scholars on literature and human rights, whose works include *Hakai to sono shūhen: buraku mondai shōsetsu kenkyū* (*Hakai and Its Entourage: Studies on the Novel of the Burakumin Question*, 1984); *Hakai no yomikata* (*Reading Hakai*, 1993); *Kindai bungaku ni miru jinzen kan* (*Human Rights Views in Modern Literature*, 1995); and *Hakai to jinzen* (*Hakai and Human Rights*, 2003).
  8. For a discussion of Tōson's relation to the French language, see Naff (351-59).
  9. The works of Émile Zola would arrive in Brazil only later, and were largely read as sources of inspira-

tion for Queirós (Mérian 187).

10. These writers were undoubtedly influenced by the ideas Zola expressed in *La république et la littérature* (1879).
11. The idea of abolishing the enslavement of indigenous peoples dates back to the Portuguese Crown's law of 1576 that prohibited the capture and enslavement of indigenous populations in the colony except in the case of just war. The complete prohibition of indigenous slavery was decreed by Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo (1699-1782), Marquis of Pombal, in *Diretório dos Índios* (1755).
12. Since slavery was a supporting pillar of the imperial system, abolitionism and republicanism shared common interests, especially the overthrow of the monarchy and the abolition of slavery. The relation between these two movements, however, and as suggested above, was complex and not without contradictions. Nabuco, for instance, remained a monarchist until the end of his life, as he explained in his book *Por que continuo a ser monarquista* (1890).
13. Here the terms "anti-slavery" and "abolitionist" should not be confused. Caminha's novel was published seven years after the Abolition (1888), which in strict terms would disavow it as an *abolitionist* work. Its anti-slavery stance, however, remains in place, suggesting the persistence of the issue of slavery in Brazil after 1888.
14. A large body of research in English has been produced in the past decade regarding the theme of the new social relations established in Japan starting in 1871, with detailed examinations of the role of the so-called *shinheimin* (new commoners) and the development of *burakumin bungaku* (literature of the *burakumin*). This essay draws mostly from the works of Chapman, Andersson, Bourdagh, Neary, and Fowler. The term *buraku* is usually translated as "village" or "hamlet," and *burakumin* are the inhabitants of such spaces. The notion carries a strong negative connotation, as explained below.
15. The relation between the rise of the novel (*shōsetsu*) in Japan and the Freedom and People's Rights Movement has been remarked upon by Tomi Suzuki, who writes that "the rise of the new notion of the *shōsetsu* was directly related to the rise and decline of the Freedom and People's Rights movement and the consolidation of governmental power in the late 1880s and early 1890s. [...] The *seiji shōsetsu* (political novel), which emerged in the early 1880's, attracted a wide range of young, ambitious, intellectuals who developed an acute awareness of the complementary ideals of national and individual independence" (28). An important figure in the People's Rights movement, and in the establishment of human rights awareness and *burakumin* consciousness in Meiji Japan, was Nakae Chōmin, who is discussed below.
16. Both Kosugi's *Hatsusugata* (1900), the tale of a liberated geisha, and Nagai's *Jigoku no hana* (1902), the frankly narrated story of a woman's infidelity, bear a strong mark of Zolaism and are generally regarded as the starting points of Japanese Naturalism. Futabatei Shimei's *Ukigumo* (*Drifting Clouds*, 1887) is seen as having exerted especial influence on the movement from the point of view of realism. The novel is considered to be the first successful product of the *genbun-itchi* movement (Suzuki 31).
17. Here we should recall Shimamura Hōgetsu's perception of the relation between the *genbun-itchi* movement and the establishment of Japanese modern poetry. In his article "Isseki bunwa" ("One Night's Conversation," 1906), published in the magazine *Bunshō Sekai* (*The Literary World*), Hōgetsu defended the movement's proposal for the creation of a colloquial literary style, and predicted its future adoption by modern Japanese poetry (see Tomassi 122).
18. See Jacobowitz, *Writing Technology in Meiji Japan*. I am indebted to CRCL's anonymous readers who pointed out the relevance of Jacobowitz's work in regard to the discussion of *genbun-itchi*.
19. One might cite Bernardo Guimarães's novel *A Escrava Isaura* (1875) as engaging identity issues relating to race and slavery, even though the novel reproduces the aesthetic of Romanticism, conciliating the faith of the protagonist with the dominant social expectations and avoiding a harsh critique of the slave system. Although scholars have generally accepted the idea of a severe critique of slavery and prejudice as a clear feature of Azevedo's works, this is not always true of Tōson. For a further discussion of the symbolic violence inherent to the *burakumin* representations in Hakai and other

works, see Morris (139-43).

20. In his discussion of the role of Tōson's *Hakai* within *burakumin* literature, Fowler recalls that no fewer than fifty *buraku*-related texts, including fiction and theatre, appeared in the decades before *Hakai*'s publication (24). This article regards *Hakai* as a starting point for the genre by virtue of the important place it occupies within the general canon of modern Japanese literature. Although contenders disavow the role of *Hakai* as the apex of *burakumin* literature, it is hardly deniable that the treatment of the *shinheimin* by Tōson meant an impulse to the genre that cannot be underestimated. For an in-depth discussion of the formation of the Japanese modern literary canon and its relation to the oeuvre of Shimazaki Tōson, see Bourdaghs, *The Dawn that Never Comes*.
  21. For an overview on recent developments on the theme of human rights and literature, see Coundouriotis and Goodlad, "Comparative Human Rights: Literature, Art, Politics."
  22. Here the most obvious candidates in a list of original elements, although certainly not the only ones, would be the religious and philosophical principles of Buddhism in Japan, and of pre-Enlightenment Christianity in Brazil. An analysis of the role of such elements in the rise of human rights sensibility through the novel in the societies in question would involve a complex debate that transcends the scope of this article.
- 158**
23. See Schwarz, "As ideias fora do lugar." I would like to thank one of the anonymous readers of this article for pointing out the relevance of discussing Roberto Schwarz's ideas in this context.
  24. I am grateful to the anonymous readers of *CRCL/RCLC* who called my attention to Screech's research on foreign cultural contact in pre-Meiji Japan.
  25. The important role of Rousseau's *Confessions* in the intellectual development of Shimazaki Tōson has been pointed out in Naff (126). Tōson's own account of his encounter with the *Confessions* appears in Rousseau no Zange no naka ni midashitaru jiko (see Naff 541). Suzuki remarks that Tōson first read the *Confessions* in an English translation in 1894, at the age of 22, and that the first Japanese translation, by Ishikawa Gian, appeared only in 1912 (217). The Enlightenment ideas suggested here are those that must be taken into account as part of the philosophical underpinnings of Naturalism, which encompasses, for instance, positivist and socialist ideas that derive from the European Enlightenment.
  26. The term "Taishō democracy" was coined by Shinobu Seizaburō in *Gendai Nihon Seiji Shi, Taishō Demokurashii*. It designates the period encompassing the 1910s and early 1920s, when a significant number of movements marked by liberal ideology appeared throughout Japan, alongside the establishment of political parties.
  27. For a detailed account of the Declaration as the first concrete document on human rights activism in Japan, see Dessi (43-46).
  28. Socialism and communism were strong tendencies within the Suiheisha. For an account of the Communist Party Faction within the Suiheisha, see Neary (131-33).
  29. Nakae was a radical supporter of the Freedom and People's Rights Movement. For more on his political activism, see Miller (82).
  30. Here it is important to emphasize that, in spite of the criticism originating within the Buraku Liberation Movement against *Hakai* and its author, to negate a relation between the novel and the Movement would amount to denying a place to *Hakai* within *burakumin* literature and activism. Such an attitude would be contrary to the factual development of Japanese literary history. However, the Suiheisha Movement's official literary wing was constructed around the political novel, a distinct development from Naturalism and from Tōson's oeuvre.
  31. Fowler notes of the appearance of the genre known as *buraku mondai bugaku*: "Literature about *burakumin* exists from the early years of the Meiji period, the entry notes; but literature by *burakumin* does not appear until a full half century later, when Saikō Mankichi (1895-1970), born to a clerical

family in Nara Prefecture and a founding member of the Suiheisha (Levelers Association), began his modest but seminal writing career in the 1920s. This flowering of letters on the part of one individual from a Kansai *buraku*, however, did not lead to a broad, literature-led cultural efflorescence even remotely reminiscent, say, of the Harlem Renaissance in York” (22). For discussions of Saikō Mankichi’s works, see Kitagawa, *Saikō Mankichi to buraku mondai*; Yoshida, *Wasuresarareta Saikō Mankichi*; Watanabe Kimio, *Kindai bungaku to hisabetsu buraku* (421), and McKnight, *Nakagami, Japan* (44). Nakagami Kenji has received more critical attention, and his works tend to be regarded as of higher literary quality than Saikō’s. See McKnight; also see Watanabe Naomi, *Nakagami Kenji Ron*. Oddly enough, Tōson’s literature has also served the interests of the Japanese right-wing political camp. In *The Dawn that Never Comes: Shimazaki Tōson and Japanese Nationalism*, Michael Bourdagh’s comments on the rediscovery of Tōson by the Japanese literati in the 1930s. Tōson became particularly attractive to *tenkōsha*, former Marxists who had committed to *tenkō* (Dawn 25). The term *tenkō* refers to the political reversal of some Japanese socialists who after 1925 were primarily forced to renounce the left and embrace the Japanese Empire’s nationalist ideology.

## WORKS CITED

159

- Amano, Ikuho. “A Modernist Adventure in Translation: Ueda Bin’s Rhythmic Poetry as Kinetics of Mind.” *Japan Studies Association Journal*, 2011, p. 74.
- Andersson, René. *Burakumin and Shimazaki Tōson’s Hakai: Images of Discrimination in Modern Japanese Literature*. Department of East Asian Languages, Lund U, 2000.
- Azevedo, Aluísio. *O Mulato*. L&PM Editores, 1998.
- Baldwin, James. “Everybody’s Protest Novel.” 1949. *Notes of a Native Son*. Beacon P, 1955, pp 13-24.
- Bosí, Alfredo. “Cultura.” *História do Brasil Nação: Vol. 2—A Construção Nacional*. São Paulo: Fundação Mapfre e Editora Objetiva, 2012.
- . *História Concisa da Literatura Brasileira*. São Paulo: Cultrix, 1970.
- Bourdagh, Michael. *The Dawn that Never Comes: Shimazaki Tōson and Japanese Nationalism*. Columbia UP, 2003.
- . “The Disease of Nationalism, the Empire of Hygiene: Reading Broken Commandment.” *Positions*, vol. 6, no. 3, 1998, pp. 637-73.
- Bueno, Eva Paulino. “Brazilian Naturalism and the Politics of Origin.” *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 107, no. 2, 1992, pp. 363-95.
- . *Resisting Boundaries: The Subject of Naturalism in Brazil*. Garland Publications, 1995.
- Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Harvard UP, 2004.
- Cândido, Antônio. “De cortiço a cortiço.” *O discurso e a cidade*. Duas Cidades, 1995, pp. 123-52.
- Carvalho, José Murilo de. *Cidadania no Brasil: O longo caminho*. Civilização

Brasileira, 2011.

Chapman, David. "Geographies of Self and Other: Mapping Japan through the Koseki." *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, vol. 9, issue 29, no. 2, July 18, 2011, apjif.org/2011/9/29/David-Chapman/3565/article.html

Chevrel, Yves. *Le Naturalisme: étude d'un mouvement littéraire international*. PU de France, 1982.

Cosson, Rildo. "O Naturalismo na década de 70—O realinhamento do cânone." *Organon*, vol. 15, no. 30-31, 2001, pp. 161-70.

Coundouriotis, Eleni, and Lauren M.E. Goodlad. "Comparative Human Rights: Literature, Art, Politics." *Journal of Human Rights*, vol. 9, 2010, pp. 121-26.

Dessi, Hugo. *Japanese Religions and Globalization*. Routledge, 2013.

Echevarría, Roberto González. *Modern Latin American Literature: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford UP, 2012.

160

Endoh, Toake. *Exporting Japan: Politics of Emigration to Latin America*. U of Illinois P, 2009.

Estramanto de Almeida, Rodrigo. *A Realidade da Ficção: Ambiguidades Literárias e Sociais em O Mulato de Aluísio Azevedo*. Alameda, 2013.

Faria, João Roberto. "Zola et le naturalisme théâtral au Brésil." *Excavatio*, vol. 20, no. 1-2, 2005, pp. 258-73.

Felski, Rita, and Susan Stanford Friedman. "Introduction." *Comparison: Theories, Approaches, Uses*, edited by Rita Felski and Susan Stanford Friedman, Johns Hopkins UP, 2013, pp. 1-14.

Fowler, Edward. "The Buraku in Modern Japanese Literature: Texts and Contexts." *Race, Ethnicity and Migration in Modern Japan: Indigenous and Colonial Others*, edited by Michael Weiner, Routledge-Curzon, 2004, pp. 21-59.

Goffman, Erving. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Simon and Schuster, 1963.

Hill, Christopher L. "The Travels of Naturalism and the Challenges of a World Literary History." *Literature Compass*, vol. 6, no. 6, 2009, pp. 1198-1210.

Hōgetsu, Shimamura. "Bungei-jō no shizenshugi." *Kindai bungaku hyoron taikai*, vol. 3, edited by Yoshida Seiichi and Wada Kingo, Kadokawa Shoten, 1972, pp. 295-324.

Hunt, Lynn. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. W.W. Norton, 2008.

Hutchinson, Rachael, and Mark William. *Representing the Other in Modern Japanese Literature: A Critical Approach*. Routledge, 2006.

Ikari, Akira. "The Method of Naturalist Literature: Tokuda Shūsei in Perspective." *Hirosaki Daigaku Jinbun Shakai*, vol. 36, 1959, pp. 68-86.

- Jacobowitz, Seth. *Writing Technology in Meiji Japan: A Media History of Modern Japanese Literature and Visual Culture*. Harvard U Asia Center, 2015.
- Kawabata, Yasunari. "Fukuda Shūsei, I, Kaisetsu." *Nihon no Bungaku*, 9, Chūōkōronsha, 1967.
- Kawabata, Toshifusa. *Hakai no yomikata*. Bunrikaku, 1993.
- . *Hakai to Jinken*. Bunrikaku, 2003.
- . *Hakai to sono shūhen: buraku mondai shōsetsu kenkyū*. Bunrikaku, 1984.
- . *Kindai bungaku ni miru jinken kan*. Bunrikaku, 1995.
- . *Shimazaki Tōson no Ningen Kan*. Shin Nihon Shupansha, 2006.
- Kimura, Ki. *Meiji Bungaku wo Kataru*. Rakurō Shoin, 1934.
- . "Suihei buraku kaihō undō to bungei." *Bungei Tōzai Nanboku*. Shinchosha, 1926.
- Kitagawa, Tetsuo. *Saikō Mankichi to buraku mondai*. Nami Shobō, 1975.
- Kōjin, Karatani. *The Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Duke UP, 1993.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Columbia UP, 1982.
- Leaman, Oliver. *Encyclopedia of Asian Philosophy*. Routledge, 2013.
- Lesser, Jeffrey. *A Discontented Diaspora: Japanese Brazilians and the Meanings of Ethnic Militancy, 1960-1980*. Duke UP, 2007.
- Levy, Indra. *Sirens of the Western Shore: The Westernesque Femme Fatale, Translation, and Vernacular Style in Modern Japanese Literature*. Columbia UP, 2006.
- Lippit, Yukio. "Fantasies and Foreign Contact in the Art History of Japan: Timon Screech in Conversation with Yukio Lippit." *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 95, no. 2, 2013, pp. 212-18.
- Machado de Assis. "Eça de Queirós: O Primo Basílio." *Obra Completa de Machado de Assis, vol. III*, Nova Aguilar, 1994, pp. 903-13.
- McCormack, Noah. "Buraku Emigration in the Meiji Era: Other Ways to Become 'Japanese.'" *East Asian History*, no. 23, 2002, pp. 87-108.
- McKnight, Anne. *Nakagami, Japan: Buraku and the Writing of Ethnicity*. U of Minnesota P, 2011.
- Mendes, Leonardo, and Pedro Paulo Garcia Ferreira Catharina. "Naturalismo, aqui e lá-bas." *O eixo e a roda*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2009, pp. 109-27.
- Mérian, Jean-Yves. *Aluísio Azevedo, vida e obra (1857-1913)*. Espaço e Tempo/Banco Sudameris, 1988.
- Miller, Scott. *The A to Z of Modern Japanese Literature and Theater*. Scarecrow P, 2010.

- Morita, Norimasa, and Graham Law. "Japan and the Internationalization of the Serial Fiction Market." *Book History*, vol. 6, 2003, pp. 109-25.
- Morris, Mark. "Passing: Paradoxes of Alterity in *The Broken Commandment*." *Representing the Other in Modern Japanese Literature: A Critical Approach*, edited by Rachael Hutchinson and Mark William, Routledge, 2006, pp. 127-46.
- Naff, William E. *The Kiso Road: The Life and Times of Shimazaki Tōson*. U of Hawaii P, 2011.
- Neary, Ian. *Political Protest and Social Control in Pre-war Japan: The Origins of Buraku Liberation*. Humanities Press International, 1989.
- Palti, Elías José. "The Problem of 'Misplaced Ideas' Revisited: Beyond the History of Ideas in Latin America." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 67, no. 1, 2006, pp. 149-79.
- 162 Pereira, Lucia Miguel. *História da Literatura Brasileira, Volume XII, Prosa de Ficção (1870-1920)*. Livraria José Olimpio Editora, 1950.
- Schwarz, Roberto. "As ideias fora do lugar." *Estudos Cebrap*, vol. 3, 1973, pp. 150-61. Rpt. in *Misplaced Ideas*, Verso, 1992, pp. 19-32.
- Sebastião de Souza, Vanderlei. "O Naturalismo de Euclides da Cunha: Ciência, Evolucionismo e Raça em Os Sertões." *Fênix—Revista de História e Estudos Culturais*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2010, pp. 1-22.
- Shinobu, Seizaburō. *Gendai Nihon Seiji Shi, Taishō Demokurashii*. Nihon Hyōron Shinsha, 1954.
- Slaughter, Joseph. *Human Rights, Inc.: The World Novel, Narrative Form, and International Law*. Fordham UP, 2007.
- Sussekind, Flora. *Tal Brasil, Qual Romance?* Achiamé, 1984.
- Suzuki, Tomi. *Narrating the Self: Fictions of Japanese Modernity*. Stanford UP, 1997.
- Tomasi, Massimiliano. "The Rise of a New Poetic Form: The Role of Shimamura Hōgetsu in the Creation of Modern Japanese Poetry." *Japan Review*, vol. 19, 2007, pp. 107-32.
- Tōson, Shimazaki. *Gendai Bunken Taikei, 13 Shimazaki Tōson 1*. Chikuma Shobō, 1968.
- . *Rousseau no Zange no naka ni midashitaru jiko (Discovering My Self in Rousseau's Confessions)*. *Shimazaki Tōson Zenshū* 6, Chikuma Shobō, 1973, pp. 9-11.
- Ueda, Makoto. *Modern Japanese Poets and the Nature of Literature*. Stanford UP, 1983.
- Wada, Kingo. *Byōsha no jidai hitotsu no shizen shugi bungaku ron*. Hokkaido Daigaku Tosho Kankokai, 1975.
- Watanabe, Kimio. *Kindai bungaku to hisabetsu buraku*. Akashi Shoten, 1993.

Watanabe, Naomi. *Nakagami Kenji Ron: Itoshisa ni tsuite*. Kawade Shobō, 1996.

Wells, Ira. *Fighting Words: Polemics and Social Change in Literary Naturalism*. U of Alabama P, 2013.

Werneck Sodré, Nelson. *O Naturalismo no Brasil*. Editora Civilização Brasileira, 1965.

Yoshida, Tomoya. *Wasuresarareta Saikō Mankichi: gendai no buraku mondai*. Akashi Shoten, 2002.