



5-28-2007

Individual Autonomy and the Work of Resistance: How Authors of the 1950s Reject State Absorption Through Imagination and Reaffirmation of the Body

Benjamin L. Boroughf
Western Michigan University, boroughf.1@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors_theses



Part of the English Language and Literature Commons

Recommended Citation

Boroughf, Benjamin L., "Individual Autonomy and the Work of Resistance: How Authors of the 1950s Reject State Absorption Through Imagination and Reaffirmation of the Body" (2007). *Honors Theses*. 1803.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors_theses/1803

This Honors Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Lee Honors College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.





THE CARL AND WINIFRED LEE HONORS COLLEGE

CERTIFICATE OF ORAL DEFENSE OF HONORS THESIS

Benjamin Boroughf, having been admitted to the Carl and Winifred Lee Honors College in Fall 2003, successfully presented the Lee Honors College Thesis on May 28, 2007.

The title of the paper is:

"Individual Autonomy and the Work of Resistance: How Authors of the 1950s Reject State Absorption through Imagination and Reaffirmation of the Body"

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Lisa Minnick', written over a horizontal line.

Dr. Lisa Minnick, English

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jeffrey Angles', written over a horizontal line.

Dr. Jeffrey Angles, Foreign Languages

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'John Adams', written over a horizontal line.

Dr. John Adams, English

From Jon R Adams <jon.adams@wmich.edu>

Sent Saturday, May 26, 2007 1:02 pm

To Lisa Minnick <lisa.minnick@wmich.edu>

Cc Jeffrey Angles <jeffrey.angles@wmich.edu> , benjamin.boroughf@wmich.edu , "Angles Jeffrey (WMU)" <jeffrey.angles@wmich.edu>

Subject Re: Thesis

Ben--

I, too, would like to give you props for the improvements that you've made on the piece, and I also agree that I'd be willing to sign (in absentia) your thesis papers. Perhaps Professors Minnick or Angles can initial/sign for me and attach this email as proof of my agreement.

I think two things have emerged in this process that you should take note of, Ben: 1) take help when it's offered. I know that my Master's Thesis advisor nearly re-wrote my thesis for me to help me with style, and I think too often we think we have to climb the academic ladder all by ourselves; and, 2) as Professor Minnick comments: no writing project is ever perfect, complete, finished. I, too, have articles that I wish I could withdraw from circulation!

Because I wish to re-enforce the idea of repeated returns to writing and because I've not been present to suggest revisions, I'll offer to give the thesis a careful combing during July and send my suggestions along to you in Columbus. How's that sound?

In the meantime, if you need to contact me about signatures, or need me to send a note to Keith Hearit, Professor Minnick has a phone number where I can be reached.

Congratulations again. I look forward to hearing of your great progress in grad school.

Jon

--

Jon Adams
Assistant Professor of English
916 Sprau Tower
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5331

----- Original Message -----

From: Lisa Minnick <lisa.minnick@wmich.edu>

Date: Friday, May 25, 2007 10:44 am

Subject: Re: Thesis

> Dear Ben (and all),

>

> I agree with Angles-sensei that the thesis in its latest (5/24)
> form is tremendously improved. I really appreciate Angles-sensei's
> careful (and extensive) responses and comments, and I appreciate
> the way that you, Ben, have incorporated many of them into your
> work. This is a much, much better paper than it was a month ago.

>

> I also agree with Angles-sensei that the process of improving as a
> writer is ongoing, for all of us involved in scholarly pursuits.
> The stages the thesis has gone through over these past four weeks
> reflect the kind of progress and improvement that is always
> possible, even for the most advanced writers. Angles-sensei's
> advice about the importance of writing in graduate school is right

> on the money and it's perhaps the most important scholarly advice
> you can get at this point in your career. In graduate school and
> beyond, your writing will be all anyone has to go on in terms of
> evaluating the quality of your ideas, thinking, logic, and
> understanding of theories and texts.
>
> So I concur with Angles-sensei and am ready to sign off on the
> thesis. I hope, though, that you still consider this paper worth
> nurturing. No piece of writing is ever really finished, until it
> shows up in print, and sometimes not even then. For example, one
> of my journal articles ended up later as a chapter in my book, but
> by the time it showed up in the book, it was practically
> unrecognizable from its earlier published form and, I think, much
> improved. It can be really satisfying when a paper finally says
> what you want it to say. (Now if only there were some way to make
> the earlier journal-article version disappear!)

>
> Let's figure out a way to get these papers signed. I have class
> MTWR from 12 to 1:40 and would be glad to work around that. Is our
> deadline Tuesday for submitting the papers?

>
> Cheers,
> LM

>
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Jeffrey Angles
> To: benjamin.boroughf@wmich.edu
> Cc: 'Jon R Adams' ; 'Lisa Minnick' ; Angles Jeffrey (WMU)
> Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2007 11:24 PM
> Subject: Thesis

>
>
> Ben-san,
>
>
>
> Otsukaresama deshita. The paper is much, much improved over the
> last draft we saw. I still think that there are places that are
> wordy or where the logic seems a bit excessively convoluted, but I
> have marked them in this draft and given suggestions about how you
> might change or clarify. I have provided some pretty extensive
> feedback, mostly about the sections having to do with Ishikawa Jun
> and the conclusion. Provided that you incorporate these
> suggestions, I think you should probably be in relatively good
> shape. (Let's hear what Dr. Minnick and Dr. Adams say.)

>
>
>
> Just a final point, as you enter grad school, do remember that
> you will be judged based on your writing, clarity, and
> organization of ideas. Do try to make sure that you are as
> straightforward, concise, and organized as possible when you write
> for them (and your future research projects as a scholar). I know
> that a lot of the professors in the OSU program are real sticklers
> when it comes to writing.

>
>
>
> Also, here is one final general hint. If you spend a lot of
> time torturing yourself about the wording of one sentence, there
> is probably too much packed in it. Step back for a second and

Benjamin Boroughf

Individual Autonomy and the Work of Resistance: How Authors of the 1950s Reject State Absorption through Imagination and Reaffirmation of the Body

Introduction

The purpose of comparing two works of literature is to highlight similarities and differences that might provide a greater understanding of the works. When comparing the two works, one can emphasize various elements of the texts, including national or international conventions, periods, genres, themes, influences, culture, movements, or aesthetic choices. At the same time, however, this process may actually distort the way in which one views the works. A reader can easily seize upon surface similarities and identify some “deep” relationship between the works that may not in fact actually exist. Moreover, a reader can easily focus on surface similarities in style and themes and assume they arise because of similar historical circumstances. If the works come from two different cultures, one of which influenced the other, then one can likely conclude that the literature was influenced as well. Unfortunately, when one does this, one forces the pieces of literature into a hierarchy, which prevents one from fully appreciating the individualistic qualities of the works. In essence, the tendency to point out similarities and differences between works helps obscure the individual work’s identity and the distinctive traits of each author.

To detail how comparing works can potentially limit the identities of author and text, this paper will focus on two works from the 1950s, William Burroughs’ novel *Naked Lunch* (1959) and Ishikawa Jun’s novella “The Raptor” (1953). Both of these works have a number of similarities. Both depict the fear of the rise in Communism; both use surrealist elements as a means to engage in social critique; both portray the potential for machines to replace humans in the future; and both illustrate the need to rebel against ideological forces. Still, this paper will

show that despite these surface similarities, there are significant differences between the themes and contents of each work. If one focuses excessively on the similarities, one will simply forget the differences. In order to effectively illustrate the bias that might arise when engaging in comparison, the first section of this paper will analyze 1950s America and William Burroughs, followed by a study of *Naked Lunch* that details how William Burroughs reflects a need to call attention to the crimes of the American government. The third section will then focus on 1950s Japan and Ishikawa Jun. The fourth section engages “The Raptor” and explores Ishikawa Jun’s writing as a representation of Japan’s occupation era and what Ishikawa Jun envisioned as the future of Japan. Finally, the last section will demonstrate how literary works lose their differences and individual identities in favor of indicating how different works from different regions of the world show a similar human condition.

The Struggle for Health in Post-World War II America

After World War II, American fear of Communism forced a separation in America between what those in power deemed American and un-American. For the American government, a Communist scare meant that the country had to unite in order to contain the ever-approaching threat to democracy. Through instilling a fear of Communism within the minds of the American public, the state spawned an anticommunist movement, which as the leftist historian Howard Zinn notes, “led the United States to spy on its own citizens” (Zinn 259). The 1950s American government belief in protecting democracy from the spreading red tide seemed justified after the “fall” of China to Communism. The government reasoned that protecting its citizens from Communist influences justified them preventing certain individuals from instigating “un-American” events in the cities of America. With their beliefs intact, the

American government hoped their actions would further the spread of democracy and the democratic way of life.

Since the state viewed supporters of Communism as opponents to the American way of life, those segments of American public who acceded the government's fear-mongering began to view many writers as enemies of the State. Some of these writers were leftist but others were simply individualists or people who wrote about their disapproval of the government. Of the writers negatively labeled, Howard Fast recalls that since he supported Communism "bookstores were reluctant to order my books" and "public spirited individuals undertook movements to have my books banned" (qtd. in Zinn 263). In fact, Howard Fast "was reduced to a struggle of literary existence" (qtd. in Zinn 263). While attempting to write and educate the American public, the writer's sense of purpose and self-confidence weakened to the point where he found no actual reason to live amongst the people who labeled him a non-person, an un-American enemy.

Simultaneously, a group of writers, known as the Beats, became determined to explore the issue of how people living as alienated "others" in their own country might find a *raison d'être*. According to Manuel Luis Martinez, author of *Countering the Counterculture*, the Beats created the foundation to their beliefs by focusing on "the central myth of the [...] individual as the target of encroaching foreign powers intent on absorbing the individual within a formless, undifferentiated mass" (27). The Beat's view paralleled the American government's "anticommunist hysteria" in that both essentially saw a formless mass encroach on their personal spaces. Each reacted by treating the amorphous as an immediate threat; while the American government viewed every Communist supporter as an enemy to American democracy, the immediate "threats" to the government's national body were those who inspired "un-American" feelings, those who advocated such "un-Americaness" as moral decrepitude, and yet who could

easily live in the nation's own body as "parasites." To awaken the national body to the threat of the "un-Americans," George Kennan, in his 1947 article, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," correlates the spread of Communism to a polluting "fluid stream" that must fill "every nook and cranny available to it in the basin of world power" and continues to state that "World Communism is like a malignant parasite which feeds only on diseased tissue" (Kennan). Through relating the spread of Communism to an organic body, the government could reason that to prevent the spread of disease, all Americans could only remain healthy by vigorously combating the spreading fluid of Communism. The American government thus concluded that the body held the right to contain or purge any individual that appeared as a threat to the body and its internal integrity.

One such individual, a Beat writer named William Burroughs, was a victim of the American national body's struggle for "health." The American government determined that William Burroughs' books provoked moral decay that could soon damage the wellbeing of the American national body. To explain his writings, William Burroughs was summoned before the Supreme Court. Literature scholar Jonathan Paul Eburne states that the central issue "was the imputation that the Beats radically and deliberately affronted firmly installed notions of decency and thus threatened to undermine the basic integrity of a nation that was already nervous about its internal security" (Eburne 54). Seen from the nation's perspective, when a writer uses obscenities in his/her writing and violates obscenity laws the writer exhibits a "disunity and internal disintegration" of the American nation that will empower the Communist movement and harm America's attempt to promote democracy (Kennan)¹. Following the Beats' beliefs, however, William Burroughs simply wrote to counter the homogenizing culture of 1950s America. After all, the government resolved to remove from public life any individual who

¹ The US Post Office impounded 10,000 copies "on the grounds of obscenity" (Grauerholz 239)

appeared or acted differently from the “all-American” in some way. To defend their censorship, The House of Un-American Affairs held trials to indict and imprison film writers and directors for suspicious connections with suspicious people².

William Burroughs, like other individuals of the conformist 1950s, viewed the American national body as unfriendly to independent thinkers who wanted to live their personal lives in peace. To William Burroughs, this national body, formed around the ideology of health, encroached upon the individual’s space. Instead, William Burroughs sought a new space; free from conforming to the national body, the new space would facilitate the living and thinking habits of those deemed “un-American,” “non-persons,” or “aliens.” The quest to locate such a space, according to Beat literature scholar Robert Holton, relates to an “impulse to found an identity on the bedrock of the naked self, free of compromising cultural historical accretions” where one could create authenticity amongst a conventionalizing culture (Holton 17). As an individual working toward the goal of locating a new communal space, William Burroughs wrote about the threatening body of the American government and its disheartening practice of labeling. Within his letters, William Burroughs relates bureaucracy to cancer, in that it is “a turning away from the human evolution direction of infinite potentials and differentiation and independent spontaneous action” (*Letters of Burroughs* 260-61). Nevertheless, just to focus on William Burroughs’ contempt for the ills of the old space prohibits one from realizing the benefits of discarding the old space and entering a new one. In the novel *Naked Lunch*, William Burroughs describes the evils of the 1950s America, fraught with conformity and bureaucracy, and the possibilities given to the alienated others by the American national body. According to *Naked Lunch*, the national body’s stalwart attempts to label and discount those considered a

² The most famous cases are those of the professed “Hollywood Ten.”

threat are precisely what causes the alienated “un-Americans” to want to depart from the national body.

The Critique of Health within *Naked Lunch*

In studying *Naked Lunch*, one often encounters reviews, critiques, or interviews that mention the work’s autobiographical nature. During an interview with Beat writer Allen Ginsberg, the interviewer, Jennie Skerl, states that the work of Beat writers including William Burroughs, Allen Ginsberg, and Jack Kerouac are “spiritual autobiography” (*Ginsberg on Burroughs* 278). Similarly, in an article, entitled “From Nightmare to Seredipity: A Retrospective Look at William Burroughs,” Richard Kostelanetz asserts that “In essence, *Naked Lunch* is a report of the hallucinatory madness Burroughs experienced during withdrawal from heroin addiction;” and the book’s scenes are “gathered [...] from notes he jotted down while undergoing withdrawal shock” (Kostelanetz 123). While these statements are perhaps probable, the statements of Jennie Skerl and Richard Kostelanetz greatly limit the ways that one might read *Naked Lunch*. *Naked Lunch* is one example of works of imagination that document an entire era, and not just the spiritual life of one person. Moreover, *Naked Lunch*, with the help of the reader and with its numerous textual clues, resembles more of William Burroughs’ pursuit to locate the required space for alienated non-people such as him and the rest of the Beat writers.

In *Naked Lunch*, the symbol of the American national body which exercises its control via a bureaucracy is Dr. Benway, a rather incompetent and sociopathic doctor. In his endeavors to manipulate the bodies and minds of individuals, Dr. Benway explains to the main character, Bill Lee, the subject who represents the American people ““must never be made to feel that he deserves *any* treatment he receives because there is something (never specified) horribly wrong with him”” (Burroughs 19). To prevent any resistance, Dr. Benway insists that ““The naked need of the control addicts must be decently covered by an arbitrary and intricate bureaucracy so that

the subject cannot contact his enemy direct” (Burroughs 19). Through Dr. Benway’s report on how to control a subject, the power relations between doctor and subject – or controller and controlled – utilize the authority of the bureaucracy to prevent any knowledge of harm or any ability for the controlled subject to fight back. As bureaucratic control manages the subjects, the organic turns to the inorganic, for Dr. Benway states, ““Soon we’ll be operating by remote control on patients we never see ... We’ll be nothing but button pushers”” (52). The doctor alludes to how the bureaucracy will solve the 1950s problem: the bureaucracy will eventually quell diversity through its machine-like controls and behaviors. The novel states that in Annexia, the state in which Dr. Benway worked contains nonconformity through its police that process “suspected agents, saboteurs and political deviants on an assembly line basis” (21). Despite Dr. Benway’s wry remarks and the perhaps comical portrayals of Annexia, the harms of the bureaucracy are clear. Bureaucracy ends diversity and the machine-like behaviors of the subjects and the controllers limit the vast potentials of life.

Although it deals with the threat to diversity, Burroughs’ diatribe against the bureaucracy of Annexia and Dr. Benway does not show a strong connection between the government within *Naked Lunch* and the American national body. For that reason, another doctor, by the name of Doctor “Fingers” Schafer speaks of the unnecessary amount of the body’s nerves. Doctor Schafer and his nervous system subject appear in the section, *Meeting of International Conference of Technological Psychiatry*. During this meeting, Dr. Schafer explains that ““the human nervous system can be reduced to a compact and abbreviated spinal column”” (Burroughs 87). When the subject appears in front of the audience, the subject mutates into a black centipede which emits a stench that fills the room, “searing the lungs, grabbing the stomach” (87). In creating a creature that resembles George Kennan’s 1947 statements of the fluid of Communism, Dr. Schafer resembles the American government’s attempts to explain the threat of

Communism. While other doctors seem dismayed over the creation, the doctors exhibit both American government and public reactions to the threat of pollution (stench or Communism). One doctor declares, ““Our duty to the human race is clear [...] We must stomp out the Un-American crittah”” (Burroughs 87, 8). The doctor then demands gasoline, and the scene fades out to a courtroom where a DA states the doctors killed the creature (88). During this quick-paced scene, the reader observes that Dr. Schafer’s projects involve reducing the peripheral nervous system. In one aspect, the reduction of the peripheral nervous system means that the subject will have no personal control over the organs and limbs. Additionally, with the nervous system reduced to the spinal cord, the subject will only act out reflexes. As a result, these reductions prevent the subject from moving or thinking independently or personally.

Nevertheless, reduction implies another aspect of control. By reducing a high number of stimulation paths to a low number, multiple potentials of action decrease to one or a very few. The subject’s controller, perhaps Dr. Schafer, then can easily manipulate the subject’s body and prevent unnecessary reactions. Accordingly, if the subject’s body equates to the nation’s body, the higher amount of nerves (or diversity of individuals) means a higher potential that the subject might perform unacceptable behaviors, or for individuals to act against the nation’s needs. The novel seems to indirectly suggest that in reducing the amount of diversity in the nation’s body, the controller limits and maintains the number of actions the body performs; consequently the controller prevents the body from performing any action that invariably lowers its health. When the state limits a subject’s amount of thinking or degree of movement, the state essentially turns people into machines. The subject as machine enables the controller to observe health and integrity carefully. For the health of the body, the controller must purge those reactions deemed unfit, thereby mechanizing the body’s reactions. Contextualized within the 1950s Communist scare, *Naked Lunch* seems to address the issues of individuals who have undergone the national

body's struggle for internal health and integrity. Labeled "others" and discounted because of their status, they are left without a viable means to life, presumably to wither away and die. Nevertheless, *Naked Lunch* suggests that these "viruses" attacking the American (bureaucratic) body can survive without the host. With Bill Lee "occluded from space-time [...] Never again [having] a Key, a Point of Intersection" he disappears from recognition (Burroughs 181). Freed from the burden of having to exist in a space and time controlled by bureaucracies, freed from "The Heat" that regulates the body's health, Bill Lee evinces the actual state of the alienated "others." Without a host, a controller or regulator of health, the "other" who does not conform, lives outside the system, in a new space guided by inscrutability and the limitless possibilities of life.

The Struggle to Control Post-World War II Japan

As the American national body attempted to promote the spread of democracy within its own borders, post World War II Japan, controlled from 1945 to 1952 by the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers (run principally by the United States) also experienced a Communist scare. America's attempt to rid Japan of Communist influences divided Japan between those who supported the American way and those who supported other means. America continued to divide the nation even as the occupation forces determined to leave Japan. As anti-Communist forces and Communists, Marxists, and Socialists struggled for control, Japan had few choices for individual liberty.

During their occupation of Japan, the American forces determined that Asia lacked a democratic influence. To spread democracy, and to contain Communist threats, the American government determined that Japan should align with the free world. With China controlled by Communism, the Soviet Union managing North Korea, and America already occupying Japan,

the only reasonable choice was, according to Don Adams and Mamoru Oshia, to make Japan “the showplace of democracy in Asia” (Adams 10). Thus, to prevent a Communist takeover of Japan the occupation forces advocated the purging of ultranationalist political officials from office and democratizing of Japan’s political and economic sectors.

Since the 1950s, the Japanese economy and nation depended largely on labor and the potential for labor, so Japan had to trade with other countries. Japan was interested in trading with Communist China, one of its nearest neighbors; but some feared that if Japan began to trade with China, democratic influences would suffer and America, according to anthropologist Douglas Haring, would “face a threat in the western Pacific equal to that posed by threatened Soviet domination of Western Europe” (Haring 12). As a result, America’s plans for Japan depended greatly on “strengthening Japanese friendship [with the United States], and arousing the Japanese to their own national danger” (12). The sense that Japan was in “danger” aligned Japan with the United States; but at the same time, the “danger” suggests that Americans actually had a greater need for Japan than Japan had for America. In fact, Dwight Eisenhower demanded American attention on the Communist scare in Japan, for ‘If the Kremlin controls [the Japanese], all of that great war-making capacity would be turned against the free world. ... And the Pacific would become a Communist lake’ (qtd. in Brands, 387). Even without the Japanese people’s support of the free world, the occupation forces could help persuade the Japanese government into cooperating with the free world of the west.

To turn Japan into the ideal American “vassal state” (*zokkoku*), the American government became determined to halt any further attempts for domestic Communists to influence Japan’s political or economic sectors. As historian Hans Baerwald states, the domestic threat of Communism took the form of “increasing militancy and political radicalism of the trade unions” in 1949 (Baerwald). To prevent Communist attempts to dismantle the American hold on Japan,

the occupation forces enacted a “red purge” in 1950. After the “red purge”, however, the American forces resolved to end its overt occupation campaign and instead to focus on a campaign of peace. In 1952, the occupation ended but America maintained its presence in Japan by means of an American ratified security treaty. With this treaty, entitled the “US-Japan Security Treaty,” came a culture war in Japan between Communists, Marxists and Socialists who insisted that an overall peace did not require a security treaty, and Americans and their Japanese followers who demanded an ongoing alliance.

For those who wanted American security, a fully independent Japan was secondary to the benefits afforded by an alliance with America. Japan American-influenced reactionaries, who wanted only the United States involved with peace, the independence of Japan seemed inferior to the benefits afforded them by an alliance with America. At the same time, however, the Socialist Party, the Communist Party, and liberal and Marxist intellectuals, advocated a peace that included powerful Eastern countries such as the Soviet Union and China. To promote the campaign of overall peace, Igarashi Takeshi states that the Socialist Party adopted five slogans entitled “The Three Principles on Peace” which included the policy of overall peace (Igarashi 348). Moreover, to garner additional support for overall peace, unions that represented “teachers, the telegram and postal services, private railways, the mining industry, [...] adopted their own peace policies” that included the principle of overall peace (Igarashi 352). Amidst the slogans and support for overall peace, however, the Socialist Party, as well as the Communist Party operated much like the reactionaries: in promoting their own form of peace for Japan, the Communists and Socialists directly opposed any plan or principle of peace the other party endorsed, and attempted to stifle Japan’s independence.

After losing the war, Japan experienced a vacuum of values, and a loss of national identity. In arguing for an American-backed peace policy, perhaps American-influenced

intellectuals sensed a need to identify with America. The editor of the conservative newspaper *Nippon Times*, Kazuo Kawai, details how Japan's history reflects positive sentiment toward democracy and how modern-day Japanese "like democracy" and "are receptive to new influences" (25). The Marxists, Communists, and Socialists, in contrast to identifying with America, recognized China and the Eastern European states so that Japan could finally find some form of identity. Neither of these two paths, however, allowed Japan to acquire its own personal identity; the Americans who arrived after the war to quell the domestic and foreign pressures on a weakened nation encountered leftist thinkers determined to resist turning Japan into an American colony.

As a writer who wrote during this time of confusion over Japan's destiny, Ishikawa Jun avoided the search for rigid identity and national integrity that plagued Japan. After the war and during the occupation, many of Japan's intelligentsia and non-intellectuals found solace in appealing to foreign models of progress and reform. For literary historian John Dower, the desire for some form of identity was embedded in "the quest for a 'modern self'" (236). A revolution of Marxist thought engulfed economic thinkers, Tokyo University educators, who "gave the elite students of the nation an eclectic education in Marxism as well as in classical and neoclassical economics," and numerous literary scholars (Dower 237). Contrary to this intense revolution of the doctrinaire Communists and Marxists, Ishikawa Jun, according to the literary historian, Donald Keene, simply focused on "his dislike of Japanese militarism and other aspects of authoritarianism" in writing his literature (1095). Due to distancing himself from uncompromising ideologies, scholars after the war considered him a part of the *burai-ha* school of writing, which generally opposed societal norms of decency. The *burai-ha*, a group of writers that frequently included Dazai Osamu, Sakaguchi Ango, and Oda Sakunosuke, were first known as the "new gesaku" writers. In his voluminous book *Dawn to the West*, Donald Keene states

that the comic criticisms of society of the “new gesaku” writers “implied a rejection of the self-satisfaction of the *Shirakaba* writers, who were convinced of the importance of their every act, and of the proletarian writers, who were sure that they could explain all human activities in terms of Marxist doctrine” (Keene 1022). One could easily understand a possible, albeit preliminary, conclusion that Ishikawa Jun’s thoughts and writings are part of the *burai-ha* school since Ishikawa Jun refrained from dogmatic schools of thought, such as Marxism. Additionally, much like the other *burai-ha* writers, Ishikawa Jun was fascinated with French literature. Donald Keene views this interest as a chance to “learn from the French how to write novels of his own” (1089). Despite these links, Ishikawa Jun greatly differs from the *burai-ha* writers. Rather than follow the *burai-ha*’s style of writing about their own personal lives, “Ishikawa Jun very rarely based [his writings] on personal experiences” (Keene 1088). Moreover, the *burai-ha* group came from disparate backgrounds and wrote with such unrelated aims that only because of scholars grouping writers who “happened to possess similar tastes” did the *burai-ha* writers even form a group (Keene 1025). Even if Ishikawa Jun’s past stances and French influences resemble a *burai-ha* writer, Ishikawa Jun’s aims limit his connections with other writers.

The Individual Body’s Power in “The Raptor”

Unlike the scene-like writing that characterizes the relatively disconnected *Naked Lunch*, “The Raptor,” is written with organized chapters and is commonly regarded as a “novel” (*shōsetsu*).³ Similarities to Japan’s occupation history reveals, however, that perhaps “The Raptor” is more than merely a fictionalized story of a man named Kunisuke. Resembling the historic “red purge” of Japan, the Monopoly purges Kunisuke from his job at the Monopoly

³ In his 1960 “Letter to Irving Rosenthal” William Burroughs explains “it is definitely my intention that [*Naked Lunch*] should flow from beginning to end without spatial interruption or additional chapter headings. I think the marginal headings are definitely indicated. THIS IS NOT A NOVEL. And it should not appear looking like one” (Burroughs 249).

Tobacco factory. According to William Tyler, who translated “The Raptor” and who also provided an exegesis that accompanies the story, other than the “red purge” of 1950, “The Raptor” also allegorizes a “culture war between two competing views of the postwar era, or ‘peacetime.’” Embodying the “conservative ‘reverse course’ establishment that began to emerge in Japan in 1947-1948,” the Monopoly, “the enemy,” and the police define, market and control a new status quo. In complete contrast to the new status quo and its controllers, the leftist faction of tobacco makers represents the “remnants of left-wing visionaries” (Tyler 224). Two years later, Kunisuke encounters a leftist faction of cigarette producers who manufacture cigarettes closely resembling those of the Monopoly. As a result, Kunisuke becomes trapped in a clash of cultures. Forced out of a culture that sought to end a lawlessness that could destroy the Monopoly’s unilateral control, Kunisuke partakes in the actions of another culture that, as John Dower notes, used the purge to confirm “the more doctrinaire Left in its self-righteous condemnations of bourgeois hypocrisies” (Dower 438).⁴ Unable to exercise his one aim in life, to produce the best cigarettes, Kunisuke realizes that he is a pawn within the culture clash – an instrument to further the aims of either culture at the expense of his autonomy.

“The Raptor” opens with Kunisuke walking from the city, across a canal and to an apparently empty warehouse. Upon walking into the house-like warehouse, Kunisuke finds a bag of cigarettes. When a man appears from the warehouse’s receiving window, the man gives Kunisuke a bag full of cigarettes and tells Kunisuke to deliver the bag to a tobacco shop shown on a map given to Kunisuke as well. As Kunisuke starts his new job, he thinks back to how he heard about the warehouse and its cigarettes. Sitting down in a café by his apartment, Kunisuke, who needed a job, hears a voice behind him asking if he needs a job. The stranger, named K tells him where to go for a job and then leaves. Back in the present, Kunisuke delivers the bags

⁴ Such threats of lawlessness evoke General MacArthur’s June 6 1950 comments that the “ultra-leftist” must not continued unchecked lest Japan’s plight worsens and the allied policies in Japan falter (Swearingen 209-212).

of cigarettes and decides to buy one of the boxes that the clerk dumps into a jar on top of the counter. After surprisingly seeing K, who gives Kunisuke a book of the language of tomorrow, Kunisuke returns to and begins to stay in the warehouse. After entering his room, Kunisuke concludes that the warehouse manufactures the fine smelling cigarettes the he bought the other day. Determined to find the leaves, he sneaks downstairs but encounters the female leader of the warehouse. She motions for him to continue his work, and Kunisuke receives another sack of cigarette boxes. Upon realizing that he works for rebels and insurrectionists, due to him seeing a city newspaper explain the same exact wordings as a newspaper with moveable print that he found in his room, Kunisuke runs to the warehouse and takes out a pack of cigarettes. Kunisuke, however, cannot remember which pack the tobacco store clerk gave him. Nonetheless, Kunisuke smokes a cigarette from the pack and the entire warehouse erupts in commotion. The female leader summons him, and as she ridicules Kunisuke for his mistake of smoking the wrong cigarette, police storm the warehouse and a battle between workers and police ensues.

Kunisuke wakes up the next day and realizes that he escaped the police. He walks to a crowd in the city who are listening to a report about the battle at the warehouse. Kunisuke continues to think that he escaped the police. He witnesses the arrest of K at the coffee shop and quickly goes to the park; but Kunisuke sees a police officer and decides to run away. The officer chases after Kunisuke and arrests him for possessing a contraband cigarette. Placed into a police wagon and sent to an underground prison, Kunisuke becomes trapped behind bars. Nonetheless, Kunisuke attempts to break through the bars. Once he hears the cries of other prisoners, and feeling their strength, however, Kunisuke escapes the underground prison. As he stands outside the prison, Kunisuke sees the female leader of the warehouse flying in the sky, in the form of a Raptor. Kunisuke leaves the premises of the prison and of the enemy and swims through the waters of the canal.

For Kunisuke, tobacco is a product for all people to enjoy. As a result of his theory that research “ought to be directed, especially in the areas of its practical applications and uses,” toward promoting “what he called ‘The Happiness of All People,’” Kunisuke initially feels that the Monopoly and he should produce the most exquisite cigarettes (Ishikawa 101, 2). To achieve his goal, Kunisuke’s idea of happiness must match the Monopoly’s idea. The Monopoly dislikes his leftist leaning phrase, “The Happiness of All the People,” however, and decides not to support Kunisuke. Without the Monopoly’s support, Kunisuke remains unable to fit in and powerless to stay with the Monopoly. Nevertheless, Kunisuke happens across the leftist faction tobacco producers. Although Kunisuke thinks of himself as an expert on tobacco, he is unable to determine a perceivable difference between the Monopoly’s cigarettes and the leftist faction’s cigarettes. Like the Monopoly’s, the outside of the faction’s cigarette boxes had “The word c-i-g-a-r-e-t-t-e-s [...] spelled out in English (Ishikawa 98). Even when Kunisuke becomes a member of the leftist faction and delivers their cigarettes around town, he cannot determine which cigarettes he gives out even though the faction’s bags “had a tear on the top edge in the form of a crescent” (106). The almost mirror-like semblance of both cigarettes thus confuses Kunisuke and disables him from determining which brand correlates to which manufacturer.

As he attempts to understand the differences between the cigarettes Kunisuke discovers that the cigarettes actually differ in smell. When a puppy that Kunisuke finds early on in the story smells the faction’s cigarettes, the puppy’s nose begins “to twitch, and as he squinted his eyes and sniffed the air, he tried to follow the train of smoked that emerged from Kunisuke’s lips” (107). After seeing the puppy react joyously, Kunisuke remembers that his Peace cigarettes from the Monopoly made the puppy give Kunisuke “the saddest look. He had even tucked in his tail and run away from him” (107). Again, when Kunisuke exhales the Monopoly cigarette’s smoke the puppy puts “his head down on Kunisuke’s lap. Looking ever so much as though he

wanted to crawl into a hole and hide, the little fellow buried his nose inside Kunisuke's jacket"

(108). Given a choice between a foul smelling smoke and a pleasant smelling smoke, Kunisuke decides on the pleasant smelling leftist faction cigarettes. As he continues to work for the faction, Kunisuke begins to have no desire for the old brand of peace cigarettes; Kunisuke "had reached the point where the ordinary brand of Peace no longer satisfied him. [...] The flavor did not measure up to his high standards" (Ishikawa 119). His high standards, much like his aim in life, leads Kunisuke to desire to locate, touch, and understand the new and fine tobacco leaf. The "peace" produced by the leftist faction began to exert such a powerful influence over Kunisuke that he no longer could remain satisfied with the ordinary "peace" of the Monopoly, which controlled all "peace" production. One can view Kunisuke's desire for the leftist faction's "peace" as indirectly denouncing the SCAP government who controlled all the operations of Japan during the Occupation, including providing peace for the nation. Indeed, according to historian John Dower, with the full transcript of Senate hearings of General MacArthur released, "a mere five words [...] drew obsessive attention: *like a boy of twelve*" (Dower 551). The words, Dower states, awakened the Japanese "to how they had snuggled up to the conqueror." As a result, "the former supreme commander began to be purged from memory. [...] Plans for a memorial were abandoned. No statue would be built" (551). Before this event, however, Communist demonstrators disrupted a Memorial Day celebration "in the plaza before the imperial palace." When eight demonstrators were arrested for stoning four Americans "the Communist party newspaper recklessly carried their photographs and hailed them as 'patriots'" (Dower 272). By simply attempting to control the peace of the nation through purifying the private and public sectors, the occupation forces merely empowered certain individuals, such as the Communists, to fashion their own ideas of how Japan should attain peace.

With the ordinary “peace” and its controllers disregarded and with his idea of working toward the goal of increasing “The Happiness of All People,” Kunisuke turns to the leftist faction’s tobacco. Given that the puppy reacts positively to the faction’s cigarettes, that the faction provides Kunisuke with a job and that they house the finest smelling tobacco leaf, the chances of Kunisuke able to exercise his purpose should improve. Unfortunately, Kunisuke never studies the faction’s tobacco leaves. Due to smoking an ordinary brand of cigarettes in the faction’s factory, Kunisuke ruins any possibility to achieve his aim. The faction labels Kunisuke a traitor and a slave to his slave cigarettes (132), a practice which also appears in *Naked Lunch*. Unlike Bill Lee and the other labeled characters such as Dr. Schafer’s nervous system subject, however, Kunisuke does not accept the label and instead proclaims “‘I’m a human being!’” (132); a human being, however, that “didn’t realize” (133) he brought and smoked the ordinary peace cigarettes. Forgiven for his human innocence, his inherent ability to pollute and not fit in, Kunisuke attempts to realign with the leftist faction. When the enemy police invade the factory, through the hole in Kunisuke’s room, Kunisuke indicates that his brothers “were the ones taking the terrible beating” (142). Still, after the enemy police arrest him for simply running away from a police officer, Kunisuke realizes that his status remains the same since the purge. As William Tyler notes, following his purge from the Monopoly Kunisuke “has begun to entertain doubts about himself and his fellow human beings. In fact, he has become something of a reject or cipher” (230). Nonetheless, Kunisuke does not even fit with the leftist faction who runs the cigarette producing factory.

Once he smokes the ordinary peace cigarettes and personally pollutes the factory, Kunisuke understands that he cannot fit in with the machine-like workers of the leftist faction, who “labored in silence and without ever stopping to take a break” (135). Kunisuke feels “his worth as a human being cast aside as something that was totally useless” resembling a rejected

leaf “the machine had dumped in a pile on the floor” (138). Moreover, upon seeing his underground prison cell, Kunisuke realizes that the faction, much like the Monopoly, provided him with little human worth. Like his walk-in closet sized room in the factory, the prison cell was a cramped space, that had a low ceiling, lacked any light fixture or furnishings, and had “a square-shaped air vent [...] cut into the outside wall” (155). Whereas he first lived with the faction on a floor that neither created a third floor or connected with the second floor, Kunisuke now lives underground. Forced into a limited existence once more, Kunisuke remains out of the machine, a human and unneeded part in the entire mechanical system of peace and happiness. Ishikawa Jun demonstrates the validity in Kunisuke’s original assumption that perhaps the leftist faction cigarettes “had been made to look like an expensive brand of tobacco when, quite the contrary, they contained a strange and unknown substitute” (99). Since the leftist faction’s peace cigarettes are simply a substitute for the Monopoly’s peace cigarettes, the leftist ideology does not necessarily provide any more human worth and comfort to the individual than the mainstream ideology.

With Kunisuke realizing his humanness and how the system leaves him out of its concepts of peace and happiness, perhaps those reading “The Raptor” realize that the struggle for peace between the reactionaries and the Communist, Marxist, and Socialist factions also exclude Japan from deciding its own future. Contrary to the obscenity and absurdity in *Naked Lunch* that might cause some to discount the text as a social critique, “The Raptor” seems eager to encourage the Japanese to reconsider the anti-Communist mindset that had been adopted by the Japanese politicians. For William Tyler notes “*The Raptor* can be read, and usually is, as championing a left-wing libertarianism over the narrow and hidebound authority and a ‘reverse course’ establishment” (Ishikawa 235). Furthermore, whereas *Naked Lunch* forces the reader to merely assume that Annexia relate to America during the 1950s, the contextualized content of

“The Raptor” assists the reader in understanding the proper time and setting of Kunisuke’s battle with the Monopoly and the leftist faction.

Ishikawa Jun seems to tout the benefits of siding with the leftist faction. Kunisuke declares that the leftist faction manufactured “the Peace of tomorrow, and because theirs was a brand that was infinitely superior to ordinary Peace, eventually the day would come when everyone in the city would rise up and embrace it for its peerless aroma and taste” (127). Nevertheless, when Kunisuke releases the polluting ordinary peace smoke, his equation of a superior peace equating to a greater amount of happiness falters and Kunisuke doubts himself once more. In spite of his doubts about the faction’s cigarettes, the world of tomorrow, and himself, though, Kunisuke eventually finds solace. While Kunisuke initially focuses on how to increase the people’s happiness through peace cigarettes, his brief time in the underground prison awakens him to the power of the people themselves. In fact, when Kunisuke first learns about the leftist faction and the opportunity for a job, Kunisuke states that he can do “just about anything so long as it has to do with cigarettes” (Ishikawa 103). In the course of attempting to break through the bars of his cell, however, Kunisuke feels a rhythmic beat that travels along the floor and through the brick walls. Just as he determines that his body is not making the sound, he realizes that “it was the rhythm of all human beings who, extracting every ounce of energy that can be squeezed from the human frame, take to their feet in revolt even if they are repulsed time and again” (Ishikawa 162). Finally, Kunisuke realizes what he “had been unaware in the past” (162). Differing significantly from Bill Lee’s individual struggle to run away from the authorities in the section *hauser and o'brien*, Kunisuke relishes in the rhythm and feels a bond with all the humans working to revolt against unknown forces. Through his labor, Kunisuke escapes the underground prison. The people, not the cigarettes, enable Kunisuke to move forward.

As a result of Kunisuke realizing the power of people, “The Raptor” moves beyond simply advocating a left-wing agenda, and thus differs drastically from *Naked Lunch*. Although both stories explain the need of an individual to revolt against ideological forces that can take the form of machines, *Naked Lunch* never advocates the strength of humans; rather it argues for the might of those alienated and labeled non-humans against the machines of the bureaucracy. In contrast, by demonstrating how the people inside the prison free Kunisuke from the limits imposed on him by the system of peace and happiness, Ishikawa Jun is perhaps responding to an opinion of another important postwar writer, Fukunaga Takehiko, who shared Ishikawa’s intellectualism and interest in French literature. Fukunaga Takehiko, Donald Keene writes, “was convinced that the discovery of the human being was the special task imposed on Japanese writers of the new generation” (Keene 1011). “The Raptor” signifies the importance of locating inner human strength over the search for peace and happiness through external means.

Moreover, since Ishikawa Jun wrote “The Raptor” in a time too when Japan faced external obstacles preventing its independence and self-definition, one might read it as a parable about how an alienated other might identify with external powers. Given a choice between similar peaces, in cigarette or policy form, the Japanese citizen who cares about wellbeing and who hopes for a world of tomorrow should thus unite with fellow human beings and revolt. The novel suggests the solution to the occupation and peace policy involves denying both foreign influences and accepting the power of human beings, for such actions will ultimately enable Japan to escape the cramped confines of foreign pressures and prepare Japan to move forward by itself and for itself.

How Comparative Processes Invade the Individual’s Space

Comparative literature involves examining different authors, literary themes and social influences. Some scholars of comparative literature explain that a work's significance and influence rests in its ability to educate disparate individuals about different cultures. For comparative studies scholar, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese states that two aspects of comparative literature, namely intertextuality and differentiation, enrich the learning process. When one reads and compares unrelated texts, one begins to observe differences and similarities in cultures. The result is that one begins to consider how these differences and similarities relate to one's own culture.

Differentiation and intertextuality are problematic, however. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese innocuously states that when there is no proof to assume "specific authors had any familiarity with texts the themes of which they appear to be echoing, we may begin to argue for universal or archetypal patterns in human experience and imagination or for recurring narrative of what it means to be human" (Fox-Genovese 141). Due to major social and global events like World War II, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese believes the world is a global village linked by cultural contacts and textual exchanges. By comparing two unrelated texts, the comparative scholar looks for proof of the post-World War II notion of the global community. The existence of this community, as Jola Skuji insists, suggests that literature cannot exist "as isolated events of the closed national existence of cultural history and cannot be understood without contacts with literary phenomenon of other national cultures" (Skuji 143). As a consequence of the global phenomenon, however, any comparative analysis between two works can lead to a misunderstanding of both works and their authors. When a comparative scholar announces that similarities exist between two separate works, the works immediately succumb to the scholar's agenda of explaining how he/she personally understands the two works connecting within the global community. Even if a scholar compares works with an understanding of "the social,

political, moral, and religious values out of which [the texts'] authors were writing" the way in which the scholar goes about comparing the works can destroy the works' personal identities (Fox-Genovese 137). A work's identity, then, is not a resolute and permanent expression of what the author wants to say. Rather, restricting a comparative study to the world of connected cultures and literatures transforms a work's identity into a malleable tool designed to convey the scholar's expression of the global community.

The notion of a global community implies an equalitarian belief in all cultures; but because one culture embraces the other culture during cultural interaction, not every culture is equal. Indeed, when two cultures come into contact, one culture may dominate the second and force the inferior culture to change; both cultures may accept one another's cultures and change accordingly, or a completely new culture may arise. Regardless of how the cultures interact, the one factor propelling change is the perception of "the other." Since a literary text reflects culture, one text invariably acts as "the other," when a comparative scholar compares two texts. Due to "the other" revealing what is missing or what is similar, the process of comparing two works to arrive at some educational goal inevitably creates a hierarchy. As a result of this hierarchy, the two texts lose their individual statuses. Accordingly, when viewed through this process *Naked Lunch* and "The Raptor" lose their ability to stand independently. One can easily assume mistakenly that perhaps "The Raptor" influenced *Naked Lunch* or *Naked Lunch* influenced "The Raptor," whereas no known connections exist between Ishikawa Jun and William Burroughs.⁵ Nevertheless, scholars may try to locate similarities and explain them.

When examined together, one finds that both texts tell of an individual struggling against the influence of powerful ideologies and, more specifically, Bill Lee and Kunisuke escaping their

⁵ Yet, one other Japanese writer, Suwa Yu "was active in introducing the 'beat poets' of America to Japan, especially Allen Ginsberg, whose poetry he translated into Japanese" (Koriyama 150). The main thrust of Ishikawa Jun still remains powerful regardless of not including Suwa's poems. Because so few Japanese authors are available in English, it is difficult to reach conclusions about lines of influence, and even those authors that are available remain individual and in need of further translations.

limited space because the ideological systems discount their statuses in life. Perhaps, though, such similarities result because of coincidental responses to comparable national histories; for both Japan and America experienced Communist scares that alienated certain citizens that the anti-Communist authorities deemed “unfit.”

Nonetheless, if one attempts to conclude that somehow the American presence in Japan was the cause of the similarities – or that American ideas influenced Ishikawa Jun’s writing – then the scholar suspiciously limits Japan’s own identity and ability to live on its own. To assume that the similarity of ideas in Burroughs and Ishikawa occurred because Japan was reflecting or imitating “the other” (American culture) wrongly raises the power and prestige of American culture.

Regardless of which way the scholar decides to compare *Naked Lunch* and “The Raptor” to conclude that cultural similarities create a global community and a shared human experience is tempting. Due to a global connection, the scholar assumes that any similarities in the personal aims of the authors further justify a shared experience. The scholar might assume that similarities in the personal aims of the authors further justify a shared experience, such as William Burroughs, in an interview, advocating that can finds his/her purpose of life and Ishikawa Jun’s character Kunisuke finding that his purpose of life is to express the power of humanity.⁶ Nonetheless, many postmodern theorists argue that scholarship should be wary about taking the personal aims of the authors into consideration; instead, postmodernists tend to read individual works of literature as a reaction to the particular cultural ethos of the time.

Ultimately, the works and authors turn into depersonalized objects of the scholar’s whim. Such abuses blatantly dominate works and authors that deserve the ability to determine their own existences. Without acknowledging the works’ or even the authors’ sovereignty, the scholar

⁶ In Jennie Skerl’s interview with Burroughs, William Burroughs states that only when a person is doing their actual purpose (“as to his ostensible purpose”) does “does someone glimpse their purpose” with the surprise of realize his actions are his real purpose in life (Skerl 6, 7)

forces readers and comparative literature learners to react only to the scholar's objectives and not to the guiding principles of each author's work. Thus, to guarantee the educational benefits of reading *Naked Lunch* and "The Raptor" one must view the literary works as the respective and dissimilar American and Japanese responses to their individual social and historical events.

Works Cited

- Adams, Don and Mamoru Oshiba. "Japanese Education: After the Americans Left." *Peabody Journal of Education*, Vol. 39, No. 1. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1961. 9-19.
- Baerwald, Hans. "The Occupation of Japan as an Exercise in "Regime Change": Reflections after Fifty Years by a Participant." *Japan Policy Research Institute: Occasional Paper*. University of San Francisco. 29 Feb 2003. 12 April 2006 < <http://www.jpri.org/publications/occasionalpapers/op29.html>>
- Brands, H.W, Jr. "The United States and the Reemergence of Independent Japan." *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 59, No. 3. University of British Columbia: Pacific Affairs, 1986. 387-401.
- Burroughs, William S. *Naked Lunch: The Restored Text*. Ed. James Grauerholz and Barry Miles. New York: Grove Press, 2001.
- Dower, John W. *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. New York: W.W Norton & Company, 1999.
- Eburne, Jonathan Paul. "Trafficking in the Void: Burroughs, Kerouac, and the Consumption of Otherness." *Modern Fiction Studies* Volume 43. Purdue Publications, 1997. 53-92.
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "Between Elitism and Populism: Whither Comparative Literature?" *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. Ed. Charles Bernheimer. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. 134-142.
- Grauerholz, James and Barry Miles. Editors' Note. By William Burroughs. *Naked Lunch: The Restored Text*. Ed. James Grauerholz and Barry Miles. New York: Grove Press, 2001.
- Haring, Douglas G. "Speculations on Japanese Communism." *Far Eastern Survey*, Vol. 22, No. 1. New York: The American Institute of Pacific Relations, Inc., 1953. 10-12.
- Holton, Robert. "'The Sordid Hipsters of America: Beat Culture and the Folds of Heterogeneity.'" *Reconstructing the Beats*. Ed. Jennie Skerl. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 11-26.
- Igarashi, Takeshi. "Peace-Making and Party Politics: The Formation of the Domestic Foreign Policy System in Postwar Japan." *Journal of Japanese Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 2. The Society for Japanese Studies, 1985. 323-356.
- Ishikawa, Jun. "The Raptor." *The Legend of Gold*. Trans. William J. Tyler. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998.

- Kazuo, Kawai. "American Influence on Japanese Thinking." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 278, The Search for National Security. Sage Publications, Inc., 1951. 23-31.
- Keene, Donald. *Dawn to the West: Japanese Literature of the Modern Era*. Vol. 3. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Kennan, George. "The 'X' Article." *CNN Interactive*. 15 May 2007 < <http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/episodes/04/documents/x.html>>
- Kostelanetz, Richard. "From Nightmare to Seredipity: A Retrospective Look at William Burroughs." *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 11, No. 3. Oct., 1965. 123-130.
- The Letters of William S. Burroughs*. Ed. Oliver Harris. New York: Penguin Group, 1994.
- Martínez, Mauel Luis. *Countering the counterculture : rereading postwar American dissent from Jack Kerouac to Tomás Rivera*. Madison : University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.
- Skerl, Jennie. "An Interview with William S. Burroughs (April 4, 1980, New York City)." *Modern Language Studies*. Modern Language Studies Publications, Vol. 12, No. 3. 1982. 3-17.
- . "Ginsberg on Burroughs: An Interview" *Modern Language Studies*. Modern Language Studies Publications, Vol. 16, No. 3. 1986. 271-278.
- Skuji, Jola. "Comparative Literature and Cultural Identity." *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Totosy de Zepetnek. Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2003. 142-151.
- Swearingen, Rodger and Paul Langer. *Red Flag in Japan: International Communism in Action 1919-1951*. New York: Greenwood, 1968.
- Tyler, William J. On the Raptor. By Ishikawa Jun. *The Legend of Gold*. Trans. William J. Tyler. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998.
- Yu, Suwa and D. Vincent Smith. *Things Oriental and Things Western*. Fitzgerald: Oliviant House, 1956.
- Zinn, Howard. *Declarations of Independence: Cross Examining American Ideology*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1990.