

帝国システムの政治・文化的比較研究

NEWSLETTER

No.12
(2005 年度 第 4 号)
2005/11/18

秋も深まり、紅葉の美しい季節となりました。ニューズレター第 12 号をお届けいたします。今回の内容は、9 月 21 日（水）に行なわれた国際シンポジウムの報告です。

■ 活動報告

国際シンポジウム（第 18 回 COE 研究会）

（科研「近代日本・西洋・中国における外国人イメージの総合的研究」と共催）
「帝国におけるアジア表象－西洋人の目に映った東洋－」

日時：9 月 21 日（水）、13 時から 18 時 15 分まで 会場：京都大学文学研究科新館第一講義室

開会：13：00

第 1 報告 13：10－14：25（報告 1 時間、質疑応答 15 分）

報告者：島 大吾氏（京都大学大学院文学研究科博士後期課程）

題目：「アメリカ映画に見る中国イメージ」

第 2 報告 14：40－15：55（報告 1 時間、質疑応答 15 分）

報告者：東田 雅博氏（金沢大学）

題目：「近代イギリスの中国観－陶磁器の文様に浮かぶ中国－」

第 3 報告 16：10－17：25（報告 1 時間、質疑応答 15 分）

報告者：Walter Demel 氏（ミュンヘン国防軍大学）、通訳：竹中 亨氏（大阪大学）

題目：「ヨーロッパ人の目にうつった日本と中国の法制度」

総合討議 17：30 閉 会 18：15

帝国システムの類型や政治、経済面に焦点を当てた昨年度に対し、本年度、本研究班は、帝国システムを文化、心性面から検討することを主要な目的の一つとしている。9 月 21 日の国際シンポジウムでは、ドイツ、ミュンヘン国防軍大学からヴァルター・デーメル氏を、金沢から金沢大学の東田雅博氏をお招きし、本学文学研究科博士後期課程の島大吾氏にもご参加頂いて、「帝国におけるアジア表象」を共通テーマに、それぞれのご専門からご報告頂いた。

一人目の報告者の島氏は、1920 年代から 30 年代のハリウッド映画を取り上げ、この時期のスクリーンにおける中国人の描かれ方がネガティブからポジティブなものに変遷した理由を、中国人を演じた二人のアクター（スウェーデン生まれのワーナー・オーランドと、中国系アメリカ人のアンナ・メイ・ウォン）に焦点を当てて検討した。島氏は、ヨーロッパ系でありながら中国人を演じることに自らの俳優としての成功の方

途を見いだしたオランダと、ステレオタイプ化した中国人を演じ続けることに疲れ、自ら「西洋人」になろうと努力したが故にスクリーンから消えていくメイ・ウォンとを比較し、イメージの変遷にもかかわらず、ハリウッドの固定的な人種概念が残存していたことを指摘した。さらに、1930年代のイメージの変遷には、アメリカの観客の反応のみでなく、中国政府の意向も大きく影響していたことも指摘した。会場からは、ハリウッドにおけるオリエンタルイメージは1920-30年代を通じて変化しなかったのか、映画産業としてのハリウッドの枠組みで考えた際にどのようなことが言えるのかといった質問が相次ぎ、活発に議論が行なわれた。

二人目の報告者の東田氏は、18世紀末以降現在に至るまでごく普通のイギリス人の中国イメージを形作ってきた絵皿の柳文様と、その文様と共に語り継がれた悲恋伝説を取り上げ、これらが体現したイギリス人の中国観とは何であったのか、また、その中国観が歴史的にどのような役割を果たしたのかについて検討した。東田氏は、イギリス起源の柳文様伝説が多くの家庭で「母の膝」の上で幼い子供に語り聞かされることにより、牧歌的な中国イメージがイギリス人の心の奥深くに植え付けられていたことを明らかにした。近代イギリスの中国観は、一般的には18世紀から19世紀にかけて好意的なものから侮蔑的なものに転換するが、東田氏は、柳文様の生み出した中国観が19世紀以降も底流として残り、安全弁的な中国観として機能しつづけたことを指摘した。会場からは、なぜ中国を表象するものとして「柳」の文様が用いられるのか、柳文様は、かつて磁器を中国からの輸入に頼っていたころの名残で、イギリス人が国産の磁器に中国産の図柄をデフォルメしたものであったのではないかなどの質問が出され、白熱した議論がかわされた。また、18世紀から19世紀におけるイギリスの中国観の変遷については、日本の中国観の変遷との共通性も指摘された。

三人目の報告者のデーメル氏は、16世紀から18世紀にかけてのヨーロッパ人が、中国の統治制度、法制度をどのように捉えたか、そのとらえ方がどのように変遷したのかを、豊富な史料に基づき明らかにした。デーメル氏は、16世紀には合理的でヨーロッパのものより優れていると見なされた明、清の統治、法制度、刑罰システムが、18世紀になると、次第に官僚に送られる賄賂や刑罰の連座制、処刑などに注目が集まり、「非人間的」で遅れた制度として捉えられるようになったことを指摘した。会場からは、中国史では犯罪に対して、ヨーロッパで行なわれたような残酷な処刑法があったのか、最初に中国の行政制度が劣っているという認識を示したヨーロッパ人は誰か、18世紀に認識が転換した後、かつて優れた制度と見なしていた記憶はどうなったのかなどと様々な質問が出された。なお、報告は英語で、質疑応答は英語、ドイツ語、日本語で行なわれたが、ドイツ語の通訳では、大阪大学の竹中亨氏にお世話になった。

最後の総合討議では、三名の報告者に個別の質問が投げかけられると同時に、ヨーロッパの中国観を扱ったデーメル氏と東田氏の報告におけるイメージ転換点のずれとその理由について、さらに検討が行なわれた。

【報告要旨】

<報告1>

Chinese Images depicted in the American Films

Daigo SHIMA

During the 1920s, Chinese characters depicted in American films almost always had been evil villains or inscrutable Orientals. Dr. Fu Manchu was a symbolic figure among them. In 1931, however, there appeared one Chinese sleuth, Charlie Chan, whose character traits were quite the opposite. As the Charlie Chan film series gained in their popularity, through the 1930s Fu Manchu fell by the wayside.

Scholars of Asian representations in American films have tried to explain why such a new kind of Chinese hero, Charlie Chan, emerged in place of the villainous Fu Manchu. According to this scholarly consensus, the novel titled *The Good Earth* written by Pearl Buck in 1931 had a decisive effect in

changing negative views of the Chinese into more positive stereotypes in the American consciousness. Additionally, some scholars have pointed to the 1924 immigration law, which closed the doors to Asian immigration, as having alleviated American attitudes toward Asian people. In contrast, this presentation pays more attention to the character of Charlie Chan himself, and in particular the process by which he appeared on the scenes. In so doing, it seeks to describe *how* and *why* the Chinese images were transformed from evil to good. In order to detail the process, this presentation takes two *Oriental* actors for concrete examples of embodiment of Chinese images.

One is Warner Oland (1880-1938). Although he was born in Sweden, he looked like a Chinese. According to him, he "owes his Chinese appearance to the Mongol invasion." Through the 1920s, he performed Chinese roles so many times that a newspaper called him "a Swedish actor who was born to portray a Chinaman." In 1929, he gained the title role in *The Mysterious Dr. Fu Manchu*, establishing a solid position as a "Chinese" actor.

The other is Anna May Wong (1905-1961), who was born in Los Angeles. Her parents were Chinese, so her appearance was quite exotic to American eyes. Although her exotic beauty gave her a chance to enter into Hollywood, it also restricted her playing roles. According to a contemporary critic, "Miss Wong is invariably conscripted when a moving picture demand Oriental intrigue. Her dark beauty appeared sinister by contrast with Nordic fairness of Laura La Plante in *The Chinese Parrot* and Dolores Costello in *Old San Francisco*. She has been a villainess and a vampire, but her appearance will never let her be heroine, although occasionally she manages to achieve a sympathetic role."

Although both of these actors played similar roles as villainous, inscrutable Orientals, they had an opposite idea about their characters. Oland knew that his appearance was his biggest advantage as a character actor, and he believed that a character actor would "live the longest in this business." In this belief, Oland continued to play Chinese roles again and again, including both Dr. Fu Manchu and Charlie Chan.

Wong, on the contrary, got tired of being depicted as a villainous Chinese, seeking to refuse such stereotypes. She left Hollywood for Europe, and there she learned both French and German, trying to westernize herself. When she came back to Hollywood in 1931, a movie magazine reported that "[t]he Chinese flapper has an English accent now. She thinks in Western terms. Her manners, her dress, her humor, her attitude, are Western. She loves tea—but an English brand. Her face no longer looks very Chinese."

In spite of her "westernization", her roles during 1930s did not radically change, and she gradually lost her chance to perform Oriental roles. This was largely due to Chinese Nationalist government's

protests against Hollywood's depiction of Chinese people as immoral females, lawless bandits, and corrupt officials. These protests had a great impact on the Hollywood industry, and Hollywood gradually shied away from casting Anna May Wong in any capacity through the 1930s, because of her Chinese identity.

In contrast to Wong, Warner Oland enjoyed incomparable popularity by playing Charlie Chan through the 1930s. What made the difference between the two actors? One reason was Hollywood's limitation of racial concept. It is true that they invented such a "good-Chinese" character as Charlie Chan, but it is also true that they always cast white actors as "good-Chinese" characters. Such non-white actors as Wong rarely got a chance to play a "good-Chinese" role because of Hollywood's paradoxical rule.

Another reason rested with the Chinese government. While they considered Wong as staining China's national image through her Chinese identity, they did not criticize Warner Oland. Although his character portrayal of Dr. Fu Manchu met with severe criticism from the Chinese government, Oland completely erased this villainous-Chinese image by playing Charlie Chan. As an actor of non-Chinese descent, he circumvented criticism against himself, for he was clearly performing a role.

The last and probably biggest reason was that Hollywood film producers clearly intended to depict Charlie Chan as Fu Manchu's "opposite number." In other words, Hollywood wanted a Chinese character with whom both American and Chinese audiences could sympathize. This, in turn, was at least partially a response to Chinese government criticisms, in so far as Hollywood wanted to demonstrate that it COULD create a good Chinese character.

For the reasons stated above, it can be said that Charlie Chan was deliberately invented as a Chinese who had "all the virtues and none of the vices of Fu." American audiences loved this new type of Chinese hero, and the Chinese government was satisfied with this positive characterization of Chinese, too. Behind the scenes, however, the only actor of Chinese descent who had an international reputation at that time was clearly losing her position in American films.

As is clear from the differences between Warner Oland and Anna May Wong, Chinese images in American films were dexterously controlled by Hollywood. The good-Chinese image of this era was deeply connected with the Chinese national image and Hollywood's racial concept, and it cautiously was retained by removing derogatory Chinese characters including those played by Anna May Wong.

<報告 2>

The Images of China in Modern Britain and Willow-pattern Plate

Masahiro Toda

The willow-pattern is a classic landscape design of china-ware whose characteristic components include a weeping willow, mandarin's pagodas, three persons on a bridge and a pair of doves, all in blue on a white background. This design has a legend of two lovers, a mandarin's daughter and his secretary, who are transformed into a pair of doves. In the late-18th-century Britain, this pattern was invented as a product of *chinoiserie*, the decorative art style produced under the influence of Chinese art. Since then, the willow-pattern has maintained its popularity in contrast to the decline of the *chinoiserie*. While other scholars of china wares and the *chinoiserie* have pointed out the importance of the willow-pattern and its enduring popularity, this presentation focuses more closely on *why* this pattern has been enjoying such a high popularity, and *how* this pattern has affected the Western images of China.

The willow-pattern covers a wide range of contemporary British cultural products. The willow-pattern china wares were originally manufactured in Staffordshire, and they soon spread throughout the country. The willow-pattern was not exclusive to the motif of china wares. It was applied to the motifs of games (Game of Willow-pattern Plate), stage set, and gardens (Biddulf Grange Garden, Staffordshire, 1850s). Such authors as Thomas Hardy and George Meredith mentioned the pattern in their writings, and the *Punch* and the *Times* featured it.

We can read a typical British impression of the willow-pattern from the following quotation. "The old willow-pattern plate! By every association, in spite of its want of artistic beauty it is dear to us. It is imagined with our earliest recollections; it is like the picture of an old friend and companion whose portrait we see everywhere, but whose likeness we never grow weary of. ("The Story of the Common Willow-pattern Plate", *The Family Friend*, Vol.1, 1849)

This impression of the willow-pattern has been preserved, and the willow-pattern itself has maintained its influence and popularity. As late as 1918, *The Daily News* mentioned "It is difficult for anyone who has never been to China not to imagine Chinese life as a sort of willow-pattern ritual."

How have British people imagined China through viewing the willow-pattern? It can be said that the willow-pattern products satisfy their curiosity about a mysterious China. The products bolstered the image of China as something like an intangible toy, something beautiful and enjoyable in their childhood. Most British people kept this impression in their mind until quite recently.

It should also be noted that, on the whole, British people turned their positive images of China in the 18th century into negative, dismissive, and derogatory ones in the 19th century. This critical change in British images of China seriously eroded 18th-century idea that China was a kind of utopia. Nonetheless, this did not mean that willow-pattern image was also undermined in the 19th century.

The positive image of the willow-pattern has survived in the modern British society. Even when British people generally took a harsh view on China, this image survived, and in part it kept creating the image of China as something nostalgic, familiar and safe.

Why has this image survived? One of the reasons can be found in the following narrative. Harry Barnard (1862-1933), general manager of London Branch of Wedgwood, explained why people loved the willow-pattern and its stories. " Every one in childhood has wondered what the mysterious people, trees, and birds meant. What is boatman doing?.....Now for the story as was told to me in childhood, and which, of course, I have retained because it was given to me at my mother's knee, who also had it from her mother in the same manner."

This quotation clearly explains why the positive willow-pattern image survived. How could anyone critically reconsider the story told at his/her mother's knee? As is clear from the narrative stated above, the willow-pattern image has been ingrained in the mind of British people who rarely reflect on its meanings of how it works.

<報告 3 >

Early Modern European Views on Law and Administration in China and Japan

Walter Demel

When European seafarers first arrived in East Asia in the 16th century, they met upon completely different forms of government in China and Japan. Seen from the outside, Ming China was a huge, peaceful and "absolutist" unitary state governed from the center, the imperial court in Peking, through a powerful, strictly hierarchical bureaucracy. Japan, by contrast, was a country divided into a large number of feudal domains that had been at war with each other for many decades. The Japanese emperor in Kyôto was almost no more than a national symbol and did not have any real power. However, in the first half of the 17th century, the situation changed. Now the shôguns of the Tokugawa family asserted their authority as sole rulers of the country. By that time, China had not only experienced numerous internal rebellions, but after many years of fighting, the Manchu finally conquered the country. Thereafter, China was in a consolidation phase under the new dynasty, the Qing.

Early modern Europeans found the structure of the Chinese administration so fascinating because, in China, there appeared to be a real functional specialization. In France and other parts of Europe during this period, the ministries had a mix of functional and territorial responsibilities. Moreover, In the European view, the entire structure of the central government organization of the Chinese empire

was an incomparable marvel of rationality, orderliness, and clarity. In Europe it was not so unusual when a superior authority assigned to a specific area simultaneously had to perform the functions of a lower authority, as well. In the Chinese administration this kind of functional distribution was not completely absent. Thus, for a long time, from the early modern European perspective, China seemed to be the very prototype of a unitary state governed by a bureaucracy that was based on merit. Also, as regards law and justice, the early modern Europeans generally praised the speed of the Chinese administration of justice, which was due in part to the frequency of court sessions as well as to the ability of the authorities to determine the facts of the case, as well as their restraint in applying the death penalty.

However, in 18th century, the European perspective towards Eastern Asian countries had become more critical and their views of the Chinese administration of justice become quite ambivalent. On the one hand there was praise for the long and tedious criminal process up to the point of execution and the Chinese prisons were praised for their roominess and cleanliness (according to Du Halde). On the other hand, there was much criticism of the corruption of the Chinese justice system and of use of the bamboo stick. Moreover, what Europeans found especially objectionable is that Chinese delinquents even had to thank their judges with a kowtow for the "paternal flogging" they had received. Even lower-ranking mandarins who had committed offences could be flogged like European schoolboys. Thus, to Europeans, the Chinese seemed to have no sense of honor. And the views that some European authors expressed about Japan around 1800 were not any milder.

One more important thing for Europeans was that in both China and Japan, it was not the individual but the family that was regarded as the smallest unit of society. In both East Asian countries, the principle of group responsibility prevailed, although, in Japan, the practice was to punish only the male relatives with death penalty. From the perspective of Europeans, the relatives being punished were simply innocent victims.

Thus the idea that the Europeans had of law and administration in China and in Japan became increasingly contradictory during the course of the early modern period. For a long time the Europeans admired the centralized bureaucratic administration of the Chinese empire and the (relatively) merit-based status of the mandarin elite. And even the Japanese administration, which the Europeans knew comparatively less well, seemed to be mostly in good order.

However, during the course of the 18th century, there arose considerable doubts about a system that was based on the mutual control of family members and neighbors, and that was associated with the principle of collective responsibility and liability. This criticism was particularly applied to Japan.

Moreover, the corporal punishments and the death penalty that were still quite usual in East Asia were increasingly regarded as "inhuman". While a non-jurist like Thunberg expressed his preference for the "short process" in Japan, compared to the European tradition of protracted processing, and a philosopher like Kant could show understanding for the different kind of legal thinking in East Asia, the Europeans soon developed an attitude of superiority over both of these countries, not only with regard to technology but also with reference to law and administration.

■ **今後の研究会の予定**

◇ **第20回（今年度第6回）COE研究会**

日時：11月19日（土）、午後1時から5時まで

会場：京都大学文学研究科新館第二講義室

<発表者・題目>

石原 俊氏（千葉大学）

「強制疎開」以後—小笠原諸島の戦—後をめぐって」

浜井 和史氏（外務省外交史料館）

「もう一つの「沖縄問題」—戦後沖縄の戦没者慰霊問題と日本外交」

◇ **第21回（今年度第7回）COE研究会**

日時：12月3日（土）、午後1時から3時半まで

会場：京都大学百周年時計台記念館会議室Ⅲ

発表者：桂川 光正氏（大阪産業大学）

題目：「領事館令に見る取り締り」

◇ **第22回（今年度第8回）COE研究会（発表題目は未定）**

日時：2006年1月7日（土）、午後1時から5時まで

会場：京都大学文学研究科新館第二講義室

発表者：吹戸 真実氏（立命館大学非常勤講師）・溝上 宏美氏（文学研究科 COE 研究員）

◇ **第23回（今年度第9回）COE研究会（発表題目は未定）**

日時：2006年3月29日（水）、午後1時から3時半まで

会場：京都大学文学研究科新館第二講義室

発表者：李 昇燁氏（京都大学人文科学研究所）

<連絡先>

〒606-8501 京都市左京区吉田本町

京都大学文学研究科 現代文化学共同研究室

電話/ファックス：075-753-2792

E-Mail: teikoku-hmn@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp

URL: <http://www.hmn.bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/teikoku/>

担当：溝上 宏美