



"Poru Ruta"/Paul Rotha and the Politics of Translation

Abe Mark Nornes

Cinema Journal, Vol. 38, No. 3 (Spring, 1999), 91-108.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-7101%28199921%2938%3A3%3C91%3A%22RRATP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-F>

Cinema Journal is currently published by University of Texas Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/texas.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Pōru Rūta/Paul Rotha and the Politics of Translation

by Abé Mark Nornes

British documentary filmmaker and author Paul Rotha had a great influence on filmmakers in prewar Japan. In fact, translations of his book Documentary Film were the “Bible” for both militarist and leftist documentarists and critics. Various translations of Rotha’s book, however, displayed the marks of self-imposed censorship or misreading and changed his socialist leanings into support for the imperial state of Japan. Such cross-cultural discourse allowed the Rotha volume to become the site of politicized thought in the Japanese film community.

Open any Japanese book on documentary and the “theory” of Paul Rotha will be singled out as one of the most influential in the history of Japanese cinema. Although the writings of all the major Western film theorists, from Münsterberg to Eisenstein, were translated, none was as fiercely contested and discussed as Rotha’s. No other theorist or critic had more impact on film practice or underwent as much “processing.”

Rotha’s influence in Japan may surprise the Western reader. His book *Documentary Film* (1935) was widely read throughout Europe and America, particularly within the educational film movement, but it was seen largely as promoting British documentary at the time, hardly as a theoretical “Bible.”¹ His place in (our) history is basically as one of the central filmmakers of the British school, as an author, and, occasionally, as Grierson’s antagonist. Thus, despite renewed interest in documentary in Euro-American film studies, one rarely if ever hears Rotha’s name mentioned. Even book-length histories of the British documentary movement refer to *Documentary Film* only in passing. This would undoubtedly shock Japanese filmmakers and scholars, who refer to Rotha’s name in the same breath with Eisenstein, Balázs, Pudovkin, Arnheim, Münsterberg, Moholy-Nagy, and Vertov.

Imamura Taihei, in his 1952 overview of film theory, discusses Rotha in his final chapter—the author is even shown posing with *Documentary Film* in his portrait. Rotha’s prestige has hardly weakened in the intervening years.² Thus, in 1960, Atsugi Taka offered a completely revised translation of Rotha’s 1952 expanded volume. This in turn was reprinted in 1976 and in 1995.³ Ironically, judging from his own papers, Rotha appears to have had no idea how influential he was in Japan, an indication of how disconnected Japan was from larger currents in film theory.⁴

Abé Mark Nornes is an assistant professor in the University of Michigan’s Program in Film and Video Studies and the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures. He is completing a book-length manuscript on prewar and wartime documentary film in Japan.

© 1999 by the University of Texas Press, P.O. Box 7819, Austin, TX 78713-7819

This apparent imbalance may be partially explained by examining events of the latter half of the 1930s, when Rotha's book arrived in Japan. At the time, Japan was escalating its invasion of China, especially with the 1937 China Incident. On the home front, the government ensured the war reached into the daily lives of citizens everywhere by drawing on young men for cannon fodder and increasingly controlling behavior. By mid-decade, police pressure, including mass arrests, imprisonment, and occasional torture, had shut down the noisy Left. Most progressive intellectuals underwent ideological conversion to a rabid nationalism and an often racist nativism. Those who refused this course quietly retreated underground or chose their language carefully when in public. At the same time, the government placed elaborate restrictions on filmmaking, ranging from intricate censorship mechanisms to nationalizing entire sectors of the industry. This culminated in the 1939 Film Law, which mandated the forced screening of nonfiction films, or the so-called *bunka eiga* (culture film).

Along with the pressures of continental warfare, this legislation propelled documentary to a level of prestige comparable to the fiction film. Film journals were filled with articles by intellectuals as disparate as Hasegawa Nyozeikan, Tosaka Jun, Kamei Katsuichirō, and Nakai Masakazu, all attempting to theorize a documentary practice appropriate for the times. Given this atmosphere, the appearance of Rotha's *Documentary Film*—especially its 1938 translation—electrified the Japanese film world and was greeted with the respect accorded the most authoritative of theoretical systems. This intense interest eventually filtered into filmmaking itself, enabling Rotha to leave a very large theoretical mark.

Why Rotha? And, by extension, what did his writing mean in wartime Japan? A hint at the answer lies in the title of his volume—*Documentary Film*. The manner in which the title was translated alerts us immediately to the political ramifications of this translation act and suggests the complexity of these questions.

A variety of words were circulating in the Japanese film world to designate nonfiction filmmaking: *jishsha eiga*, *kiroku eiga*, *nyūsu eiga*, *dokyumentarii eiga*, and the like. The 1938 edition appeared with a title on the cover that may or may not be a mistranslation: *Bunka eiga-ron* (On culture film). First, the suffix *ron* (argument, discourse) appended to the title could be translated as *Documentary Film Theory*. This might have given Rotha's thought a heft we do not feel when reading the original English text. Second, an intertext for the *bunka eiga* is the *kulturfilm* of UFA in Germany. These were primarily science films; however, upon their successful Japanese release, some critics began using the term for a variety of nonfiction films by Japanese filmmakers.

The term *bunka eiga* begins to appear in Japanese texts as early as 1933, and all documentary came under the rubric of *bunka eiga* with the 1939 Film Law.



Japan's preeminent film theorist, Imamura Taihei, posing with Paul Rotha's *Documentary Film* (1952).

Although most readers knew the term *dokumentarii eiga* (documentary film), in choosing to use *bunka eiga* the translator strongly connected Rotha's book with propagandist filmmaking. Many of Rotha's contemporary critics pointed out the ambiguity of the film genre to which this title points. Few noted, however, that the title firmly inserted Rotha's thought into the discourse raging around the terms of the new Film Law, and Rotha's translation roughly coincided with the announcement of plans for these detailed government regulations over the film industry. Consequently, amid the fervent discussion about the new meaning and direction for nonfiction film, Rotha's cheerleading for the documentary found an enthusiastic audience. In one sense, this would appear to associate Rotha with a radically opposed politics; however, I would argue it could also be seen as an attempt on the part of the translator to quietly shift the terms of the Japanese documentary debate in a certain direction. Thus, the short answer to the question above is that Rotha's book meant many things indeed.

The long answer is that, because of this slipperiness, a curious situation arose in which Rotha's book appealed equally to members of the entire political spectrum, and all participants in this debate claimed Rotha's thought to different ends. This article will examine this struggle over meaning on many levels. To root out the most important issues, however, we must look to the media through which Rotha's thought came to be known: translation.

Consider this relatively obvious example: the 1938 edition mistranslates Rotha's "Worker's Revolution" as the more innocuous "Rōdōsha katsudō," or "Worker's Activities."⁵ Only in the postwar revision did the proper translation appear: "Rōdōsha kakumei."⁶ The reason is unambiguous; "revolution" was a dangerous term in Japan in 1939, and a text containing it would never have passed censorship review. Authors, translators, and publishers had been deflecting such trouble with authorities for nearly a decade by printing obvious synonyms and even substituting problematic words with XXs (called *fuseji*). Readers knew the protocol; when they came across *fuseji* or ambiguous words, they could read past them to the original meanings. The first edition of *Documentary Film* is sprinkled with many such examples, but analysis of such simple instances of intentional mistranslation only get us so far. First, as the example above suggests, there were entire communities of readers who were forced to conceal their true relationship to the book, and, second, everyone knew the translator's command of English was dubious at best because it became one of the issues raised in the debates.⁷

We must dig far deeper into the issue of translation to appreciate the complexity of the highly politicized discourses circulating around Rotha's original text when it entered the Japanese linguistic world. Furthermore, shifting our analysis from simplistic notions of (one-way) "influence" to the site of translation brings an array of larger issues into focus. For example, looking at the sheer volume of translation reveals much about the relationship between cultures (it follows that a lack of translation activity indicates a discourse stuck in an unhealthy short-circuit of desire).

When transferring texts from one language to another, the translator's approach to language and meaning is inseparable from larger historical and ideological currents in the target language. This new linguistic and cultural context

often impinges on the translation while having little to do with the original text itself. In this situation, in which competing translations are circulated among overlapping readerships, a struggle over authority occurs—after all, can there be a more powerful position over cross-cultural discourse than that of the translator? We must look at the qualities of a given translation and ask who the translator is, what his/her relationship is to the original text, the author, and the larger communities of readers. From this perspective, the difference between translation theory and documentary film theory is very slim indeed, since both fields involve representations weighed by a debt to an “original,” whether it be the source text or the world.

Documentary Film Enters the Japanese Linguistic World. Japan’s pre-eminent prewar film theorist, Imamura Taihei, read Rotha’s book and passed it on to Dōmei Tsūshin’s Kuwano Shigeru. From there, the book surged into the film community.⁸ At one point, it came into the hands of Atsugi Taka, one of the first Japanese female filmmakers. Atsugi came to filmmaking as a leading member of the Nippon Puroretaria Eiga Dōmei (Proletarian Film League of Japan), or Prokino for short. After the breakup of Prokino in 1934 under police pressure, Atsugi began writing film criticism and translating foreign film theory. Along with other former Prokino members, she was also one of the *dōjin* producing the early film theory journal *Eiga sōzō*. This gave her concrete links to Yuibutsu Kenkyūkai (Materialism Study Society), or Yuiken, a group of leftist intellectuals organized by the philosopher Tosaka Jun.⁹ Atsugi even wrote a review article in their *Yuibutsuron kenkyū*, probably the first mention of Paul Rotha’s *Documentary Film* in print.

In the late 1930s, Atsugi began a long career in documentary screenwriting, working for Photochemical Laboratory (PCL), Toho, and Geijutsu Eigasha (GES). This afforded her the chance to bring Rotha’s theory into practice. Above and beyond her own filmmaking activities, Atsugi’s most influential project was a translation of *Documentary Film*, which she undertook at the request of her PCL supervisor; he was moving to JO Studios to become head of production and wanted to use the book as the text for study groups. Atsugi had been reading the English original and was glad to use the need for a translation as an excuse to finish the book. She published the first edition in the fall of 1938.¹⁰

The translation had an enormous impact and went into second and third printings within a year.¹¹ The book’s influence spread in the late 1930s as critics debated Rotha’s terms and their implications for documentary filmmaking, often offering their own translations of the original in their quotations. Soon an alternative translation by Ueno Ichirō appeared in *Eiga kenkyū*, a film studies series put out by the magazine *Eiga hyōron*.¹² Study groups were devoted to Rotha’s book in production companies and film studios. At Toho, where it was considered the documentary filmmaker’s Bible, the Kyoto studio circulated its own handwritten, mimeographed translation within the company.¹³ Before Atsugi’s translation appeared, the original English-language book was even used for English practice at JO Studios.¹⁴

About the same time, the original text came into the hands of Ōmura Einosuke and Ishimoto Tōkichi, whose reading of the book had a great impact on the formation of Geijutsu Eigasha. Thanks to Rotha's ideas, the company's early films, such as *Yukiguni* (Snow country, 1939) and *Kikansha C57* (Train C57, 1940), strove to surpass the usual public relations film and bring documentary to a new, independent level.¹⁵ Geijutsu Eigasha's own film journal, *Bunka eiga*, published enthusiastic debates about Rotha's book, as did most of the other serious Japanese film publications.

One of the major responses to the Rotha translation involved a knee-jerk reaction to his disdain for the "story-film," which he said "threaten[ed] to stifle all other methods of cinema" and "tend[ed] to become an anesthetic instead of a stimulant."¹⁶ The most vociferous of these critics displayed a nearly uncontrollable anger. In his book-length bibliographic survey of film literature, Okuda Shinkichi, for example, passes Rotha off with a flourish: "I—and others—can only recognize [*Documentary Film*] as a little like drawing water for one's own field [i.e., self-serving]. Above all, Rotha's rejection of the feature film, and his view that documentary was the main path for cinema, is clearly ridiculous; even as a theory of art, it never exceeds shallow abstraction."¹⁷

The most scathing attack on Rotha came from Tsumura Hideo, who sarcastically wrote:

Put a different way, Rotha's book is extremely heroic and vigorous. He praises documentary based on materialist socialism as the most valuable cinema of tomorrow. In contrast to that, it pulverizes the fiction film into dust, with writing like vicious gossip. The way it attacked fiction film was extremely rough with ideological tricks. I confess that this is one of the reasons which gave me the courage to criticize Paul Rotha.¹⁸

This now-famous attack provoked a response from Takagiba Tsutomu, who ran Toho's Shinjuku News Film Theater and was a frequent essayist on documentary film. Takagiba humorously rewrote Tsumura's article, substituting "Tsumura" for "Rotha" to turn the attack back on the Japanese critic.¹⁹ However well this strategy neutralized Tsumura's critique, it did not address the key issues: that Rotha's definition of "fiction" in documentary was less than clear and that his book offered less a theory of documentary film than a specious promotion of government cultural policy. There is a grain of truth to the accusations against Rotha (his arrogance, his self-promotion of the English documentary, and his faith in government sponsorship), but the critical debate that actually affected Japanese filmmaking practice was over the problem of "fiction" in documentary.

The most tempered discussion of this issue was offered by Kubota Tatsuo in *Bunka eiga no hōhōron* (The methodology of the culture film, 1940). This was one of the more serious attempts to explore the phenomenon of the *bunka eiga*. Although he came out of a film production background (Shochiku's Kyoto studios), Kubota was very well read. He drew on the writing of Münsterberg, Arnheim, Balázs, Eisenstein, and other major film theorists. The book was ultimately a disappointment, however. Kubota's aesthetic agenda centered on expunging any influence of the avant-garde from documentary, positioning the *bunka eiga* with a

hard and fast opposition between fiction film “sensitivity” (*kansai*) and science film “intellect” (*chisei*).²⁰ Unfortunately, this dichotomy colors his discussion of Rotha as well. Kubota had originally intended to structure his entire book around *Documentary Film*, a measure of Rotha’s prestige and influence over the very conception of nonfiction filmmaking. In the end, Kubota wisely saved his discussion of Rotha for the final chapter. After his careful discussion of the avant-garde, Kubota warns readers that although Rotha has his good points, his vague definition of “dramatization,” bolstered as it is by questionable examples such as Pabst’s *Kameradschaft* (1931), could lead documentary to stray too completely into the world of fiction.

Kubota’s represents one brand of discussion that was occurring in the Japanese documentary community in which the relatively innocent-sounding debates about Rotha’s conceptions of “fictionality” and “actuality” veiled struggles over the function of documentary in Japanese society. The written record on this discussion is decidedly one-sided. Rotha proposed a nationally sponsored documentary film committed to the enlightenment and unification of the citizenry, precisely the kind of cinema necessary for a country like Japan that was deeply embroiled in foreign warfare. Under the restrictive circumstances of 1930s Japan, however, many other important perspectives went unrecorded. In particular, one aspect of Rotha’s appeal—his apparent sympathies for socialism—necessarily had to be concealed from the Japanese public sphere; restricted to private discussion, this discourse never appeared in the written record, posing a battery of problems for the historian. Traces remain, however, that provide access to these hidden spaces, and in the remaining pages I will explore their furthest reaches.

Battle of the Translators. Like many other (underground) leftists in the documentary film world, Atsugi found Rotha’s writing inspirational. Committed to social change, she saw cinema as a medium for critiquing everything from class discrimination to totalitarian political systems. Having spent the last decade immersed in Marxism and committing her life to demonstrating its relevance to filmmaking, criticism, and translation, Atsugi found a true compatriot in Paul Rotha. *Documentary Film* became the “hidden sacred book” of filmmakers like Atsugi who opposed the direction their nation and film industry were taking. Only after the war was over, however, could they reveal their views publicly.

One can feel Atsugi’s intense relationship with Rotha’s book by scanning her personal copies, which she recently donated to the National Film Center of Japan. Opening those pages provides both a thrill and a challenge to the historian. Her 1976 Miraisha version appears brand new and unopened. Her 1960 Misuzu copy contains only a few penciled-in notes and an inscription inside the cover: “To Takeshi, the husband I love.”

Her first editions—Rotha’s and her own translation—are far more intriguing. One can quickly detect a pattern in the highlighted sections. For example, in this time of stricture, she singled out the following sentence: “There is little within reason and little within the limits of censorship that documentary cannot bring before an audience to state an argument.”²¹ Although there can be no doubt that she liked the sentence, she also filled other pages with obscure checks, question

marks, circles, and exclamation points. Strange symbols and many M.B.s lie mute in the margins. Bookmarks sit in curious passages. We will never know their significance, but three marks stand out for their powerful evocation of what this book meant at the height of the China War. Apparently, Atsugi took her own translation in hand and read it over the space of several weeks in 1939, because she left dates next to three paragraphs. At the time, the government was taking steps to convert all documentary into propaganda in support of the emperor's war, brilliant filmmakers were subverting these efforts with clever editing, and open resistance meant persecution. (Kamei Fumio's *Tatakau heitai* [Fighting soldiers, 1939] had just been suppressed, and the director would be in prison within a matter of months.) In this context, these three passages make Atsugi's cathexis with Rotha's text palpable. For this reason, they are worth quoting in full (Atsugi Taka's dates are included in square brackets):

Relative freedom of expression for the views of the documentalist [*sic*] will obviously vary with the production forces he serves and the political system in power. In countries still maintaining a parliamentary system, discussion and projection of his beliefs within certain limits will be permitted only so long as they do not seriously oppose powerful vested interests, which most often happen to be the forces controlling production. Under an authoritarian system, freedom is permissible provided his opinions are in accord with those of the State for social and political advance, until presumably such a time shall arrive when the foundations of the State are strong enough to withstand criticism. Ultimately, of course, you will appreciate that you can neither make films on themes of your own choice, nor apply treatments to accepted themes, unless they are in sympathy with the aims of the dominant system. And in view of the mechanical and hence expensive materials of cinema, it will be foolish of the documentalist if his sympathies do not lie, or at least appear to lie, with those who can make production a possibility [June 28, 1939].²²

The following is a critique of Flaherty's apolitical approach:

In every location which he has chosen there have existed social problems that demanded expression. Exploitation of native labour, the practises of the white man against the native, the landlords of Aran, these have been the vital stories, but from them Flaherty has turned away. . . . Idyllic documentary is documentary without significant purpose. It takes romanticism as its banner. It ignores social analysis. It takes ideas instead of facts. It marks a reactionary return to the worship of the heroic, to an admiration of the barbaric, to a setting up of "The Leader" [July 6, 1939].²³

Finally, here is a Pudovkin quote on the power of montage:

I found the way to build up a dialogue in which the transition of the actor from one emotional state to another . . . had never taken place in actuality before the camera. I shot the actor at different times, glum and then smiling, and only on my editing table did these two separate moods coordinate with the third—the man who made the joke [July 20, 1939].²⁴

Atsugi's handwritten dates convert these translations from something in the public domain to something new and contradictory. They act as conduits, allowing those resistant discourses retained safely in hidden spaces to leak from between

the lines. But this is only half the story, because the criticism and debate surrounding *Documentary Film* are an instance of oppositional discourses being coded into public view, camouflaged to deflect the threat of reprisals. To render this complicated discourse visible, we must return to the problem of translation. On the one hand, Atsugi wove her point of view into the very fabric of her translation, both in conscious and unconscious ways. On the other hand, intellectuals from far different perspectives engaged her in a veritable battle of the translators.

In the course of researching the subject of prewar Japanese documentary, I occasionally ran across copies of Atsugi's translation in used bookstores. Taking a volume in hand, one gains a material appreciation for the respect with which Rotha was viewed, from the high quality of the printing, binding, and paper to the book's beautiful slipcase. Each time I found a copy of the Rotha translation, I pulled it off the shelf to see if it belonged to anyone I knew from my research. One of these dusty first editions contained quite a surprise: every single page had detailed annotations. Between every single line of the book—cover to cover—someone had diligently scrawled corrections to Atsugi's translation. Inside the cover, this anonymous editor had written a message: "This is a surprising book. She can't understand English. Japanese is pretty bad. Even Ms. Atsugi cannot argue with this. I don't understand how this person had the guts to translate it. This caused the chaos in this country's *bunka eiga* discourse. I'm sorry these corrections are a year late." The original owner who requested this involved check of the translation was unclear; other than this message, there was only an illegible scrawl across the page. (Hereafter I will refer to this copy of *Documentary Film* as the *teiseiban* [corrected version].)²⁵

The first edition of the Atsugi translation came out in September 1938, and whoever pored over Atsugi's work left us only with the message that the translation was so bad its revision took the better part of a year. Actually, the existence of this *teiseiban* came quietly into public view in January 1940—fourteen months after the original publication of the book—in a program passed out at Takagiba Tsutomu's Shinjuku News Film Theater. In addition to advertising the week's film slate, these pamphlets often contained in-depth essays printed in tiny type. The January 18, 1940, issue contained an article by Sekino Yoshio that asserted that the controversies over Rotha sprang primarily from the inexperience of the person who had translated him. Sekino wrote, "Below, let us pick out two or three parts of interest from a corrected text pretty much black with corrections."²⁶ He proceeded to compare passages from Atsugi's translation with corrections from the *teiseiban*. (With this in mind, the odd pencil slash inside the cover clearly reads "Seki" in *hiragana* with a long tail.) In the following months, Sekino drew on the *teiseiban* for a series of lengthy articles in which he attempted to clear up the controversy surrounding Rotha's book.²⁷ These articles also became the basis for the book *Eiga kyōiku no riron* (Theory of film education).²⁸

The main issues for Sekino involved the translation of terms such as "story-film" and the "dramatization of actuality." He attempted to contextualize Rotha's thoughts in terms of his development as a critic—the differences between *Film Till Now* and *Documentary Film*—as well as the vast changes in English society.

Sekino's success in reorienting the translation debate is difficult to judge, although it appears to have influenced his reputation as an authority on the topic. There is a good reason for this. In this series of high-profile articles, Sekino positioned himself less as a critic than as the translator. He gives a discreet nod to the help of the *teiseiban*, but the substance of his articles is unusual. Rather than provide his own interpretation of *Documentary Film*, Sekino all but retranslates the book. These articles were basically strings of extended quotes from the *teiseiban* with short passages of paraphrase inserted in between. Thanks to the corrections by Sekino's anonymous colleague, the new translations are quite good—for the most part, they are better than Ueno's or Toho's, and they are certainly better than Atsugi's. With its rows of exclamation point annotations, the *teiseiban* remains by far the best translation. Sekino ultimately does not offer an actual translation as such, however, since significant portions of the book are paraphrased or deleted. To be more specific, they are suppressed. Here is a typical, and relatively innocuous, example. Sekino's deletions are in italics:

Art, like religion or morals, cannot be considered apart from the materialist orderings of society. Hence it is surely fatal for an artist to attempt to divorce himself from the community and retire into a private world where he can create merely for his own pleasure or for that of a limited minority. He is, *after all, as much a member of the common herd as a riveter or a glass-blower, and of necessity must recognize his obligations to the community into which he is born. His peculiar powers of creation must be used to greater purpose than mere personal satisfaction.*²⁹

Sekino's reading, or more properly his selective translation, evacuates Rotha's Left-leaning politics and aligns *Documentary Film* with the dominant ideology of wartime Japan. Sekino effortlessly converts the passage above into an attack on individualism and a call for artists to serve the mission of the national polity. Elsewhere, extremely long series of extended quotations often skip a sentence or two in the middle when Rotha brings in the subject of class or Marxism. The segment of Rotha's audience to which Sekino belonged was enthralled with the Englishman's high moral tone and sense of "mission."

Sekino himself was far more than a film critic. After studying art at Tokyo University, he worked at the social education section in the Tokyo metropolitan government. In this capacity he promoted the use of film for education through publications, lectures, study groups like STS,³⁰ and regular *jidō eigahi* (children's film days).³¹ In the latter stages of World War II, Sekino worked at Nichiei as the vice president in charge of *bunka eiga* production. Throughout the war, Sekino was a prominent theorist in the education film movement, meaning that he was not in the classroom trenches, where the real teaching was going on. With his articles on the Rotha controversy, Sekino moved beyond pedagogical issues and claimed a position of authority over the Rotha text and therefore over Japanese documentary film.

The Rotha we encounter through Sekino's articles speaks of responsible citizenship and the central role of cinema in educating the nation's populace. Sekino's Rotha heightens the stakes of these ideas by drawing the readers' attention to the worldwide

sense of crisis—the theme that was so central to pre–Pearl Harbor Japan—but the British filmmaker’s calls for peaceful settlement of conflict, disarmament, and intelligent social critique are completely suppressed from Sekino’s blow-by-blow “translation = correction” of Rotha’s book. With these themes purged from the text, one is left with a discourse on propaganda and the necessity for state support of documentary to the end of enlightening its citizenry. No wonder that Rotha’s work was attractive to Sekino and to the new leadership emerging with the Film Law.

A further example of this political reinscription of Rotha is his emergence in *Eiga kokusaku no zenshin* (The progress of national film policy), a 1940 book outlining the national film policies of all the major Western nations. The latter half of this book covers the situation in Japan and offers essays on the implications of the new Film Law for various segments of the film industry. Its chapter on the deployment of film as an instrument of state propaganda cites Rotha as the international authority, posing the English filmmaker’s innovations as the proper course for a nationalized film industry.³²

Even more revealing than the ways in which Sekino intentionally mistranslated *Documentary Film*, in a manner analogous to Atsugi before him, are the differences between their actual texts. *Documentary Film* straddled the space between the hidden and the public discourses, and the multiplicity of readings this position implies was built into all the translations. The following example reveals how the differences between Atsugi and Sekino play out in their translations. This is one of Rotha’s numerous digs at the powers that be, followed by its extant translations (emphasis mine):

Rotha: Every day I come across persons who manifest increasing anxiety not only at the growing complexity of political and social problems, but at the patent inability of *those in power* to find adequate solutions.³³

Atsugi: Mainichi ni sakusō suru seijiteki, shakaiteki mondai ya, sore ni tekitō na kaiketsu o miidashi enai *jiko no munōsa* ni kokkoku fuan o kanjite iru hitobito ni deatte iru.³⁴

Ueno: Mainichi watashi no au hitobito ga seiji mondai ya shakai mondai no shinkokuka suru fukuzatsusa ni tsuite fuan o kataru bakari de wa naku, *jibunra* ni tadashii kaiketsu o miidasu *nōryoku no nai koto* o gaitan suru no de aru.³⁵

Sekino: Taezu watashi wa, seijiteki, shakaiteki na jyaku mondai ga masumasu fukuzatsusa o mashite kuru koto ni taishite nominarazu, *torō no hitobito* ga sore e no tekitō na kaiketsu o miidashi enai to iu meihaku na muryokuburi ni taishite mo, fuan ga kuwaete iku bakari da to tansaku suru hitotachi ni ikiatte iru.³⁶

Teiseiban: Mainichi watashi wa, seijiteki, shakaiteki mondai ga masumasu sakusō suru shite kuru koto ni tai shite bakari de naku, *kenryoku no chū ni aru mono* ga, sore ni taishite tekitō na kaiketsu o miidashi enai to iu akiraka ni munōryokusa ni taishite masu bakari da to tansaku suru hitobito ni deatte iru.

Rotha’s original text sets up a relatively straightforward contrast between, on the one hand, common people who find themselves bewildered by the complexity of the world on the verge of war and, on the other hand, those in power who seem too incompetent to deal with the situation. Here Rotha’s critical spirit comes out

in force, but in 1939 such comments landed people in Japan in prison. All the translators seem to deal with this problem of potential censorship or reprisals in their own way; everything from choices of vocabulary to mistakes reveal the ideological undergirding of their respective translations. The *teiseiban* provides the best, most straightforward translation of the quotation's most problematic phrase, "those in power": "kenryoku no chii ni aru mono" (people in positions of [political] power). However, Sekino strays from the guidance of his *teiseiban* and substitutes this phrase with the rather vague "torō no hitobito" (authorities, intellectuals), deflecting the criticism into ambiguous territory. Other decisions further weaken Rotha's criticism, as a rendering of this phrase back into English reveals: "but at the clear powerlessness of authorities/intellectuals in finding appropriate solutions."

Both Atsugi and Ueno completely erase "those in power" from the sentence; the effect is to create a single group of common people who feel anxiety about the world's complexity and *their* inability to effectuate change. We might assume that the Japanese translators expunged Rotha's attack on the powerful to preempt punishment by their own authorities. Without more documentation, the case of Ueno is difficult to judge; however, Atsugi produced a postwar version of *Documentary Film* when threats of reprisal were not an issue. In this 1960 translation, she significantly revised the text with the help of two young scholars,³⁷ but, although she completely rewrote this sentence, Atsugi retained the mistake. Even the 1995 "re-furbished edition" (*shinsōban*) remains unchanged. In other words, Atsugi simply didn't understand the meaning in the first place.³⁸

Atsugi's word choice is also significant. Ueno's exasperated, anonymous masses are literally the people Rotha has met on the street ("jibunra ni tadashii kaiketsu o miidasu nōryoku no nai koto o gaitan suru no de aru"), but the Marxist Atsugi does not shirk social responsibility and uses the much stronger "jiko no munōsa," which places the burden of history on herself and the reader—it is the difference between "their own inability" and "our own incompetence."

Atsugi's misprision circulates in a gray area between Rotha's original English text and its dim representation in Japanese; the latter reflects a conception of documentary cinema that combines Rotha's thinking with that of Atsugi's community of leftist filmmakers who restrict their politics to hidden spaces in the teeth of power.³⁹ Rotha himself said, "I came nearest to becoming a Socialist in my *Documentary Book*."⁴⁰ This was not lost on the filmmakers, who found themselves in a forest of pressure, especially since many had recently spent time in the so-called pig box (*butabako*, or slammer) for their filmmaking activities in Prokino. For some filmmakers, Rotha's book simply confirmed the direction in which they were already taking nonfiction film, and knowing that someone outside Japan thought the same way gave them a measure of confidence.⁴¹ Many others, however, had a far deeper, hidden relationship with *Documentary Film*. Kuwano Shigeru worked at Dōmei Tsūshin's film unit before becoming the section head in charge of *Nippon News* at Nichiei. He was probably the second person in Japan to read *Documentary Film*, having received it from Imamura Taihei, himself a Marxist critic. In a 1973 book on documentary, he included a reminiscence about his wartime encounter with Rotha:

This book, for me, was a shock. He was choosing his words extremely carefully, but this is clearly what Paul Rotha was saying: The duty of documentary filmmaker was to somehow replace today's rotting capitalist society and construct a new socialist society, and indicate the clear, social scientific analysis of it [capitalist society] by the emergent classes—the proletariat and the farmers. There was no question that the so-called documentary, which started out as the news film, would become a strong weapon of the movement for social revolution. This has been evidenced by the Soviets. Even in Japan, which was under the violent oppression of a militarist government, each and every cut of the news film preserved a fragmentary "truth." Therefore, if we consciously shoot that at the location, and if we edit these scenes purposefully, the "truth" of modern-day Japanese society—the anguish of the people, the necessity of collapse because of those contradictions—we could precisely indicate this to the people of the emergent classes of Japanese society. . . . However, even though we can do this, what are we Japanese documentary film producers—no, what am I doing right now?!⁴²

As a filmmaker working in what were basically semigovernment agencies (Dōmei Tsūshin and Nichiei), Kuwano was extremely limited by the form of the newsreel. He did try to include subversive moments in his films to direct spectatorial readings against the grain. For example, he recalls inserting a funeral pyre of some fallen soldiers with melodramatic narration, such as "Even now, the soldiers' souls return to their hometowns, where wives and children quietly wait." However, this was inevitably snipped by the censors, leaving Kuwano clinging to the hope that his documentary images of the fighting retained some grain of truth.⁴³

Filmmakers in the budding field of *bunka eiga* had far more latitude to code multiple readings into their films. This is the issue running quietly behind many of the debates over fiction in nonfiction film between 1939 and 1942. Filmmakers were working out the nature of this new brand of fictionality.

In the end, Rotha was exceedingly vague on this point, but Japanese filmmakers were looking for a prescription. Shirai Shigeru spoke of Rotha's influence on documentary production, but had he not seen six or seven of the British school films at the Education Ministry—including *Drifters* (1929) and *Night Mail* (1936)—he would have had no idea what Rotha meant by "dramatization of actuality."⁴⁴ Certainly the filmmakers who did not attend those screenings were handicapped in their reading of *Documentary Film* and the massive discourse it generated. Many articles discussed the definitions of Rotha's terminology and its translation,⁴⁵ but the bulk of the writing was a continuation (and vulgarization) of earlier Yuiken debates concerning the epistemology of cinema—"documentary as art" or "documentary as science."⁴⁶ This argument itself, as Ueno Kōzō has suggested, was a structural continuation of earlier struggles over whether film was art; the aesthetic domain simply migrated from "Cinema as Art" to "Talkie as Art" to "Documentary as Art."⁴⁷ However, in one of Atsugi's finest articles responding to her critics, we find her best definition of the core issue:

In order for documentary film to have a meaningful existence as art, we must correctly recognize the essential meaning of this "fiction." This is what I want to state over and over again. To this same end . . . filmmakers' efforts must be more than the turning of the camera as it has been up to today. There needs to be more care for "working" on works, more intensity, more like throwing one's entire soul into the hardships of a novelist.

“Poetry is more philosophical than history.”—Aristotle.

Today we can find the meaning of this saying if, while native born to the turbulent breath of history, we seek in documentary film the possibility of finding poetry (fiction) in the very center of that history (actuality).⁴⁸

In the midst of the spectacular war films of the day, a new kind of documentary emerged. Although some filmmakers were locating their filmmaking practice at the sites of greatest power (the Japanese military and the bureaucracy), other filmmakers were endeavoring to produce a new documentary film that (indirectly) pointed to the backwardness of the nation and to the sheer poverty and suffering in everyday life.⁴⁹ For their producers, these films were the finest examples of documentary being made. Ishimoto Tōkichi's *Yukiguni* set the pattern, recording the fight between Yamagata villagers and their fierce winters for nearly three years. *Yukiguni* was unusual for its long-term study, foreshadowing the Yamagata films by the most important postwar documentarist of the 1970s and 1980s, Ogawa Shinsuke. Indeed, Tanikawa Yoshio goes so far as to say that *Yukiguni* marked the start of Japanese documentary film.⁵⁰ Other films include Atsumi Teruo's *Sumiyaku hitobito* (People burning coal, 1940–41) and *Ishia no inai mura* (Village without a doctor, 1939). The latter, Itō Sueo's first film, shows the terrible health conditions in village Japan and the government's obvious inability to provide adequate health care for all its people. Kyōgoku Takahide's *Ishi no mura* (Village of stone, 1941) shows the severe manual labor at a rock quarry, and his *Hōmensen* (Field diagnosis boat, 1939) follows a medical group traveling the Sumida River to treat river workers.

Imaizumi Yoshitama turned his camera to the rough life of train workers in *Kikansha C57*. Ueno Kōzō's *Wagu no ama* (The *ama* of Wagu, 1941) contrasts the hardships of life for *ama*, or female shell divers (including steep pay inequities in comparison to men) with stunning underwater sequences that aestheticize the work itself. Mizuki and Atsugi's *Aru hobo no kiroku* (Record of a nursery, 1942) shows the cooperative work of mothers and nursery school teachers in raising healthy, educated children. This impressive body of work arose from the competing claims over the significance of Paul Rotha's *Documentary Film*.

Although they were all inspired by Rotha, these filmmakers took varying positions vis-à-vis the use of reenactment and screenwriting in documentary. What they held in common was a striking exclusion of the war hysteria and its rhetoric and a focus on the difficult life of Japanese citizens, resulting in a socially conscious reportage that resisted the temptations of spectacular explosions and exotic locales. In this way, the filmmakers encoded into their very public media various degrees of discontent usually restricted to hidden spaces. The filmmakers perceived their efforts to be interconnected and dedicated to bringing documentary to an unprecedented level of excellence. Although they never gave themselves a collective name or identity, they did consider their combined efforts to be akin to a “documentary movement.”⁵¹ Influenced by a British filmmaker and author, their films constitute the finest of the prewar Japanese documentary cinema and an instance of theory and practice finely tuned and in thorough interaction.

Notes

1. See Iris Barry, review of *Documentary Film*, *Saturday Review*, August 12, 1939, which discusses how people were nervous about Rotha's politics and his immodest pontification. Also Frank Evans, "How the Film Can Help Democracy," *Evening Chronicle* (Newcastle upon Tyne), May 12, 1939, a book review that discusses the social function of documentary (nothing on style). Also see Elizabeth Laine, "About Documentary Films," *Transcript* (Boston), June 10, 1939; "Documentary Film," *Times*, August 11, 1939; "Documentary Film," *Lady*, August 3, 1939.
2. Imamura's book contains the best Japanese overview of Rotha. In contrast to the wartime debates, its reasoned overall critique reveals how narrowly the discussion was focused in 1940. This suggests how other issues were at stake besides the one explicitly on the table in 1938. Imamura Taihei, *Eiga riron nyūmon* (Introduction to film theory) (Tokyo: Itagaki Shoten, 1952), 184.
3. Paul Rotha, *Bunka eigaron* (Culture film), trans. Atsugi Taka (Kyoto: Daiichi Geibunsha, 1938); Paul Rotha, *Dokumentarii eiga* (Documentary film), rev. and exp. ed., trans. Atsugi Taka (Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1960); Paul Rotha, *Dokumentarii eiga* (Documentary film), rev. and exp. ed., trans. Atsugi Taka (Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1976); Paul Rotha, *Dokumentarii eiga* (Documentary film), refurbished ed., trans. Atsugi Taka (Tokyo: Miraisha, 1995). The 1960 edition involved a fairly extensive revision of the translation itself, although this translation has its own problems. The 1995 printing is billed as a "refurbished edition" (*shinsōban*), but the only apparent difference is a new color on the jacket.
4. Nothing in Rotha's personal files suggests he knew what the Japanese thought of his work. Quite the opposite, he clearly shared fears about the menace Japan posed to the West. In a letter to Eric Knight written at the height of Rotha's prestige in Japan, he wrote, "I agree that the sooner America sees her immediate danger the better and that now more than ever is the time to come into this business . . . She actually [it sounds] is trying to appease the Japs which seems odd after all the examples of appeasement she's had before her. I agree with all your beliefs about the cementing of the English speaking peoples—at least that would be a beginning basis for reconstruction." Letter, August 28, 1941, Paul Rotha Collection, UCLA, Box 26, 2001. After the war (in the 1960s, from the look of the paper and adjacent documents), in a statement written to someone in Japan, Rotha wrote, "One day, perhaps, if I am still alive, I will come to visit to the land of Hokusai and Kurosawa and Ozu." (No mention of any Japanese documentarists, let alone his translation by Atsugi.) Undated letter, Paul Rotha Collection, UCLA, box 82, folder 3, 2001.
5. Rotha, *Bunka eigaron*, trans. Atsugi (1938), 108.
6. Rotha, *Dokumentarii eiga*, trans. Atsugi (1960), 68.
7. In her postwar autobiography, her embarrassment over rushing the translation prematurely to print is clear. Atsugi Taka, *Josei dokyumentarisuto no kaisō* (Reminiscences of a female documentarist) (Tokyo: Domesu Shuppan, 1991), 103–5.
8. Okamoto Masao, *Bunka eiga jidai + Jūjiya eigabu no hitobito* (The era of culture film and the people of Jūjiya's film unit) (Tokyo: Unitsūshin, 1996), 62–63.
9. Atsugi also married Yuiken philosopher Mori Kōichi.
10. Rotha, *Bunka eigaron*, trans. Atsugi (1938). The original volume is Paul Rotha, *Documentary Film* (London: Faber and Faber, 1935).
11. Rotha, *Bunka eigaron* (On culture film), 3d Japanese ed., trans. Atsugi Taka (Kyoto: Daiichi Geibunsha, 1939).

12. Paul Rotha, “*Bunka eigaron josetsu*” (Introduction to *Bunka eigaron*), trans. Ueno Ichirō, *Eiga kenkyū* 1 (1939): 54–84 (covers chap. 1 in Rotha’s *Documentary Film*); Paul Rotha, “Dokuyumentarii no jyakuha to sono shiteki kōsatsu” (Various groups in documentary and their historical thought), trans. Ueno Ichirō, *Eiga kenkyū* 2 (1939): 50–85 (covers Rotha’s chap. 2). Although there were many reports on the British documentary movement, Ueno probably wrote the best; this study certainly contributed to his translation: Ueno Ichirō, “Eikoku no bunka eiga” (British culture film), *Eiga kenkyū* 1 (1939): 146–61.
13. Paul Rotha, *Bunka eigaron* (On documentary film), *Chōsa shiryō* no. 4 (Kyoto: Toho Kyoto Satsueijo, n.d.), Makino Mamoru Collection. This mimeographed publication completes the Ueno translation, covering Rotha’s chap. 4.
14. Makino Mamoru, “Kiroku eiga no rironteki dōkō o otte 41” (Pursuing the theoretical movement of documentary film 41), *Unitsūshin*, June 19, 1978.
15. Tanikawa Yoshio, *Dokuyumentarii eiga no genten—sono shisō to hōhō* (The origins of documentary film—its thought and method), 3d ed. (Tokyo: Futosha, 1990), 194–95.
16. Rotha, *Documentary Film* (1935), 70.
17. Okuda Shinkichi, *Eiga bunkenshi* (The history of film literature) (Tokyo: Dai Nippon Eiga Kyōkai, 1943), 39.
18. Tsumura Hideo, “Pōru Rūta no eigaron hihan—sono cho ‘Documentary Film’ ni tsuite” (Criticism of Paul Rotha’s film theory—on that writer’s *Documentary Film*), *Shineiga* 9, no. 12 (November 1939): 17.
19. Takagiba Tsutomu, “Kyokō no riron—Tsumura Hideo-shi no ‘Pōru Rūta hihan’ o yomu” (Theory of fiction—reading Tsumura Hideo’s “Paul Rotha criticism”), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 1 (January 1940): 525–28.
20. Kubota Tatsuo, *Bunka eiga no hōhōron* (The methodology of the culture film) (Kyoto: Daiichi Geibunsha, 1940).
21. Rotha, *Documentary Film* (1935), 156.
22. Atsugi Taka’s personal copy of Rotha, *Bunka eigaron*, trans. Atsugi (1938), 150–52, Atsugi Taka Collection, National Film Center of the National Museum of Modern Art, Tokyo. Original text is Rotha, *Documentary Film* (1952), 135–36.
23. Rotha, *Bunka eigaron*, trans. Atsugi (1938), 132. Original text is Rotha, *Documentary Film* (1952), 108.
24. Rotha, *Bunka eigaron*, trans. Atsugi (1938), 198. Original text is Rotha, *Documentary Film* (1952), 143.
25. I have deposited this book in the Makino Collection.
26. Sekino Yoshio, “Tadashiki ‘documentary’ riron no ninshiki no tame ni” (For the correct recognition of ‘documentary’ theory), *Bunka nyūsu Weekly*, January 18, 1940, 1, Makino Collection. The Makino Collection holds quite a few issues.
27. Sekino Yoshio, “*Kyō made no eiga to ashita no eiga* (1)” (*Film till now and the films of tomorrow* [1]), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 2 (February 1940): 8–11; Sekino Yoshio, “*Kyō made no eiga to ashita no eiga* (2)” (*Film till now and the films of tomorrow* [2]), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 3 (March 1940): 58–60; Sekino Yoshio, “*Kyō made no eiga to ashita no eiga* (3)” (*Film till now and the films of tomorrow* [3]), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 4 (April 1940): 109–12; Sekino Yoshio, “*Kyō made no eiga to ashita no eiga* (4)” (*Film till now and the films of tomorrow* [4]), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 5 (May 1940): 176–79; Sekino Yoshio, “Dokuyumentariiron kentō no tame ni (1)” (For an investigation into documentary theory [1]), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 6 (June 1940): 236–39; Sekino Yoshio, “Dokuyumentariiron kentō no tame ni (2)” (For an investigation into documentary theory [2]), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 7 (July 1940): 304–7; Sekino Yoshio,

- “Dokumentariiron kentō no tame ni (3)” (For an investigation into documentary theory [3]), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 10 (October 1940): 563–67. The other major series of articles by Sekino is Sekino Yoshio, “Pōru Rūta: dokyumentarii eiga no sonogo no shinten 1” (“Paul Rotha: documentary film and progress since then 1), *Nihon eiga* 5, no. 7 (July 1940): 22–29; Sekino Yoshio, “Pōru Rūta: dokyumentarii eiga no sonogo no shinten 2” (Paul Rotha: documentary film and progress since then 2), *Nihon eiga* 5, no. 8 (August 1940): 68–73, 120; Sekino Yoshio, “Pōru Rūta: dokyumentarii eiga no sonogo no shinten 3” (Paul Rotha: documentary film and progress since then 3), *Nihon eiga* 5, no. 10 (October 1940): 72–77, 14.
28. Sekino Yoshio, *Eiga kyōiku no riron* (Theory of film education) (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1942).
 29. Rotha, *Documentary Film* (1935), 66; Sekino, *Eiga kyōiku no riron* (1942), 163. By way of contrast, Ueno’s translation is complete and correct in Rotha, “*Bunka eigaron josetsu*,” trans. Ueno, 79.
 30. STS, or the Square Table Society, was an influential study group composed of a variety of intellectuals interested in film education. The group published its own *dōjinshi*: *Eiga zehi* and *Eiga dai-issen*. For a history, see Makino Mamoru’s column in *Unitsūshin* between September 26, 1977, and November 21, 1977.
 31. For an extensive discussion of Sekino’s children’s film days, see Gonda Yasunosuke, *Minshūgorakuron* (On popular entertainment) (Tokyo: Ganshōdō Shoten, 1931), especially 309–28. Gonda sandwiches this discussion between chapters on *kyōiku eiga* and dedicated children’s theaters. In the 1930s, one of the main pedagogical struggles was over the manner in which cinema was used in education. In the course of much debate, educators narrowed the conditions of projection down to two possibilities: assembly screenings (*kōdō eishakai*) and classroom screenings (*kyōshitsu eishakai*). During assembly screenings, all the students in an entire school came into one big hall where the principal or some other official would provide the context for viewing the films through formal speeches and rituals such as singing the national anthem and paying respect to the emperor. Classroom screenings would take place in the classroom where students received the substance of their education. In this latter case, how the film was contextualized would be left entirely to the individual teacher. Although this will require further research, it appears that conservatives with nationalistic politics favored assembly screenings because their “total education” and “group training” offered complete control over the films and conditions of reception. Teachers with more liberal attitudes opposed assembly screenings, however, because they replicated the structure of the nation or, more specifically, attempted to unify and control the thought of people. At the very least, classroom screenings narrowed film education to localized issues: “This is how a volcano forms,” and so on. This is yet another example of the battles taking place between totalization and difference as the public discourse became more oppressive. Those interested in pursuing this topic should start with the extended historiography of the film education magazines in Suzuki Kiyomatsu, *Eiga kyōikuron* (On film education) (Tokyo: Shikai Shobō, 1941).
 32. Yamada Hideyoshi, *Eiga kokusaku no zenshin* (The progress of national film policy) (Tokyo: Koseisho, 1940), 216.
 33. Rotha, *Documentary Film* (1935), 48.
 34. Rotha, *Bunka eigaron*, trans. Atsugi (1938), 34.
 35. Rotha, “*Bunka eigaron josetsu*,” trans. Ueno, 56.
 36. Sekino, *Eiga kyōiku no riron* (1942), 136.
 37. One was Asanuma Keiji, Japan’s best-known film semiotician.

38. Further evidence that Atsugi did not recognize the mistranslation may be found in the various copies she deposited at the Film Center. None contains any corrections here, although she did underline the *adjacent* sentence in her 1960 edition.
39. This is not the only place where Atsugi's misprision reveals the nature of her (mis)reading of Rotha. Her translation (in all editions) provides many examples. Most critics refer only to how "bad" it is. For example, in the afterword to his *Eiga riron nyūmon* (Introduction to film theory), Imamura Taihei points out how thankful we should be for the work of translators like Iijima Tadashi, Sasaki Norio, and Atsugi Taka. He also warns readers to be cautious about trusting translation; ultimately, they must refer to the original, as Imamura has. He cites one example of misprision, and he singles out Atsugi: Rotha refers to some "modern authorities" who call dialectical materialism "out-of-date," but Atsugi translates this *saishin* as "latest," "brand-new." Although Imamura picks a good example of mistranslation, he—like everyone else—does not ask what factors led to this particular misreading. It does seem rather obvious. Rotha, *Documentary Film* (1935), 182; Rotha, *Bunka eigaron*, trans. Atsugi (1938), 270; Imamura, *Eiga riron nyūmon* (1952), 184.
40. Letter, Rotha to Eric Knight, November 8, 1938, Paul Rotha Collection, UCLA, Box 26, 2001.
41. This is how Kamei Fumio described his relationship to Rotha's book. Various people had criticized *Tatakau heitai* (Fighting soldiers), claiming that Kamei was Rotha's disciple. However, Akimoto Takeshi introduced the original book to Toho Studios when Kamei was in China shooting the film. Rotha was less a guidebook than an inspiration, especially the second half of the book on practical matters (this was the section translated and circulated within Toho). Kamei Fumio, Akimoto Takeshi, Ueno Kōzō, Ishimoto Tōkichi, and Tanaka Yoshiji, "Nihon bunka eiga no shoki kara kyō o kataru zadankai" (Zadankai to talk about Japanese culture films from the early period to today), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 2 (February 1940): 16–27.
42. Kuwano Shigeru, *Dokumentarii no sekai—sōzōryoku to hōhōron* (The world of documentary—creative power and methodology) (Tokyo: Simul Shuppankai, 1973), 201–2. On Kuwano, see "Kuwano Shigeru," *Bunka eiga* 1, no. 6 (June 1941): 70.
43. Kuwano, *Dokumentarii no sekai*, 201.
44. Shirai Shigeru, "Kameraman jinsei" (Cameraman life), in *Kinema no seishun* (Japanese cinema in its youth), eds. Iwamoto Kenji and Saiki Tomonori (Tokyo: Libroport, 1988), 73.
45. See Takagiba Tsutomu, "Dokumentarii firumu no oboegaki" (A memo on *Documentary Film*), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 4 (April 1940): 112–13; Atsugi Taka, "Story-film no yakugo ni tsuite" (On the translation of story-film), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 4 (April 1940): 118–19; Takagiba Tsutomu, "Eiga no honshitsu ni kan suru ronmo" (Discussion regarding the essence of cinema), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 10 (October 1940): 577–80; Kubota Tatsuo, "Gekiteki yōso to kirokuteki yōso" (Theatrical elements and documentary elements), *Bunka eiga kenkyū* 3, no. 10 (October 1940): 575–76.
46. See, for example, Ueno Kōzō, "Eiga ni okeru geijutsu to kagaku—bunka eigaron no kisoteki mondai 1" (Art and science in cinema—the fundamental problem for culture film theory 1), *Nihon eiga* 5, no. 2 (February 1940): 24–35; Ueno, "Eiga ni okeru geijutsu to kagaku—bunka eigaron no kisoteki mondai 2" (Art and science in cinema—the fundamental problem for culture film theory 2), *Nihon eiga* 5, no. 3 (March 1940): 25–35.
47. Ueno, "Eiga ni okeru geijutsu to kagaku—bunka eigaron no kisoteki mondai 1" (Art and science in cinema—the fundamental problem for culture film theory 1), *Nihon eiga* 5, no. 2 (February 1940): 33.

48. Atsugi Taka, "Kiroku eiga no kyokō—'jijitsu' wa sono mama 'shinjitsu' de wa nai" (Fiction in documentary film—"actuality" as it is not "truth"), *Nihon eiga* 5, no. 2 (November 1940): 82.
49. Atsugi discusses this phenomenon in her translator's afterword to the 1960 edition of *Documentary Film* (332). Atsugi Taka, "Yakusha no atogaki" (Translator's afterword), in Paul Rotha, *Dokumentarii eiga* (Documentary film), trans. Atsugi Taka (Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1960), 329–34.
50. Tanikawa, *Dokumentarii eiga no genten* (1990), 195.
51. See Kamei Fumio, "Bunka eiga geppyō" (Monthly culture film criticism), *Nihon eiga* 5, no. 12 (December 1940): 24–26; Kamei Fumio, Akimoto Takeshi, et al., "Nihon bunka eiga no shoki kara kyō o kataru zadankai," 16–27.