

# The Afro-Asian Writers' Association and a Reimagining of Japan: Intersection of Imperialism and Nationalism

KWAK Hyoungduck\*

**Abstract** | This article investigates the relationship between the Afro-Asian Writers' Association (AAWA) inaugurated in 1956 and a reimagining of Japan. Existing until the 1990s, the Afro-Asian Writers' Association does not easily lend itself to a comprehensive treatment. This article thus focuses on the 1961 AAWA Tokyo Conference, examining how Japan came to participate in the so-called "Third World" literary movement. In 1960, a year marked by severe international tensions, AAWA representatives resolved to organize a conference in Tokyo for the purpose of demonstrating solidarity in the face of Japan's ongoing "security struggle." Yet even as Third World nationalism and solidarity emerged, the shadow of the past—imperialism—still lingered over postwar Japan. As the forces of nationalism and (neo)imperialism intersected in Asia and Africa, as well as in Japan, the AAWA Tokyo Conference served to dispel the shadow of imperialism and realize the hopes of Japanese authors endeavoring to establish solidarity with the Third World. However, the conference was also accompanied by criticism of Japan's past, and Japan found itself unable to smoothly take its place among the nations of the Third World as the controversy escalated. Questioning the political nature of literature and the responsibility of the author, this controversy served as an opportunity to reflect not only on Japan's past, but "contemporary" Japan and Japanese literature. In this manner, the article considers the significance of Japan's participation in the AAWA and its impact on postwar Japanese literature.

**Keywords** | Afro-Asian Writers' Association, Bandung Conference, nationalism, Cold War system, postwar literature, Ōe Kenzaburō

---

\* KWAK Hyoungduck (kwak202@gmail.com) is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Japanese Language and Literature at Myongji University.

## The Rise of Third-World Literature

Following World War II, newly independent nations in the Third World set out to establish their independence from the structure of the US-Soviet Cold War, then taking form. The “Cold War” refers to the postwar world order structured around the conflict between the US and the Soviet Union, each of which strategically deployed nuclear and conventional weapons through military alliances. But many of the states emerging after World War II emphasized nonalignment and neutrality, refusing to participate in the Cold War system. This shows how newly independent countries endeavored to free themselves of the constraints of the new world order that saw US-Soviet conflict develop into a global confrontation. From the position of these formal imperial domains in the Third World that had only just achieved independence, entry into the Cold War system was recognized as a path into renewed conflict and war.

As is well known, the Third World independence movement was proclaimed at the Bandung Conference in 1955. At the time, many countries in Asia and Africa were undergoing a process of nation-state building following independence from colonial powers, and the achievement of complete independence was an urgent task. Reflecting this historical change, the conference was attended by the likes of communist China and an independent India. The world order thus took on a new level of complexity, the character of which cannot be understood by reference to the US-Soviet conflict alone. Considering the deepening economic and military dependence of aligning with either the US or the Soviet Union, the nonaligned powers put forward the establishment of strong, independent states unfettered by the Cold War structure as their most urgent task. Meanwhile, having fiercely fought for independence under the colonial rule of Western imperial powers, these newly independent countries could not but feel a sense of revulsion toward the US’ postwar strategy of world domination. The so-called Third World independence movement viewed the US’ global designs as neo-imperialism, or “colonial domination for extracting maximum gains through means such as economic assistance and collaborative investment in the Third World rather than outright territorial division” (Im Tong-uk 2012, 82).

Organizing in response to US neocolonial rule and the tension (threat of war) engendered by the Cold War, the Bandung Conference served to challenge US-Soviet led international politics.<sup>1</sup> It is no difficult matter to infer that the US

---

1. Of course from a contemporary perspective, the “historical error” of the Bandung Conference is all too clear. Member countries closed their eyes to their undemocratic conduct, and their concentrated criticism of the great powers eventually led to accusations regarding their own

perceived the Bandung Conference as a threat to its global strategy, as evident in its establishment of Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in response to what it regarded as a communist threat (Miyagi 2001; Lee 2010). The Bandung Conference was significant insofar as it was the realization of the efforts of newly independent states to pursue possibilities outside of the Cold War system and imagine and practice an alternative world system.

On the Korean peninsula, however, the outbreak of the Korean War had already ensured the hardening of Cold War battle lines. In a situation where neither side could be free of US or Soviet designs, the Cold War divisions took root and participation in the wave of “anti-imperialism” represented by the Third World and the Bandung Conference was obstructed. For a time, the Republic of Korea (South Korea) would remain isolated in Asia, receiving no invitation to the Bandung Conference, let alone the Afro-Asian Writers Association (AAWA).<sup>2</sup> It was not that South Korean intellectuals had no desire to participate in the Bandung or AAWA conferences, but military rule commencing in the aftermath of the Korean War and April Revolution ensured they would have few opportunities to engage with the Third World. Interest in Third World literature nonetheless increased following Kim Chi-ha’s reception of the AAWA Lotus Prize for Literature, whereby publications of Paek Nak-chŏng’s *Understanding the Third World* (*Che 3-segye ũi ihae*, 1979) and Ku Chung-sŏ’s *Third World Literature* (*Che 3-segye munhangnon*, 1982) soon followed. Korea’s inability to participate in the AAWA, even as it demonstrated the characteristics of a Third World nation, cannot but appear as greatly unfortunate.<sup>3</sup> As the opportunity for solidarity between Korean and Third World literature disappeared under a military dictatorship that adopted anti-communism as state policy, Korean literature took on the character of “national literature” or “division literature,” divorced from any characteristics of the Third World. Be that as it may, this did not mean the utter insulation of Korea from the Third World’s imagined new world order or its cultural movement. As O Ch’ang-ŭn (2016, 32) points out, “The 1960s was a time in which [Korean] literary and

---

democratic regression. Faced with economic crises beginning in the 1970s, moreover, the solidarity of the Third World gradually broke down as these nations became economically dependent on the US.

2. Latin American writers began to participate in the AAWA in 1981. The organization then changed its name to the Afro-Asian-Latin American Writers’ Association.

3. Koreans participated in the Asia, Africa, and Latin America (AALA) Cultural Conference held in Kawasaki, Japan in 1981. Sin Kyŏng-rim published the collected and translated conference minutes in *People’s Culture and the Third World: Afro-Asian Cultural Conference Minutes* (*Minjung munhwa wa che 3-segye: AA munhwa hoeŭi kirok*).

intellectual figures pursued the possibility of overcoming division in the nonaligned movement, the Afro-Asian Third World, and the Bandung Conference, as they held on to pursuing the ‘Third Way,’ revealed in the April 19 Revolution.” But as the spirit of the April 19 Revolution was snuffed out by the military dictatorship, the possibility of connecting Korean literature with the Third World became severely restricted. The character of Korean literature today would undoubtedly be different if it had been allowed solidarity with Third World writers and to view itself in a non-Western space from the 1950s or 1960s.

Ironically, the formerly imperialistic nation of Japan was able to participate in and perform an important role at the Bandung Conference and in the AAWA as the country reemerged as a major actor in international society following its defeat in the Pacific War. Despite regaining its “sovereignty” through the San Francisco Peace Treaty (1952), Japan was under the protection of the vast US nuclear umbrella, so how was Japan able to participate in these two organizations? In a situation in which US troops were occupying Japanese territory (e.g. Okinawa), it should have been difficult for Japan to attain the right to speak at the Bandung Conference, which was inaugurated under the banner of anti-imperialism. Furthermore, Japan’s background during World War II as an imperial power occupying much of Asia was decidedly different from that of the other nations participating in the Bandung Conference. In explaining the eventual participation of Japan, despite such a troublesome past, one might look to Japanese nationalism emerging at the time. After signing the San Francisco Peace Treaty, the path toward rejoining international society was open to Japan, which Japanese citizens supported. As the Japanese economy underwent a rapid recovery following the Korean War, the aspirations of the Japanese people expanded to include establishing a “normal country” free of US domination. Japanese politicians strove to realize this aspiration, even as they sensed the weary eye of the US. Considering Japan’s domestic situation and its people’s desires, Japan’s participation in the Bandung conference was actually an urgent matter.

The issue, however, was that the spirit of the Bandung Conference ran counter to US global strategy. Considering this international situation, it is therefore possible to infer that Japan would have required US permission to attend the Bandung conference. As attested to by recent research, Japan cooperated closely with the US embassy in Tokyo regarding participation in the Bandung Conference (see Miyagi 2001). It would have looked very bad for the US if word was leaked that it was forcefully preventing Japan from attending the conference, despite its intentions as a sovereign nation. Japan would have seen

the conference as an opportunity to mitigate civil dissatisfaction by reemerging on the international stage. Furthermore, as one can infer based on the US expectation that Japan might serve as a check against China and India at the conference, Japan's participation was certainly not completely divorced from US interests.

Meanwhile, in the 1960s, as the AAWA movement was gaining momentum, Japan's fierce security struggle engendered an environment in which Japanese writers earned the right to participate in the AAWA. In 1960, when the security struggle reached its climax, AAWA representatives resolved to hold a conference in Japan in the spirit of solidarity with the security struggle. Nevertheless, despite the rapid rise of nationalism and the solidarity of the Third World, the specter of the past (imperialism) yet lingered over Japan. In 1960, nationalism and (neo)imperialism were intersecting in Japan and all over Asia and Africa. Amid this process, the Emergency Meeting of the Permanent Bureau of Afro-Asian Writers took place in 1961. This gathering championed a vision of Japanese writers banishing the imperialist specter and establishing solidarity with the Third World. Would Japanese writers be able to escape the past and establish solidarity with Asia and Africa by participating in the AAWA? How would Japanese writers respond to the intersection of nationalism and imperialism under the Cold War system? This article attempts to answer these questions, focusing on 1961 Japan, when the significance of the AAWA became linked with Japan's security struggle.

## **The History of the Afro-Asian Writers' Association**

The AAWA was formed in 1956 and dissolved in the early 1990s when the Cold War came to an end. What is less well known is the fact that the movement behind this organization persisted into the late 1990s in Japan and Latin America. The AAWA existed over a long period, traversing such momentous historical events as the security struggle in Japan, Sino-Soviet split, Vietnam War, and Cultural Revolution. Considering the degree to which the AAWA was directly influenced by the vicissitudes of world history, it is not easy to understand comprehensively. Instead, it should be approached in terms of a limited timeframe or by individual countries or writers, with the synthesis of such findings put off for a later date. Research on this topic is still in the early stages and requires a bibliographic methodology organizing relevant records and literary works. One such method would involve analysis of the memoirs and commentaries of central AAWA figures. Particularly when investigating the

relationship between the AAWA and Japan, one cannot but look at the records of those who played central roles in this movement. The memoirs of literary critic Kurihara Yukio, although he is by no means one of Japan's better-known authors, are certainly worthy of attention. A key figure in the New Japan Literary Society (*Shin Nihon Bungakukai*), Kurihara participated in the AAWA movement beginning with his involvement in the Japanese chapter of the AAWA, the experience of which formed the basis of his voluminous memoirs. To begin, one may look at the manner in which he encapsulated the relationship between Japan and the AAWA:

*But the "Asian-African era" was also the "era of Sino-Soviet split." Since the site of this confrontation was mainly in the Third World, the freshly initiated Afro-Asian Writers' Association movement was quickly swept up in that conflict. The Afro-Asian Writers' Association in Japan (then known as the Afro-Asian Writers' Association Japan Council) would experience the same fate, as it was increasingly subject to the interventions of the Communist Party. In 1966, the international Afro-Asian Writers' Association split along Sino-Soviet lines, and in the following year the Japan Council fractured into three groups. Shunning this organizational conflict and division, Noma Hiroshi engaging in individual exchanges with both Chinese and Soviet authors during this era. He began to participate in the international Afro-Asian Writers' Association once he received the Lotus Prize for Literature in 1973. ... In the 1970s, great changes occurred in many of the nations of Asia and Africa that subtly influenced the writers' movement. Despite the essential realization of political independence by Afro-Asia Writers' Association member countries in the 1960s, the failure to also achieve economic independence exacerbated deepening dependence on the capitalist core. (Kurihara 1991, emphasis added)*

Kurihara provides an intelligible description of the relationship between the AAWA and Japan over the 1950s to 1970s. In sum, the Japanese chapter of the AAWA split into three as the AAWA itself underwent internal conflicts in relation to the Sino-Soviet split, and the Japanese AAWA revolving around Noma Hiroshi (this last part is not mentioned in the passage) succeeded them in 1974. The following table provides a summary of AAWA activities based on Kurihara's records (Kurihara 1989).

As evident in the table above, the AAWA split along with China and the Soviet Union in the early 1960s, and separate Chinese or Soviet-led conferences were held until the late 1960s when China withdrew from the association with the onset of the Cultural Revolution. From the third AAWA conference onward, the Soviets had a free hand in running the association.<sup>4</sup> While the historical

---

4. Unlike with the Bandung conference, the Soviet Union was able to participate in the Third

**Table 1.** Brief Chronology of the AAWA

Conference	Location	Date	Remarks
First Asian Writers' Association Conference	New Delhi	December 23, 1956 (one week)	Attended by fifteen nations, more than 150 participants
International Preparation Committee	Moscow	June 2–25, 1958	Attended by Arab Union, China, Soviet Union, India, and Japan Resolution to invite Africa to second association conference
Inauguration of Japanese Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee			Name later changed to Afro-Asian Writers' Association Japan Council
First AAWA Conference	Tashkent	October 7, 1958 (one week)	Attended by about two hundred participants from thirty-five countries
Permanent Member Nations' Conference	Colombo	January 3, 1961 (one week)	Attended by Ceylon, China, Indonesia, Sudan, UAE, Soviet Union, and Japan Resolution to hold emergency conference in Tokyo in March 1961
Tokyo Conference	Tokyo	March 28–31, 1961	Organized by AAWA Japan Council Attended by eighty-four participants from twenty countries
Second Conference Preparation Committee	Cairo	February 12–March 2, 1961	
Second AAWA Conference	Cairo	February 27, 1962 (sixteen days)	
Permanent Secretariat Conference	Colombo	October 4–7, 1962	Treatment of Vietnam War as emergency issue
Cairo Conference	Cairo	June 29–30, 1963	Inauguration of critical "council" on China Resolution to transfer Permanent Secretariat to Cairo Soviet Union declared disqualified at the Colombo Permanent Secretary Conference (actually run by Beijing) in response
Beijing Emergency Conference	Beijing	June 27–July 9, 1966	Attended by 161 participants from fifty-three countries China-led conference Fierce opposition from Cairo
Cairo Secretariat Emergency Conference for Supporting Vietnam	Cairo	August 30–September 1, 1966	Soviet-led conference Severing of relations between Soviet Secretariat and Japan Council Communications later reinstated via New Japan Literary Society Japan Council was subsequently dissolved

Table 1. (continued)

Conference	Location	Date	Remarks
Third AAWA Conference	Beirut	March 24–31, 1967	First conference since division Attended by forty-three nations China withdrew from association due to Cultural Revolution Establishment of Lotus Prize for Literature Attended by thirteen guest nations, mostly from Europe Japan largely represented by New Japan Literary Society members
Tenth Anniversary Conference	Tashkent	September 21–25, 1968	
Fourth AAWA Conference	New Delhi	November 17–20, 1970	Attended by thirty-two nations
Fifth AAWA Conference	Almaty	September 4, 1973 (nine days)	
Twentieth Anniversary Conference	Tashkent	October 7, 1978	
Sixth AAWA Conference	Angola	June 29–July 1, 1979	
AAAL Cultural Conference	Kawasaki	November 4–5, 1981	Attended by Koreans such as Sin Kyŏng-rim
Seventh AAWA Conference	Tashkent	September 26–October 11, 1983	
Eighth AAWA Conference	Tunis	December 8–12, 1988	AAWA disbanded with end of Cold War Afro-Asian writers' movement in Japan disbanded in late 1990s
<b>Other Activities</b>			
Creation of Japan Afro-Asian Writers' Association, "Japan's Independent Organization"	Tokyo	May 25, 1974	Noma Hiroshi is first chairman and Hotta Yoshie is first secretary
Establishment of International Relief Committee	Tokyo		Kim Chi-ha and Ugūgi wa Thiong'o relief activities
Japan-Arab Cultural Solidarity Conference	Tokyo, Osaka, Fukuoka	June 27–July 4, 1974	Invitation of Palestinian authors such as Mahmoud Darwish and Adonis



changes characterized by the likes of the Sino-Soviet split, Vietnam War, and Cultural Revolution can hardly be summed up in a table such as the one above, such events are clearly reflected in serious internal conflicts within the AAWA. In particular, at one such historical inflection point, the AAWA "Japan Council" divided into conflicting factions (Beijing faction, independence faction, New Japan Literary Society Liaison Office faction) supporting the Soviet Union, China or neither. The Beijing faction was the first of these to disband, and since the independence faction was hardly active, the New Japan Literary Society soon became the main AAWA participant.

Looking at the table above, one can see that the Tokyo Conference—this paper's focus—took place prior to the Sino-Soviet split. Key details regarding this conference are provided in the following passage:

The Afro-Asian Writers' Association Tokyo Conference was attended by eighty participants from a total of twenty countries: eight from Africa, and twelve from Asia, including Japan [as some of these were not yet technically independent it would be more accurate to say there were twenty territories]. At the General Assembly, the agenda of "the international circumstances confronted by two continents and the duty of the writer" was introduced. At the first discussion session, issues included national independence and peace, imperialism, colonialism, and military bases. Second session issues included national cultural and international cultural exchanges. Third session issues included threats to journalists and writers. (Abe 1961, 256)

Looking at the Tokyo Conference, it is clear that attending members were most concerned with the question of how the "nation" would achieve or maintain independence under the threat of US and Soviet "imperialism" and "colonialism." In particular, "neoimperialism," distinguished from its predecessor in terms of the use of military bases over direct occupation, was a major issue at the conference. Moreover, one can also sense just how urgent the issue of national independence was by recognizing that the Tokyo Conference was held directly after the signing of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the US and Japan on June 19, 1960. In this sense, the Tokyo Conference was inherently opposed to Japan becoming a US military base. This dissent is palpable in the lyrics of the conference's commemorative song, "The Sun Rises":

Asia, Africa! The Sun Rising for the Future / Asia, Africa / Rising up and crying

---

World literary movement. There is a need for research pertaining to this participation in the contexts of the "honeymoon relations" between the Soviet Union and China in the 1950s as well as Soviet writers' support for the Afro-Asian writers' movement.

out / The hands of two billion / Now and here / Plant your feet / Let your song be heard / The people of the World / Their solidarity and liberty / The people of the World / Their independence and peace / Waving / Waving / Our flag / Soaked in blood and sweat / Under the mountains and on the sea / On the vast future sky / Over two continents / Waving. (Commemorating the AAWA Tokyo Conference in March 1961) (*Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōgikai* 1961, 3)

As evidenced in this song, the nations that attended the AAWA Tokyo Conference were full of self-awareness and hope regarding a newly emerging era. Although looking back, the domestic and international circumstances of these nations appear quite severe, at the time, the energy of revolution (particularly the Cuban Revolution) was intense enough to consider this an “era of revolution.” On the other hand, the Cold War system had been taking root in Asia since the Korean War. In particular, US bases established in Okinawa, on the Japanese mainland, and in Korea disseminated the Cold War system. As Japan’s security struggle commenced with the signing of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the US and Japan, “revolution” became a real possibility, albeit not in the same sense as in Cuba. As a literary movement initiated in the name of transcending the Western-centric order through the power of Third World literature, the AAWA welcomed the Japanese security struggle in terms of its potential to undermine the Cold War system. However, the domestic situations in these countries were complicated, and the movement was characterized by numerous contradictions and problems unexplainable through the logic of revolution and counterrevolution alone. Kurihara, for instance, questioned the idea of the Third World as a single totality. But the suppression of democracy and the AAWA’s nationalistic character were also growing concerns (Kurihara 1989). At the time, however, thoughts of revolutionary change naturally outweighed those of its limitations.

### **The Significance of the Afro-Asian Writers’ Association Tokyo Conference**

Inaugurated in earnest following the Bandung Conference in 1955, the AAWA garnered attention as an anti-colonial, anti-imperial movement endeavoring to overcome the Cold War system. For most of the states involved in the AAWA, having recently achieved independence from colonialism, steadfast autonomy and state building were emerging as important issues. While nationalism is often interpreted in terms of exclusivity and ethnicity, the nations of the Third World recognized nationalism at this time as something positive, capable of

engendering solidarity on the grounds of resistance to imperialism. Thus, this movement tended to focus on the question of how to develop the nationalism of newly independent countries into international solidarity. Asian and African nationalism, in other words, was distinguishable from Western nationalism in terms of calls for the “solidarity of the weak” (Takeuchi 1981b, 7). It was the AAWA movement’s emphasis on political solidarity transcending race, culture, and the state that endowed it with international and diplomatic qualities beyond the scope of a mere literary movement. On the other hand, this global reach also entailed the possibility of the movement running aground due to political circumstances in individual countries.

One cannot but conclude that, having been an imperial aggressor in World War II and now being a core member of the global system, Japan’s participation in this movement was quite unusual. As Mizutamari Mayumi points out, Japan occupied an “exceptional position” among the AAWA participating states (see Mizutamari 2014) in terms of its imperialist history. But even as Japanese writers at the time criticized the many transgressions of the Japanese Empire, they also recognized Japan’s current “colonial status,” relating it to the Third World.

After the Meiji Restoration, Japanese perceptions of Asia unfolded in a diverse and complex manner incommensurate to the well-known slogan, “Leave Asia, Join the West” (Takeuchi 1981a). One can certainly say that calls to “leave Asia and join the West” existed during the Meiji period, but the Japanese Empire also occupied Asia in the name of liberating it from the Western Great Powers. In particular, the idea of “Greater East Asia,” expounded as the Sino-Japanese War expanded into the Pacific War, was one component of the call for Asian unification. While this ideology naturally served to justify assimilation, it was not simply empty rhetoric. Although during the war the Japanese media depicted the enemies of Japan as anomalies instigated by the West, it generally depicted China in a positive light (Gomibuchi 2015). This fact also serves to overturn the commonly held idea that Japan tended to demean and demonize China. In this respect, one can assert that Japan desired to “leave Europe and join Asia” and did not simply disregard Chinese intentions. While the situation changed considerably as the Japanese Empire collapsed in defeat, its participation in the Bandung Conference and the AAWA after the war could be said to be an expression of Japan’s desire to take its place once again among the nations of Asia and confront the West.

Nonetheless, this desire ran counter to the Japanese state’s position as an agent of neocolonialism in the 1960s. As the Cold War system set in, the Japanese writers’ movement was compelled to break free of the confines of Japanese society and enter the world at large. Japan’s position as mediator in the

AAWA was made possible, one might infer, by its situation in the 1960s. Following defeat, Japan entered a kind of colonial situation with the US military occupation. Thus, when the San Francisco Treaty was signed, many Japanese began to long for the transition to a sound sovereign state, and nationalism in Japan began to gain strength in the 1950s. The vibrant development of the debate around national literature in Japan was not indirectly related to the rise of this nationalist sentiment at the time. In that sense, one can say that both nationalism and internationalism (solidarity between nations of the Third World) existed in postwar Japan in the 1960s. However, as Japan's subordination to the US set in with the signing of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the US and Japan under the Cold War system, the Japanese people's anger began to reach extreme levels. Characterized by this so-called "security struggle," the 1960s were a time of impassioned nationalism in Japan over the humiliation of becoming a site for US military bases.

The fact that the AAWA Tokyo Conference was organized in support of Japan in the midst of the security struggle is worthy of attention. This is well reflected in a statement of the Indian-Afro-Asian Solidarity Writers Committee at the AAWA Tokyo Conference: "We express solidarity with the Japanese people in their courageous struggle against imperial forces and their agents intent on establishing nuclear weapons bases in Japan. ... Indian writers would like to take this opportunity to express their solidarity with Asian and African writers and peoples struggling against imperial rule, colonialism, and all forms of racism, and for national liberation and human rights" (*Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōgikai* 1961, 256). Under these conditions, Japanese writers united with Third World writers under the banners of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism to begin a vibrant solidarity movement. Meanwhile, the inability of Taiwan and "Chosŏn" (Republic of Korea and People's Democratic Republic of Korea) to attend the Tokyo Conference meant that Japan's confrontation with the past would be somewhat mitigated.

Japan's active participation in the AAWA was made possible by its colonial status and the fact that its authors attending the conference shared with the newly emerged nations of Asia and Africa the goal of fighting the common enemy of the US Empire to win "liberty." Also, the Japanese writers that participated in the AAWA belonged to the "postwar democracy faction," which adopted an introspective attitude to toward Japan's past, albeit to differing degrees, and this allowed them to avoid any conflict with writers attending from other Asian countries. However, coinciding with a historical context characterized by the intersection of imperialism and nationalism, Japan's participation in the AAWA could not but lead to friction. The following passage written by

Ōe Kenzaburō after attending the Tokyo Conference demonstrates Japanese intellectuals' conflicted feelings at the time:

Nakano Shigeharu and Kamei Katsuichirō, two representatives from Japan, did not forget to speak of Japan as an aggressor. It was all but natural that Japanese representatives alone should make comments pertaining to imperial aggression, and the other delegations were impressed. *However, we should also have acknowledged Japan's continuing role on the side of aggression in international politics, which I think would have presented a crucial opportunity with respect to the relationship between Japanese writers and Japanese politics.* ... Flowery proclamations of friendship between Asia and Africa echoed throughout the convention hall. But I think the acknowledgement of how Japanese political behavior betrays Africa and Asia, even if these were foreign delegations, was not adequately addressed at the conference. I also think the criticism that we avoided making this wholly clear is a legitimate one. (Ōe 1961, 270-71, emphasis added)<sup>5</sup>

Ōe Kenzaburō, who was a newly emerging writer at the time, bitterly reveals Japan's predicament better than any other writer who attended the Tokyo Conference. Pointing to the folly of erecting a new social edifice on a foundation tainted by the foul vestiges of imperialism, Ōe recognized their situation at the intersection between imperialism and nationalism better than other Japanese writers. It is for this reason that the individual AAWA councils in each member country cannot be simply defined as "anti-government"<sup>6</sup> organizations (Sugimoto 1961). In this respect, it looks as if Japanese writers who participated in the AAWA intended to shoulder for the state the load of a dark past irreducible to an individual level.

Japanese writers advanced under the banner of anti-imperialism and dreamed of solidarity with Third World writers, even as the image of imperial Japan lingered, embracing the difficult task of overcoming these contradictions. The possibility of accomplishing this, as Ōe Kenzaburō pointed out, lay in self-criticism and introspection. Speaking purely in consequential terms, considering that the AAWA movement in Japan bypassed serious self-criticism and introspection, it could not but demonstrate the real limitations of achieving solidarity with the rapidly changing Third World. One could say this reflected Ōe Kenzaburō's failure to occupy the main stream of the Japanese AAWA

---

5. For related comments, see Matsuoka (1961).

6. It is well known that Sugimoto Tatsuo was a scholar of modern Chinese literature who focused on Lao She. At the time, having graduated from Osaka University of Foreign Studies majoring in Chinese language, he participated in the Tokyo Conference as a volunteer assisting Chinese writers with interpretation and the like. In the work cited here, he was severely critical of certain Japanese authors who looked down on authors participating in the conference from Africa and Asia.

movement, which was intimately related to the writers of the postwar democracy faction, including Ōe, taking responsibility for the war and their perception of Asia. Rather than self-criticism and introspection regarding the past, these writers seemed focused on reforming the newly revitalized “nation.”

However, the consciousness of Japanese writers participating in the Tokyo Conference varied, and cannot be explained in general terms. This is because, in 1961, this group’s demographic composition consisted of members in their mid-twenties (Ōe Kenzaburō) to fifties (Kamei Katsuichiro and Ishikawa Tatsuzō). While the consciousness of these writers cannot be neatly categorized by age, there were clear differences by age regarding their evaluation of Japanese aggression, the war, and levels of cooperation with the war effort. Those in their youth or middle age during the war had to participate and thus could not be free of that responsibility. Besides, since writers forcefully mobilized to participate in the war had been agents of Japanese imperial propaganda, memories of the war remained deeply engrained, regardless of their introspection and rejection of their part in it. In that sense, the eruption of criticism regarding these writers’ past experiences (cooperation in the war) amid the AAWA Tokyo Conference was quite a natural phenomenon. Ōe Kenzaburō, in particular, having been a child during the war and thus less personal attachment to it, could take the lead in this regard.

As (neo)imperialism and nationalism intersected in postwar Japan, the issue of how to situate “contemporary” Japan became the ideological task of the times. In the 1950s, thinkers such as Yoshimoto Takaaki, Fujita Shōzō, and Tsurumi Shunsuke produced research on Japan’s way forward. But the rise of national literature under Japanese writers and Takeuchi Yoshimi’s revisiting of the fundamental question of Japan’s place in Asia through his research on China were closely related to this historical background. In this respect, despite epistemological limits and errors, one can say that Japan’s participation in the AAWA presented opportunities to dispel the shadow of the past and escape the Cold War system into a new world.

## The Writer’s Responsibility

Extensive criticism was levied against writers who had cooperated with the Japanese imperial war effort as they began to take on a role in the AAWA around the time of the Tokyo Conference. This criticism was in the same vein as that regarding authors who had been wartime cooperators aligned with the main figures of the prewar proletarian literary movement and who also argued

for Japan to take responsibility for the war around the time when “The Pursuit of War Responsibility in Literature” (*Bungaku ni okeru sensō sekinin no tsuikyū*, New Japan Literary Society, March 1946) was published. The following passage is from this work:

The War was over but new literary creativity was poor and chaotic, having only recently been initiated. This speaks to the reality that we, the agents of creativity, were severely oppressed during the dark and seemingly endless days of war. Our spirits and bodies distorted by oppression cannot be restored until we endure new creation. Such restoration will not be easy, since our bodies were smashed and our blood dirtied by wounds large and deep that did not heal without difficulty. It is ourselves that we must first do battle with. ... *Therefore war responsibility in literature, more than anything else, is our first problem. This begins with our engagement in self-criticism. In a free world, trickery cannot abide. We take the initiative to question, examine, and criticize what we did during the war. By doing this, I think we can clarify our responsibility for the deplorable depravity and corruption of Japanese literature over the past ten years.* (Odagiri 1946, emphasis added)

The reconstruction of Japan (in spirit) through devastating self-criticism formed the core of the New Japan Literary Society's argument for war responsibility. But this was only a proposal—complete realization under US military rule was unattainable. Meanwhile, the task was further complicated by evidence of cooperation with the war effort among even critically minded authors. Ozaki Hotsuki thought it irresponsible to participate in the Tokyo Conference when Japanese writers were not doing all they could to self-criticize and take responsibility for the past. He was furious, in other words, at the contradictory situation, declaring that Japanese writers who had cooperated with the Japanese Empire must this time overthrow the new US Empire:

The “Journalists and Writers' Conference” held before the Sino-Japanese War, the “Greater East Asian Writers' Conference” held toward the end of the Pacific War, and the “Afro-Asian Writers' Association Conference” held in March 1961 each convened in Tokyo, Japan. ... What has changed in the exchanges between Japan, China, Asia, and Africa between the “Greater East Asian Writers' Conference” and “Afro-Asian Writers' Association Conference”? ... There are those in the Japan Council, for example, who also attended the Greater East Asian Writers' Conference. *What is it these writers understand as the disjuncture between this Tokyo Conference and the Greater East Asian Writers' Conference? What continuities do they perceive? What might have changed and how in these writers? It would be good if this were recognized as the writers' responsibility. As a writer, to*

*neglect this recognition is unforgiveable.* (Ozaki 2013, 33-67, emphasis added)<sup>7</sup>

Ozaki Hotsuki's criticism of the AAWA Japan Council pertained to the failure of Japanese writers who participated in this movement to clearly acknowledge the continuity between the pre- and postwar periods, instead acknowledging only disjuncture. It was not just Ozaki, but many intellectuals following the AAWA Tokyo Conference who paid close attention to these writers:

The roots of the conceit in thinking that Japan is the most advanced nation in Africa and Asia and the delusion that Japan is the leader of Africa and Asia are deep. This nonsensical superiority deeply permeates their bodies and shows on their faces, even among the most respected of writers. I was furious at the vast majority of Japanese representatives among those assisting in managing the AAWA Conference who did not treat equally the "nameless representatives of small and weak nations." (Sugimoto 1961)

Naturally this description did not apply to all of the writers who attended the AAWA Tokyo Conference. But might have the AAWA Tokyo Conference commenced without clear appreciation of disjuncture and continuity, as Ozaki criticized? Before answering this question, it will be worthwhile to briefly mention the nations and representatives that attended the Tokyo Conference. With eight countries and twelve representatives from Africa and twelve nations and seventy-two representatives from Asia, there were twenty countries and eighty-four representatives altogether. There were twenty-six representatives from Japan, the details of which are as follow:

Ishikawa Tatsuzō, Abe Tomoji, Bon Shiraishi, Sata Ineko, Aono Suekichi, Hirotsu Kazuo, Hotta Yoshie, Kaikō Takeshi, Kamei Katsuichirō, Kinoshita Junji, Kusano Shinpei, Matsuoka Yōko, Miyake Tsuyako, Nakagawa Masafumi, Nakajima Kenzō, Nakano Shigeharu, Niwa Fumio, Noma Hiroshi, Ōe Kenzaburo, Okakura Koshirō, Sakamoto Tokumatsu, Satō Shigeo, Serizawa Kōjirō, Takeuchi Yoshimi, Takeuchi Minoru, Yanaihara Isaku. (Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōgikai 1961)

Looking at the list of Japanese writers who participated in the Tokyo Conference, it is clear that, as Ozaki pointed out, there were those who had

---

7. I have slightly changed the notation of proper nouns and so forth. The quotation is from Ozaki Hotsuki, *Kindai bungaku no kizuato: kyū shokuminchi bungakuron* (The Scars of Modern Literature: Colonial Literature) (Iwanami Shoten, 1991), which is based on Ozaki Hotsuki, *Kyū shokuminchi bungaku no kenkyū* (A Study of Colonial Literature) (Keisō Shobō, 1971).



participated in the Greater East Asian Writers' Conference<sup>8</sup> and/or the war effort. Among attending nations, there was Ceylon, China, Indonesia, Japan, Chosŏn, Laos, Lebanon, Mongolia, Vietnam, and the Soviet Union. While it is notable that the Soviet Union was considered a part of Asia, what is particularly interesting was the participation of "Chosŏn," a nation without a specified territory. The writers who attended the Tokyo Conference under the ambiguous title of "Chosŏn" (such as Hŏ Nam-gi) were affiliated with *Chongnyŏn* (The General Association of Korean Residents in Japan) and adhered to Pyŏngyang literary policy. This was due to the fact that Japan did not permit the participation of writers from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). South Korea was also unable to attend due to the chaotic circumstances following the April 19 Revolution.

Looking at the minutes of the AAWA Tokyo Conference collected in *Afro-Asian Writers' Association Tokyo Conference (Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Tokyo Taikai)*, there were many ways in which the Tokyo Conference succeeded the Greater East Asia Writers' Conference, just as Ozaki criticized. This was particularly so with regard to format and itinerary.<sup>9</sup> This means that the management of literary conferences was more or less carried over intact following the war. There is, however, still room to consider Ozaki's comments further. Once again, he wrote: "What is it these writers understand as the disjuncture between this Tokyo Conference and the Greater East Asian Writers' Conference? What continuities do they perceive? What might have changed and how in these writers? It would be good if this were recognized as the writers' responsibility. As a writer, to neglect this recognition is unforgiveable" (Ozaki 2013). Reading the AAWA Tokyo Conference minutes and relevant commentary, there was evident controversy over criticism and introspection pertaining to Japan's aggressive war. While the Japanese writers who attended the Tokyo Conference did not explicitly specify the "disjuncture" between the Greater East Asia Writers' Conference and the AAWA, they did engage in critical introspection concerning Japanese colonial rule. Ozaki's criticism, however, still stands insofar as it was directed at writers such as Kamei Katsuichiro who attended both the

---

8. The first Greater East Asia Writers' Conference was held in Tokyo and Osaka from November 3-10, 1942. The second conference was held in Tokyo from August 25-28, 1943. The third conference was held in Nanjing, China from November 11-15, 1944.

9. The conference itinerary lists the following: There was a leading representatives meeting and welcoming ceremony on March 27; a general meeting on March 28; a general meeting, group meeting, and draft committee meeting on March 29; a leading representatives meeting, general meeting, commemorative lecture, and Kabuki viewing on March 30; a trip to Kansai on March 31; a commemorative lecture on April 1; a tour of Kyoto and a reception on April 2; and a return to Tokyo on April 3.

Greater East Asia Writers' Conference and the AAWA Tokyo Conference.

If Ozaki criticized the past conduct of writers attending the AAWA Tokyo Conference and Japan as an aggressor, Ōe Kenzaburō did more to extend such criticism to the “present”:

The government made little effort with regard to this conference; the Cabinet was indifferent and the Ministry of Education was silent. When they did act it was to interfere with Democratic People's Republic of Korea representatives. ... “Representatives from twenty Asian and African countries attended this conference today, but representatives from our nation, which is nearest to Japan, were unable to attend due to the unfriendly manner of the Japanese government. I think it quite sad that the only choice left was to attend as writers of Korean ethnicity residing in Japan. I am thankful to the Japanese Preparation Committee, which worked tirelessly in this regard” (comments of Hō Nam-gi). These comments were deeply touching to the Japanese authors. ... Algerian writer Malek Haddad asked Japanese authors why Japan should not hold a literary conference together with West Germany, a question they found quite saddening. ... To be frank, perhaps Malek should have proposed a conference together with Korea rather than Germany. Such a conference is necessary, and should involve not only Japan and the Republic of Korea but also the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This would be a difficult, unenviable task for those who oversee it. But it may sprout into what the Japanese people need, both in terms of truth and politics. Perhaps such a conference might even be more urgent than one with Chinese writers. (Ōe 1961, 268-70)

As can be gleaned from the title of the work from which this passage was taken, “Was It Political?” Ōe was overtly critical of the Tokyo Conference. Those who criticized the conference's themes—anti-imperialism, anti-military base, and anti-alliance—as too political to be handled by writers shared this point of view. Asserting that the AAWA Tokyo Conference was a literary movement, the political nature of which accorded with the logic of prevailing circumstances, Ishikawa Tatsuzō wrote the following: “Many countries in Asia and Africa are currently cooperating in the struggle to break free of colonialism and achieve national independence and freedom. This may be objectively regarded as a political movement, but I think that speaking from the subjective perspective of the parties directly concerned, it is an ideological and literary one” (Ishikawa 1961, 21-22). One may evade the controversy surrounding the political nature of a literary conference by questioning literature's potential to provoke meaningful change, a capacity that is difficult to explain in terms of a simple “culture versus politics” dichotomy. Indeed, the very conceptualization of literature's political nature as a problem attests to literature's great substantive capability (see Kwak Hyoungduck 2014). In Korea's case, the recently increasing calls to revive the

politically imaginative power of literature demonstrate the degree to which literature's substantive capability has declined. In 1960s Japan, however, literature illustrated the potential to affect meaningful political change under a solidifying Cold War system. The AAWA Tokyo Conference was thus held in a time in which literature's utility was widely acknowledged. This was different from the situation prior to the Pacific War, when increasing recognition of literature's utility (political nature) meant its use by political forces as Japan became embroiled in the Sino-Japanese War. Nonetheless, these eras are similar insofar as each was characterized by the increasing power of literature. Each may be evaluated differently, however, according to whether literature was "used" by politicians or directly by writers. Criticism of writers' participation in the war effort was due to the fact that literature's power had been used in the implementation of the war, ensuring the wartime system would firmly take root. The AAWA Tokyo Conference, which took place in postwar Japan at the intersection of imperialism and nationalism, was thus a site at which literature's political nature once again became the subject of earnest debate.

## **Postwar Japanese Literature and the World**

In this paper, I have attempted to shed new light on the significance of the AAWA Tokyo Conference. This international symposium attempted to transcend the scope of national literature, forge solidarity with the Third World, and establish a new anti-imperialist world. Research on the AAWA Tokyo Conference is thus crucial to exploring the links between postwar (Japanese) literature and the world. It was at this time that Japanese literature set out to form a connection with the Third World and its own ideological landscape while acknowledging Japan's past wars of aggression. The AAWA's vigorous development in Japan also coincided with the formation of intimate connections between Japanese literature and Okinawan writers, as well as ethnic Korean writers residing in Japan. In the 1970s, however, as the AAWA's public awareness and power diminished, Japanese literature began to move toward a more mainstream position, embracing diversity rather than solidarity with ethnic Korean and Okinawan writers.

It was not a coincidence that the AAWA Tokyo Conference was held as large-scale resistance to the US-Japan security system arose in Japan. Evidence of this resistance, which Third World representatives recognized as an "independence" movement oriented toward escaping a semi-colonial status, is apparent throughout the AAWA Tokyo Conference minutes. In this respect, US

military presence in Japan and the security system played important roles at the AAWA Tokyo Conference. These conditions led Third World writers to disregard the Japanese past and stand with Japan against a “common enemy.”

To complement these findings, future studies should investigate how writers such as Hotta Yoshie, Noma Hiroshi, Ōe Kenzaburō, and Oda Makoto were able to actively participate in the AAWA for such a lengthy period of time. Only then may the relationship between the AAWA and postwar Japanese literature unambiguously emerge. Over the course of successive AAWA conferences, writers like Hotta Yoshie, Noma Hiroshi, Ōe Kenzaburō, Oda Makoto, Takeda Taijun, and Shimao Toshio wrote about what they perceived as the Third World while engaging in exchanges with Third World writers, but research in this regard is still insufficient.<sup>10</sup> These writers, representative of postwar Japanese literature, became deeply imbued with the spirit of Third World literature as they participated in AAWA conferences, which by all accounts transformed aspects of postwar Japanese literature. In particular, through the AAWA conferences, albeit within certain limits, these writers endeavored to comprehend Japan’s past role as aggressor and forge new relationships with Asian and African writers by observing territories previously occupied by imperial Japan in a new light. By participating in the AAWA, in other words, one can say that these writers adopted a fresh view of the disjuncture and discontinuity between the pre- and postwar eras, situating Japanese literature within the realm of “world literature.” Revisiting the movements of these authors during this era and investigating their works in terms of solidarity with the Third World allows one to see postwar Japanese literature in a new light and gain perspectives that might dispel the taboo against Japanese literature in Korea, allowing it to disseminate anew.

• Translated by Keiran MACRAE

*Acknowledgements* | This article is the revised and translated version of the author’s Korean article, “Asia-Ap’ūrik’a Chakka Hoe’ui wa Ilbon: Chegukchu’ui wa naesyōnōllijūm ūi kyoch’a chidae,” published in *Ilbon hakpo* [The Korean Journal of Japanology] 110 (2017), with the permission of Han’guk Ilbon Hakhoe [Korea Association of Japanology].

10. For literature relevant to this topic, see *Gendai Arabu shōsetsu zenshū* (Collected Modern Arab Novels, 1978); Nihon Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi (Japanese Afro-Asian Writers’ Association, 1978b, 1978c, 1979), which were transcripts of public lectures; Nihon Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi (Japanese Afro-Asian Writers’ Association, 1978a), a product of field research; and Noma (1974) and Noma and Hotta (1976), records of the Japanese-Arab literature Solidarity Association. I have omitted individual works because I am still investigating them.

## List of References

- Gendai Arabu shōsetsu zenshū* [Collected Modern Arab Novels], 10 vols. 1978. Tokyo: Kawade Shobō Shinsha.
- Abe Tomoji. 1961. "A·A Sakka Kaigi no seika" [The Achievement of Afro-Asian Writers' Conference]. *Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōgikai* [Afro-Asian Writers' Association Japan Council]. 1961. *Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Tokyo Taikai* [Afro-Asian Writers Association Tokyo Conference]. Tokyo: Ajia Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōgikai.
- Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōgikai [Afro-Asian Writers' Association Japan Council]. 1961. *Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Tokyo Taikai* [Afro-Asian Writers Association Tokyo Conference]. Tokyo: Ajia Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōgikai.
- Gomibuchi Noritsugu. 2015. "Tekusuto to iu na no senjō" [A Text is a Battlefield of Names]. *Nihon bungaku* [Japanese Literature] 64.
- Im Tong-uk. 2012. *Segyehwa wa munhwa chegukjuūi* [Globalization and Cultural Imperialism]. Seoul: Kōmyunikeisōn Puksū.
- Kurihara Yukio. 1989. *Rekishī no dōhyō kara: Nihon-teki "kindai" no aporia o kokufukusuru shisō no kairo* [From the Signposts of History: Circuitous Thought Overcoming the Aporia of Japanese "Modernity"]. Tokyo: Renga Shobō Shinsha.
- Kurihara Yukio. 1991. "AA sakka undō to Noma Hiroshi" [The Afro-Asian Writers' Movement and Noma Hiroshi]. *Shin Nihon bungaku* [New Japanese Literature] 46 (10).
- KwakHyoungduck. 2014. "Daitōa' danron to Nihon teikoku no bungakuba: Daitōa bungakushō to Akutagawashō o chūshin ni" ["Greater East Asia" Discourse and Literature of the Japanese Empire: Focusing on the Greater East Asia and Akutagawa Prizes]. *Hanminjok munhwa yōngu* [Korean Cultural Studies] 46.
- Lee, Christopher J. 2010. *Making a World After Empire: The Bandung Moment and Its Political Afterlives*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Matsuoka Yōko. 1961. "Kagaisha ishiki to higaisha ishiki to: A-A Sakka Kaigi Tokyo Taikai ni tsuite" [Consciousness of Perpetrators and Victims: On the Afro-Asian Writers' Association Tokyo Conference]. In *Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Tokyo Taikai* [Afro-Asian Writers' Association Tokyo Conference], Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōgikai [Afro-Asian Writers' Association Japan Council]. Tokyo: Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōkai.
- Miyagi Taizō. 2001. *Bandon Kaigi to Nihon no Ajia fukki: Amerika to Ajia no hazama de* [The Bandung Conference and Japan's Return to Asia: Between the US and Asia]. Tokyo: Sōshisha.
- Mizutamari Mayumi. 2014. "Horita Yoshie to Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi 1 dai san-sekai to no deai" [Hotta Yoshie and Asia-African Writers' Conference 1: Encounter with the Third World]. *Hokkaidō Daigaku Bungaku Kenkyūka kiyō* [Hokkaido

- University School of Letters and Sciences Bulletin] 144.
- Nihon Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi [Japan Afro-Asian Writers' Conference], ed. 1978a. *Ajia o aruku Tōnan'ajia* [Walking Asia: Southeast Asia Story]. Tokyo: Bunyūsha.
- Nihon Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi, ed. 1978b. *Bungaku o kangaeru* [Thinking about Literature]. Tokyo: Mainichi Shinbunsha.
- Nihon Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi, ed. 1978c. *Sengo bungaku to Ajia* [Postwar Literature and Asia]. Tokyo: Mainichi Shinbunsha.
- Nihon Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi, ed. 1979. *Kindai o kangaeru* [Thinking of Modernity]. Tokyo: Mainichi Shinbunsha.
- Noma Hiroshi, ed. 1974. *Gendai Arabu bungakusen* [Selections from Modern Arab Literature]. Tokyo: Sōjusha.
- Noma Hiroshi and Hotta Yoshie. 1976. *Daisan sekai to gendai bunmei: Nihon Arabu Bunka Rentai Kaigi no kiroku* [The Third World and Contemporary Civilization: Record of the Japan-Arab Cultural Solidarity Conference]. Tokyo: Ushio Shuppansha.
- O Chang-ün. 2016. "Kyōryō üi chūngōn, pop'yōn ül hyanghan t'ujaeng" [Testimony of Lack, Struggle for the Universal]. *Han'guk munhak nonchōng* [Journal of Korean Literature] 72.
- Odagiri Hideo. 1946. "Bungaku ni okeru sensō sekinin no tsuikyū" [The Pursuit of War Responsibility in Literature]. *Shin Nihon bungaku* [New Japanese Literature] 1 (3).
- Ōe Kenzaburō. 1961. "Hatashite seijiteki datta ka" [Was it Political?]. In *Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Tokyo Taikai* [Afro-Asian Writers' Association Tokyo Conference], Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōgikai [Afro-Asian Writers' Association Japan Council]. Tokyo: Ajia-Afurika Sakka Kaigi Nihon Kyōkai.
- Ozaki Hotsuki. 2013. *Ilbon kūndae munhak üi sanghūn: kusingminji munhangnon* [The Scars of Modern Japanese Literature: Colonial Literature]. Translated by O Mi-jōng. Osan: Hansin Taehakkyo Ch'ulp'anbu.
- Sugimoto Tatsuo. 1961. "AA Sakka Kaigi zakkan" [Impressions of the Afro-Asian Writers' Conference]. *Kaki no Kai geppō* [Persimmon Meeting Monthly] 14.
- Takeuchi Yoshimi. 1981a. "Ajia no naka no Nihon" [Japan at the Heart of Asia]. In Vol. 5 of *Takeuchi Yoshimi zenshū* [Collected Works of Takeuchi Yoshimi]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.
- Takeuchi Yoshimi. 1981b. "Ajia no nashonarizumu" [Asian Nationalism]. In Vol. 5 of *Takeuchi Yoshimi zenshū* [Collected Works of Takeuchi Yoshimi]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.