

Postcolonial reading of Natsume Soseki: anticolonial inclinations and its limitations

Héctor Benjamín UCLÉS FLORES*

Abstract

Soseki is one of the most iconic writers from the modernization period of Japan. Inside his understanding of the past there is a signaling against the movement for a colonialist project, that is reverted in his affirmation of the present, creating an unresolved contradiction in his theoretical framework. His critique of colonialism focuses on the dissatisfaction that Japanese citizens will experience from becoming Westernized, which, in Soseki's view, is equivalent to becoming a colonial nation. Although his critique addresses the dissatisfaction of the colonizer rather than the suffering of the colonized, his observations on the misguided path of colonialism are assertive and remain relevant.

Natsume Soseki's work presents a staple of postcolonial reading that would be unraveled under the epistemological categories of Gayatri Spivak. Spivak's category of catachresis will be particularly utilized to showcase the virtues and limitations of Soseki's understanding of colonialism for the postcolonial field.

Keywords: Catachresis, Spivak, Soseki, Comparative Literature, Postcolonialism

* Graduate School of Human Sciences, The University of Osaka ;
hector.benjamin.ucles@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Natsume Soseki, a staple of Japanese modern literature, has been disregarded to an extent when it comes to postcolonial interpretations specially through the Spivakian method of postcolonial reading. This article seeks to address this gap; Soseki's work is prime for such exercise. I sustain that Natsume Soseki had a critical approach to colonialism, limited by his own eurocentric-colonial epistemological framework, holding unsolved contradictions. However, its deconstruction through Gayatri Spivak's methodology holds great value for postcolonial studies. The article will be divided into five sections.

The first section is the introduction, contextualizing the reading to be made. It contains two inner subdivisions that exemplify the methodological tools used to deconstruct the text. The following sections follow the structure of the argument to analyze and start with the quotation that is prioritized for analyses.

The second section utilizes the introduced tools to manifest Soseki's understanding of the past as one undefined and the construction of the term "West" as one lacking objective clarity but that was utilized by Soseki to exemplify an attitude that disregards limitations in tune with colonial attitudes.

The third section constructs on the previous statements of the West to unveil how Soseki constructs an identity of Japan in opposition to what he perceives as the West.

The fourth section clarifies Soseki's intent for a Japan that doesn't seek a path for westernization, making a critique to values of colonization with the limitations of not doing a postcolonial statement, Soseki's Individualism philosophy is introduced.

The fifth section is the conclusion. Soseki's limitations in approaching the postcolonial subject are clarified and commented upon.

The article is centered in Natsume Soseki's novel (Soseki 2002) *I am a Cat*, closing argument of the Third volume's first chapter⁽¹⁾. To contextualize our reading, the closing argument is delivered by a friend to our character, an English Literature Teacher, who is currently entangled in a societal battle with students of a neighboring school hired by a rich man, to play a baseball game in the most disruptive manner besides his house, due to an unaware disregard to his wife committed by our vicarious character. In this case, we find ourselves in a society that has been altered in typical societal values (as respect for a teacher) by those of pecuniary

characteristics, the rich can buy wills. This is all happening in Japan, and it is done by Japanese, but it is portrayed as a battle against westernization. Centering in this precise section allows an extrapolation of Soseki's conception to be analyzed to the light of postcolonial theory. Its future deconstruction will showcase how this short extract encapsulates Soseki's perception regarding colonialism and gives us the opportunity to add to it.

1.1. Postcolonial reading-contested history

This method of postcolonial reading remits its interpretations to readings of reality as reading of texts, in this manner some epistemological crossings between Spivak and Soseki in the field of theory are found.

The first tool to utilize is the concept of the double bind, which interprets existence as determined by the friction found between history and literature, what it is and what we understand it to be. As it comes to understanding, there exists more than one existence and more than one interpretation of that existence. For this reason a postcolonial reading is open to a never-ending myriad of interpretations both for reality and literature, as both coincide, in the words of Spivak (2012:203) "History as construction of fiction", which transmits a traditional category from the sphere of literature to the realm of reality intertwining them both in fiction, this presents a striking parallel with Soseki's argument that the past is merely an illusion (Komori 1999:278). As illusion exists as a substitute of fiction, both Spivak and Soseki coincide in the lack of objective interpretation on the construction of historical events.

Between Soseki and Spivak, there are parallels, with the limitations of difference. Soseki's tenets are a straightforward understanding of life, (Komori 1999:278) reasoning that if the past is an illusion which purpose is to give reasons for the present and future, then life is more uncertain than dreams. This is the equivalent to asserting that the reasonings utilized to understand life are less objective and justifiable than one of the most subjective experiences in the human being. Spivak regards the epistemological creation of reality as an in between. In her words (Spivak 2006:265) "is the result of an obstinate misunderstanding of the rhetorical question that transforms the condition of the (im)-possibility of answering-of telling a story-

into the condition of possibility. Every production of experience, (.....), has this double bind at its origin.” What is given and the interpretation of it, both trapped in a constant cycle of combination and separation. This can be exemplified as history and literature, being history an intent for recollection of information and literature a retelling untied to expectations of reality, neither history nor literature are exempt of one another, in words of Spivak (2012:205) “Literature as a supplementation of History”. Every historical retelling is created under the historian’s inclinations, as every work of literature is a mark of a historical creation, the reading in between, is the fiction that carries our understanding of the world. Human beings are creators of their own fictions.

In both Soseki and Spivak, reality is presented as a selected fiction. In Spivak we find an elaborate argument for education in the humanities to guide this drive, in her words (2008:3) “The ethico-political task of the humanities has always been the rearrangement of desires.” If we follow Komori’s interpretation, Soseki affirms the existence of the present “*I*” cannot be doubted (.....) then the past is not a dream, it is like a searchlight that is clearly illuminating me into the present moment (Komori 1999:278-279).

In Soseki, the existence of the Subject negates the existence of the past as an open illusion, this is a contradiction. While Soseki did not intend to do postcolonial theory, his assessment of history coincides with postcolonial interpretations. This core structure of human reality is by itself a resistance to colonial universalism, which intends the imposition of a monocular interpretation of history usually through the guise of progress.

1.2. Postcolonial reading-catachresis

The second tool to be utilized is the catachresis, as Spivak repurposes it for postcolonial reading that follows closely Derrida’s⁽²⁾ mission of deconstruction as defined by him (Derrida 2021:31) “(.....) to show that things (...) do not have definable meanings and determinable missions (.....) that they exceed the boundaries that they currently occupy.”

Catachresis is utilized by Spivak, as a (Spivak 1999:14) “wholesome abuse of the

figurative move.” When explaining a catachresis, the term becomes a catachresis for the word translation. In the spivakian perspective, the job of the translator is to put the translation in the context of the meaning, the translation is a manifestation of the understanding of the translator which is formed inside a historical and epistemological context, negating the existence of a pure-objective translation, in words of Spivak (2012:270) “The impossibility of translation is what puts its necessity in a double bind”. Translation is always a supplement to what is translated as a catachresis is a supplement to meaning. It’s extrapolated from the previous paragraph, that the term translation as Spivak observes (Spivak 2012:256) “is not just the stringing together of the most accurate synonyms by the most approximate syntax”, there is a component behind the words itself, the writer itself and the intention it holds, the translator must understand the writer, limited by his own grasping capabilities. This affirmation is a direct correlation to the absence of essentialism or essence as an in between. The translation exists as in between the intentions of the translator and the intentions of the writer, in the words of Spivak (2012:257) “translation is the most intimate act of reading, a prayer to be haunted.” In this way, holding knowledge of a language is but an approximation and it’s not related to our use of the word translation. It is in this space that catachresis is used to showcase what was previously categorized as cultural coding, pre-concepts that sustain a statement⁽³⁾. Even when this understanding can be unintentional in the author, it holds conscient relevance in Soseki, always with the limitations of he who is not doing postcolonial theory, when he refers to “*I am a cat*” the impossibility of the translation as observed by Komori Yoichi in his essay titled as the book *I am a Cat* (吾輩は猫である), the term *wagahai* translated as [I am], lacks an equivalent in the English language. Soseki intended to approximate to the Royal “We”. He reappropriated for a subject under submission which was constructed by trauma, in other words, he repurposed the royal term for the oppress, which is a typical use of catachresis in postcolonial theory.

2. The catachrestic use of the term Westerner

At the beginning of the exhortation, the phrase “I believe the ways of our ancestors

are wiser....” (Soseki 2002: 306), the possessive term “our ways” or any adjective that implies direct temporal correlation is not in use, which by prolongation exemplifies absence, the pronoun “our” which implies spatial presence, as a property of “us” as “human existing beings” is in use. For further conceptual clarification, the category of catachrestic, as defined by Spivak (2012:242) “In other words, no other word will do, and yet it does not really give you the literal meaning in the history of the language”, comes in to use. The phrase has the possibility to be a catachresis for: the way of the people we descend from was wiser than ours, the currently living. The option of change, a return to the past, which is a temporal impossibility, is a remembrance of other ways. In this manner, the past reroots itself as foreseer of ways. The way of the past is not anymore, and the current one is undesirable. This follows Soseki’s understanding of the present, our past is not our present, is a statement of fact, his idea of reality as given, as conveys his introduction in “The Civilization of modern day Japan” saying (Soseki 1992:154) “All of you are Japanese, and so am I; and we live in the modern age” as in “My Individualism” he starts by stating (Soseki 1992:161) “Having been born into the world, I had to find something to do” and as our titular character in “I’m a cat” states (Soseki 2002:3) “I am a cat. (.....) I have no idea where I was born”. This is Soseki’s understanding of reality, the past as a given undefined, that is ordered by the existence of the subject in the present. The implication that an unclear past could give several interpretations is not affirmed in Soseki. The subject exists in a one direction reality, even when constructed on an illusory past.

The term “Western civilization” is catachrestic, lacks a coherent direct object. The west is just a direction in a map, calling The West as Europe is mistaken as it tends to exclude Eastern Europe, its geographical direction can’t be understood when it integrates the USA and Australia, as a mode of life it excludes Indigenous populations of those areas, it’s a religious contradiction as countries in North, South and Central America, The Caribbean, Africa, and Asia hold majority Christian communities as seen in UNdata (2024), and don’t enter inside the terminology of Western, (by immediate outside recognition as in the their inners there are some who consider themselves Westerners). The race category doesn’t apply as Syria, Argentina, Turkey and other white majority countries are excluded. The economic

argument doesn't hold as already mentioned countries with powerful economies don't qualify as seen in the United Nations, World and Situation Prospects (United Nations 2024). For our use, inside Soseki's literature, it will be argued that the category Westerner exists as a culture that doesn't acknowledge boundaries or limitations.

The English reader, with philosophical inclinations, may interpret the term "positivism" as a criticism to Western, in the time vogue, philosophy with the same name originated by Augusto Comte, but in this case, a direct referral to the original Japanese text uses the term positive in opposition to the term Positivism, as it comes, it could have been better understood as "positive attitudes" but in the same manner, these will be a misalignment as the term positive attitudes holds in the English reader a morally correct inclination, define by The Cambridge Dictionary of The English Language as (Cambridge 2024) "full of hope or confidence", these definition doesn't imply action. Revisiting Soseki's statement (Soseki 2002: 305) "The main snag with positivism is that it acknowledges no limits", manifests positivism as a lack of limits. This ties with the following sentences (Soseki 2002:306) "no human individual can ever have the whole of his heart's desire (.....) Western civilization has produced some noticeable results (.....) but also a civilization of the inherently dissatisfied, a culture of unhappy peoples..." It implies a condemnation to the nature of Eurocentric colonialism, the drive for desire fulfillment through the eradication of what can't be consumed or colonized.⁽⁴⁾

Further reading of Soseki's intentions is correlated with his understanding of civilization as entanglement between (Soseki 1992:155) "the conservation of our vital energies as a negative response to the stimulus of duty, and the consumption of our vital energies as a positive response to the stimulus of pleasurable times". Positivism correlates with the first part of the civilizatory dynamic, the one activated by the action of duty, which is better understood as the productive side of society or what we will associate with the work force. The inclination to observe the lack of limits as a colonial characteristic exists as a postcolonial reading, but as Soseki was outside this sort of elucubrations his critique is limited to the unbalances of a work force and the stimulus of pleasurable times, the balance between work and pleasure. In the final extract of this segment Soseki writes (Soseki 2002:306-307) "The

traditional civilization of Japan does not look for satisfaction by some change in the condition of others but in that of the self....” Soseki ties this positive attitude of ignorance on the face of limitations to an attitudinal way that goes in parallel with an unfulfilled life, in this case, the criticism is not directed to the direct modification of the environment or others. Soseki’s observations don’t meander on the ethics of the actions, but on the unsatisfaction that will grasp a subject that doesn’t see its limitations. It is in this context that the call for a return to the past that no longer is there, the traditional Japan, the isolationist Japan, the Japan that understood that fulfillment is not in the outer quest, is made.

3. Japan’s identity in correlation with Western identity

On July 8, 1853, Commodore Perry arrived at Japan to force open the country to commerce, by gunboat diplomacy, firing 78 blank canons. As the high school kids commence their offensive to forced submit our professor to the values and morals of money. Baseball playing is presented as a metaphor for USA canon diplomacy, in the words of Soseki (2002:287) “Preparing for battle (.....) practicing a game newly imported from America (.....) Baseball (.....) is nothing less than the gunnery aspects of siege warfare”. The text clearly uses canon analogies as (Soseki 2002:287) “battery of artillery” for pitching and batting, and “dumb-dumb bullet” for munition⁽⁵⁾. As the Professor’s offense to the rich was inaction rather than action, the not understanding that the rich expect a preferable treatment. Japan’s offense to the United States of America (catachresis for West) was its self-imposed isolation.

The opening scenery for this section marks a punctual difference between Japan and what is perceived as the West in the historical context of Japan’s forced opening and its reaction to it. Japan is defined by itself as an existing opposition of what the other is, in this case the West, more by refusal than by acceptance as observe by David Graeber (2022:249) “Cultures where effectively, structures of refusal.”

Soseki structures a contraposition when he says: (Soseki 2002:287) “The main difference between the west and Japan”. As it has been marked, the catachresis of West exists in Soseki’s interpretation as an attitude that regards no limitations, the West does not exist in opposition to the East in Soseki’s vicarious advice, what exists

in opposition is Japan, the easy inverse of oppositions would have located the East in opposition to the ways of the West, this wasn't the case.

The catachresis East, holds similar deficiencies as the terminology West, with the differentiation that East exists as an epistemological determination of Western expansionism, The West as the known and the East as the unknown, in words of Edward Said (1994:72) "For Orientalism was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted between the familiar (Europe, The West, "us") and a strange (the Orient, the East, "them")". East-West categories where (are) in use, there are very low possibilities to acknowledge ignorance in this department from Soseki. In the opposition, Japan-West, one may read Soseki's perception. The Western perspective is built through its impressive propaganda machine, which creates the perspective of the non-westerners on other non-westerners, let's typify this as the dominant of the oversimplification of differentiation, as an example Spivak presents the following: (Spivak 2006:249) "The dominant radical reader in the Anglo-U.S. reactively homogenizes the Third World and sees it only in the context of nationalism and ethnicity." The one who exists inside the simplification reclaims his identity by refusing this typification, the crux becomes, what was he refusing? The erasure of his identity or the negation of amalgamation with the other. This phrasing was bestowed before the fervent over inclination of Japan for becoming Western, but in the incipient inclination, it was as a colonial power that the Japanese discourse as an identity besides Asia and not in Asia took hold, in words of Sangjung (2005:89) "The question, then, was how Japanese culture could distance itself from Asia (.....) and at the same time acquire the force and identity with which to establish an equal dialogue with the West as other." Soseki's direct analysis is absent in this topic as its roots were still developing, but as it holds in Soseki's discourse, Japan in the face of the West, exist as demand for recognition and not a refusal of association with the Eastern Nations.

This observation also finds correlation with Soseki's theoretical framework as he expresses (Soseki 1992:157) "Western civilization (that is, civilization in general) is internally motivated, whereas Japan's civilization is externally motivated." This sentence provides insight into Soseki's unsaid understandings. There are two civilizations framed, the West and Japan, Western civilization is also categorized as

General Civilization in opposition to Japanese Civilization. Soseki is aware of the existence of other civilizations and his own classification of civilization is open to multiple interpretations, regardless, the phrasing could be understood as only Japan and The West exist as civilizations, which will be close to a narrow colonial view of a potential colonial Japan tied with civilization as progress, but this is better judged under the light of the following quote (Soseki 1992:156) “civilization in this sense means only that our general standard of living has risen; it does not mean that the pain of existence has been softened for us to any extent”. Soseki typifies civilization inside the lines of progress, leaving happiness outside of it. Soseki wasn’t outside the dominant colonial scheme, the term civilization is related to progress, but happiness exists in another sphere, and it has more value as it becomes the category Soseki calls attention on. Soseki’s rebels to the framing but accepts the concepts. The West exists as the civilization driven to consume everything in existence, while Japan exists in opposition. In these curious elucubrations, the emphasis is on the titular role of the West, not in the exclusionary sense of the non-existence of other civilizations besides Japan and the West.

4. The fool’s way

Deconstructing Soseki’s quotes, touches on the repercussions of human made alterations to one’s environment, the priority is not in the environment but in the wellbeing of the Japanese people. The positivist approach is not disregarded on account of immoral implications but due to its proclivity to generate unhappy people, the emphasis is not in nature itself, disregarding nature is the disregard of ones on self-fulfillment, unbalancing nature is the fool’s errand of trying to stop the sun, the futility of the action by itself is not the problem, but the dissatisfaction of desire. Technology by itself carries a great harm as homogenizing power into an unfulfilling life. Komori⁽⁶⁾ observes in Soseki, the train, the image of progress, only brought the adaptation of lifestyles and customs at every level to those of the Western Powers (Komori1999:125).

In Soseki’s words: (Soseki 2012:306-307) “You see, everyone is different. You can’t refashion others to be like you.... that one’s external environment cannot be

significantly changed, ... (be) constant with nature itself... the sun can't be stop from setting...." In this moment one can easily define Western by the opposite, refashioning others to be like you and trying to break away from nature. These two characteristics exist as the two pillars of postcolonial and decolonial studies, understood by Mignolo as (Mignolo 2018:4) "the compound expression: modernity/coloniality" also called the colonial matrix of power. Coloniality-modernity exist as a catachresis of refashioning others to your own image.

To ask about "we" by differentiation are constant questions that in words of Satoshi Ukai (2005:263) "The discipline called Postcolonial Studies constantly and often unconsciously revolves around (.....)." When it comes to the catachrestic expression "Western" that some call Europe, Satoshi says quoting Takeuchi Yoshimi: (Ukai 2005:266) "Simply being Europe doesn't make Europe Europe". Europe is understood as a nonidentical identity. Modernity has in its matrix of movement the principal of universality and assimilation, partaking inside the universal colonial project implies the renunciation to the culture of the assimilated. Inside the context of the reading, assimilation is not being executed by submission, but through voluntary assimilation. Its roots are in the necessity of recognition, the parameters are set, this competition was established by the rich men and it's by the rich men's rules that they are playing. The professor is being assimilated by fighting, as Japan became a colonial power by fighting its own humiliation. Japan associated its own Europeanization as liberation, as observed by Ukai (2005:275) "the nature of Japanese culture misapprehended its own Europeanization as liberation."

European non-identical identity is the project of life that seeks to be recognized as a human through the subjugation of the other. Self-defining as a civilizer or bringer of progress, can only exist in opposition to the uncivilized and backwards, this is a project trapped in a cycle of subjugation, in Satoshi Ukai's words: (Ukai 2005:276) "colonialism does not begin between Europe and its outside. It has always already begun (and its moreover not finished) in the inside of Europe's geographical boundaries and in the midst of its history. Europe itself is in a sense a colony, and this is why colonialism constitutes its essence". As Komori (1999) notices in "I am a Cat" the cat frames himself in opposition to his possible victimizer as a barbaric cannibal, following a rubric of the colonial-Christian tradition of typifying other

human projects as barbaric to justify colonialism. In this case, the cat refers to an overlord, the human student, by inverting this characteristics we can see Soseki reclaiming the words used by the colonial powers, making the powerful the barbaric inside their epistemological tools, an exercise of limited catachresis, there is rebellion to this system but not an overhaul, constant with Soseki's limitation, of criticizing the colonial power but not escaping their conceptual tools, the other is still a barbarian.

Soseki's quote (2002:308) "If you continue to behave as a Westerner", is catachrestic for, if you continue to behave as a colonial power, you will submit to the rich men and be humiliated by those who should learn from you, it's not the single fact of seeking recognition through the imposition of the other, you will also have to internalize the values of nations who define their existence through pecuniary accumulation, through greed, and your current values will be unacknowledged by those who have submitted to the biggest purse. As it's the case of the youth that renounce the tradition of respecting a proverbial teacher by submitting to the rich man's coins. (Soseki 2002:308) "You are a man of no wealth seeking,... a quarrel on positivist lines" It falls back on the interpretation of the positivist formula of he who doesn't acknowledge limitations, wealth exists as the way of the positive individual, the term "wealth" holds meaning. Soseki's use of "wealth" is open to our translation, wealth is pecuniary, the main characterization of the western values, even if the actor is Japanese. The man of wealth holds characteristics in opposition to our vicarious protagonist, as it's determined in the previous exposition, wealth gives the predisposition to engage in positive struggle, or the attitude of not acknowledging limits, the implication is not to wealth itself but the predisposition of the unsatisfactory way of not knowing one limits that he refers to, it's not pecuniary accumulation, but the predisposition of the unfulfilling project, he seems to be saying, you are a person seeking to live like another, another who knows no boundaries, but you are man of no wealth. The relation between wealth and boundaries is intertwined not in the pecuniary but in the over-bursting all seeking and all-encompassing attitude of the rich man, the way of the man who doesn't acknowledge ones limited domain.

The vicarious character is a self-absorb man, not inclined to forced self-assertion

on others, a man of books who does not understand or does not care of the values outside his word of academics, the rich man is a colonizing antagonist that seeks to expand its domain outside his field of influence to the one of the vicarious character. The war of the man of no wealth is foolish, as it's foolish the war of the rich man. The man of no wealth is fighting to ascertain control of his domain in the ways of the rich man, the rich man is trying to ascertain domain on a field that escapes his epistemological limitation, he wants to be respected by a man who doesn't respect wealth, this is a sign of homogenization of values which has been established as a dominant radical category, understood in the words of Pheng as (Pheng 2010: 187) "the dominant epistles of decolonization and as the result of the Subaltern's exclusion from the project of making the colonial subject". The imposition of one's values through the erasure of the other's values, the foolish errand of the rich man, is the action itself. The vicarious character can't understand the war he is been embroiled in, the reasoning and desires of the rich man escapes him, for this reason his submission is impossible, as the vicarious character is incapable of winning out of lack of resources, the two are fools, the one for being incapable of understanding that different values exist, and the other for being unable to ascertain that the way to respond was not through imitation.

These actions are being committed by Japanese but define as Western. "You are a man of no wealth" is directed to the professor, but the exhortation is to Japan, wealth is a catachresis. He talks to Japan, but our man of wealth is Japanese, it seems to say, you're one that doesn't hold values of colonization and you're seeking a fight in colonizers terms. In Soseki's words (1992:199) "Western manners-manners which, on us, look ridiculous."

The persistence of Soseki's admonishment against European tendencies has its origin in European tendencies. As he understood the present as a subject guided by the past, the subject's attitude to life becomes relevant, to this Soseki answers with Individualism from which he says (1992:169) "philosophy that replaces cliquism with values based on personal judgement of right and wrong. An individualist is not forever running with the group, forming cliques that trash blindly on the interests of power and money" here is important to clarify that Soseki understands power as (1992:165) "tool by means of which one forces his individuality on others." This,

according to Soseki, is the attitude to life that allows the English a balance within their impulses of over extension, in accordance with Utilitarian philosophy and its variants that were (are) extremely influential in England.

5. Conclusion

Lost to Soseki are his contradictions. Soseki can be viewed through a postcolonial optic but that doesn't make Soseki postcolonial. His fundamental understanding of historical reality and values are in opposition to the colonial tendency, he is not in direct opposition to colonialism. His critique of Japan adopting a colonial behavior verse on inefficient energy redistribution, since, according to Soseki, the Japanese haven't developed Individualism. The link between Individualism and capitalistic colonial greed is self evident. Soseki exists in the contradictions of opposing colonialism but playing with its epistemology, his insight of perceiving the past as a dream that fits the mold of postcolonial interpretation is cut by an assumption of a present reality, that is hold by an assumed Cartesian affirmation of "I exist", Cartesian affirmation that brakes the plural past, which is perceived as a colonial hallmark, as expressed by Aníbal Quijano (2024: 338) "In this sense, it is undeniable that without the radicalization of social relations and the basic social classification of people, without the doubling of the population between humans and semi-humans, into racially (i.e. naturally) superior and inferior people, the secularization of medieval Christian theology into the new Eurocentric philosophy with harshness would have advanced so far to propose its new radical Cartesian dualism (between reason and nature) and manage to be accepted as the basis of rational modernity."

Soseki marks a distance with colonialism when he sustains his view of the past but exists in the colonial word, this contradiction was not solved in Soseki, even in his own text where he spouses Individualism as manifestation of English balance, its recognition of the other and the lack of cliques inside this way of living, he is forced by himself to acknowledge a discrepancy, the suffragettes, women who seeking citizen rights as men possess, starved themselves and for this reason, according to Soseki, don't respect individualism. He was unable to see that women being unable to partake in politics is a clear sign of cliquism and imposition, regarding them he

says (1992:168) “I don’t know what is with this suffragettes -perhaps they can’t find husbands or they can’t find jobs”. This one sided view, goes to the limits of contradictions as he comments on the suffragettes on hunger strike (Soseki 1992;168) “makes life miserable for their jailers”. The obvious juxtaposition of those in jail against the jailers presents a clear case of someone cutting Individual liberty. This fact escapes reflection as do the reasons of the suffragettes, whose motivations are stated by Soseki between job and marriage. Soseki, makes no remark of the treatment of the English toward their colonies. Soseki was preoccupied with a colonial Japan, as he believed this will bring less happiness to its own citizens, nothing is said about the colonized. He acknowledges the dangers of colonization under this guise. His works hold a critique to colonialism, but he was not doing postcolonialism. His value for postcolonial studies lies in unraveling this dualism.

Notes

- (1) My summary of the advice is the following:
(Soseki 2002:306-308) “You see, every one is different. You can’t refashion others to be like you....I believe the ways of our ancestors are wiser.... Than the ways of Europe.... The main snag with positivism is that it acknowledges no limits...no human individual can ever have the whole of his heart’s desire”... Western civilization has produced some noticeable results... (but also a civilization of the inherently dissatisfied, a culture of unhappy peoples...The traditional civilization of Japan does not look for satisfaction by some change in the condition of others but in that of the self....The main difference between the west and Japan is that the latter civilization has developed ... that one’s external environment cannot be significantly changed, ... (be) constant with nature itself... the sun can’t be stop from setting....Any positivism approach... involves the question of money and power, it also involves the fact that you are a minority of one against heavy odds....if you continue to behave as a western... you will be forced to knuckle under the rich man and... be humiliated by little boys. You are a men of no wealth seeking,... a quarrel on positivist lines”
- (2) Gayatri Spivak, is a renown translator of Derrida, noticeable is the translation

Of Grammatology by Derrida

- (3) as expressed by Pheng (Pheng 2010:185-186) “In the scenario where the interests of the dominant class are particularistic (.....), these class interests are able to sway and organize society through the ideological constitution of subjects.”
- (4) in words of Quijano (Quijano 2024:235) “(.....) demystification of Eurocentrism by un hiding (.....) its nature as an intellectual provincialism that imposed its hegemony in the world as a tool of domination (.....)”.
- (5) As note by 小森 (2020:26)
- (6) For further reading is suggested 小森 陽一 1999『世紀末の予言者・夏目漱石』講談社。
- (7) 小森 陽一 2020『漱石深読』翰林書房。
- (8) 小森 陽一 1999『世紀末の予言者・夏目漱石』講談社。

References

- Calichman, Richard. 2005. (Editor) *Contemporary Japanese Thought*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cambridge-Dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/positive>,
consulted on 30/9/2024
- Derrida, Jaques. 2021. *Deconstruction in a nutshell*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Graeber, David. & Wengrow, David. 2012. *The Dawn of Everything*. Dublin: Penguin Books.
- Komori, Yoichi. 1999. *Natsume Soseki, the End of the Century Prophet*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
-The 20th Century as an Age of War and Revolution
-Militarism or Individual Freedom⁽⁷⁾
- Komori, Yoichi. 2020. *A Deep Reading of Soseki*. Tokyo: Kanrin Shobo.
-I Am a Cat⁽⁸⁾
- Mignolo, Walter. & Walsh, Catherine. 2018. *On decoloniality*. London: Duke University Press.
- Pheng, Cheah. 2010. Biopower and the New International division of reproductive labor, Reflections on the History of an Idea. *Can The Subaltern Speak*. pp. 179-212. New York: Columbia University Press
- Quijano, Aníbal. 2024. *Foundational Essays. On the Coloniality of Power*. London: Duke

University Press.

Said, Edward. 1994. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Sangjung, Kang. 2005. The discovery of the “Orient” and Orientalism. *Contemporary Japanese Thought*. Pp. 84-100. New York: Columbia University.

Soseki, Natsume. 2002. *I am a Cat*. Tokyo: TUTTLE.

Soseki, Natsume. 1992. *Kokoro: a novel and selected essays*. Chicago: Madison Books.

-My Individualism translated by Jay Rubin

-The Civilization of modern-day Japan translated by Jay Rubin

Spivak, Gayatri. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*. London: Harvard University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri. 2012. *An Aesthetic Education In The Era of Globalization*. London: Harvard University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri. 2006. *In Other Worlds*. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, Gayatri. 2008. *Other Asias*. Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.

Ukai, Satoshi. 2005. Colonialism and Modernity. Pp. 263-280. *Contemporary Japanese Thought*. New York: Columbia University.

UNdata World of information. 2024.

<https://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=POP&f=tableCode%3A28>, consulted on 30/9/2024

United Nation. 2024. World Economic Situation and Prospects 2024. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.