At the beginning of the 20th century, Southeast Asia was on the cusp of the birth of ‘fine art.’ Almost all of Southeast Asia was under Western colonial rule then. The Philippines, having emerged from a long period of Spanish control at the end of the 19th century, was now under American authority. Java and the Indonesian archipelago comprised the Dutch East Indies. The peninsula states of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia formed French Indochina; Myanmar was annexed as part of British India, while Singapore became part of the British Straits Settlements along with Penang, Malacca and Labuan. The Malay Peninsula and North Borneo were also British colonies. Only Thailand escaped colonisation in the power struggle between England and France.

The concept and institutions of ‘fine art’ were non-existent in Southeast Asia before this juncture, and it was amidst this political climate that the system of ‘fine art’ was first introduced from the West and gained traction. Needless to say, diverse forms of art-making already existed in the region. The daily lives of people were coloured and adorned by a myriad of creative forms, beginning with the well-known examples of Borobudur and Angkor Wat, and ranging from murals and sculptures in Thai temples and icons in Filipino churches to folk and vernacular art. However, such objects would not have been understood or produced according to the Euro-American holistic value system and concepts associated with ‘fine art.’ While the term ‘fine art,’ as used in a Western art historical context, can be largely defined as modern art, initial notions of ‘fine art’ stirring in various parts of the region were not in accord with this Western understanding.

With the introduction of the system of ‘fine art’ from the West, new terms were invented and added to the lexicons of local languages, gradually taking root in each area. In Chinese, this term was meishu; in Indonesian, seni rupa; in Malay, seni lukis; in Thai, silpa; in Vietnamese, mỹ thuật; in Tagalog, sining, and so forth. These nativised terms came to be used interchangeably with the Western terms ‘art’ or ‘fine art.’ It was thus in the first half of the 20th century that the overarching notion of ‘fine art’ came to exist in Southeast Asia, engulfing any closely related indigenous words and concepts that had previously existed in the region (as, for example, Jim Supangkat has discussed with regard to the Javanese word kagunan).1

Individuals began consciously identifying themselves as painters or artists—those who produced works as expressions of the self that were targeted towards spiritual values centred on aesthetics and beauty, and presented them at exhibitions and in other public forums to-
gether with others who shared their aims. This phenomenon could be seen occurring in the various cities of Southeast Asia that served as colonial administrative centres from the 1920s to the 1930s. One of the earliest cities in which this was manifest was Manila.

**Manila, 1928**

In the Philippines, where the tradition of Christian art had been cultivated under more than 300-years of Spanish colonial rule, Western-style art education was introduced relatively early. Art schools such as the Academia de Dibujo y Pintura in Manila were established in the 19th century, and local painters were producing Western-style portraits. Additionally, in the second half of the 19th century, some privileged youths in the colony who had studied at art schools in Manila also received formal art education in Europe. Of note among them was Juan Luna (1857–1899), who studied at the Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando in Madrid and, in 1884, received a gold medal at the Madrid General Exhibition of Fine Arts. This achievement, along with Félix Resurrección Hidalgo’s (1855–1913) receipt of a silver medal, greatly inspired a sense of nationalistic pride among the people of the Philippines.

In the 1920s, Fernando C. Amorsolo (1892–1972), who had also studied at the Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando in 1919, gradually gained widespread popularity for his sweetly sentimental portrayals of pastoral landscapes and coquettish female figures. His work, along with that of Fabián de la Rosa (1869–1937) and others, popularised the image of the Philippines as an ideal tropical paradise abroad. His paintings of rice planting scenes were charged with everything that people visiting the country could wish for (as well as anything anyone wishing to visit could dream of): rice paddies, people planting rice, charming young women, a man playing songs of labour on a guitar and, in the far distance, an old stone church and a brewing tropical storm. However, there was also something that was completely absent from his depictions: any sign of urban life, which was just starting to surface in the city of Manila.

Victorio C. Edades (1895–1985) went to the United States in 1919 and studied architecture and painting at the University of Washington, Seattle, in the 1920s. He returned to the Philippines in 1928 and at the end of that year held a solo exhibition at the Philippine Columbian Club in Ermita, a centre for the association of students who had studied abroad in America. The show which presented highlights of Edades’ oeuvre developed during his study in America, reportedly shocked the Philippine art world. Although Amorsolo had studied in Madrid around 1920 and had also visited New York, he had not been moved by the tide of new art that was developing in 20th-century Western Europe and, stylistically, his works never strayed from 19th-century naturalism. In contrast, although Edades’ studies were based in Seattle, which would then have been considered on the periphery of the Paris-centred art world of the day, he was exposed to Post-Impressionism and the later development of modernism in 1920s America.

The works on show that Edades produced during his stay in America appeared heavily influenced by Cézanne, but the piece that attracted the most attention was probably *The Builders* (1928, fig. 9.1). The painting depicts male labourers working to build a city. Where Amorsolo’s work features coquettish women bathing, Edades’ powerful image is filled with sweat-drenched men. In place of the romantic countryside, the work is set in a symbolic cityscape that represents the reality of the emerging metropolis of Manila of the time.

Edades later collaborated with Galo B. Ocampo (1913–1985) and Carlos “Botong” Francisco (1914–1969)—a young prodigy who later achieved national popularity under the nickname “Botong”—to paint Art Deco-
style murals on various modern architectural structures being built in Manila. The three came to be called the “Triumvirate of Modern Philippine Art” and together produced several murals, starting with *Rising Philippines* (1935), which adorned the lobby of the Capitol Theater in Manila. Unfortunately, however, almost all their representative works were entirely destroyed during the war. Later, Edades became an instructor at the University of Santo Tomas and further advanced the activities of the Triumvirate, establishing the Atelier of Modern Art in Malate, Manila, together with Ocampo and Diosdado Lorenzo by 1938. This group further expanded to become the “Thirteen Moderns,” in order, according to Edades, “to form a stronger body to promote modern art in the country.” They held regular meetings and were acknowledged for being “the first to attempt to create a single, tightly knit organisation of modern Philippine artists.” Before long, however, the Japanese army invaded Manila and the group’s activities came to a standstill. The full-scale blossoming of their efforts, as significant within an art historical context, would come later in the post-war period when the group’s members resumed their pursuits via new forms of activity.

As the leader of this group of modernists, Edades incited conflicts with conservative painters and sculptors like Amorsolo. This too resumed after the war, specifically in a polemical debate on modernism between Edades and the sculptor Guillermo E. Tolentino in 1948. A portion of Edades’ bitter critique against the conservative faction reads as follows:

> Prejudice, personal taste, and even a predilection for sentiment still govern our judgment and appreciation. We in the Philippines are still slaves to accuracy, to photographic delineation and to prettiness of surface colouring. It is a common thing to hear a landscape praised if it approaches the naturalistic appearance of its subject. If one can paint a pretty girl with sufficiently vivid color as to be worthy of decorating a calendar or the top of a candy box is forthwith a new “master”. If one or two of our countrymen win prizes abroad for historical knickknacks which are good only for documentary purposes, or win recognition with an alien subject-matter and style, then we are satisfied and believe we are internationally recognized [sic] for our art.

Batavia, 1938. S. Sudjojono’s Manifesto

In Batavia (now known as Jakarta), Java, the stronghold of the Dutch East India Company in the Dutch East Indies, S. Sudjojono (1917–1986) was attempting to perform the role of a midwife in assisting the birth of modern art. During the first half of the 20th century in the Dutch East Indies, artisan painters were producing tropical landscapes suffused with exotic sensibilities. To Sudjojono, such landscapes represented no more than meaningless pandering to the tastes of the Dutch and other travellers from Europe. He called these landscapes *Mooi Indië* (beautiful Indies in Dutch) paintings and fiercely criticised them:

> The paintings we see nowadays are mostly landscapes: rice fields being plowed, rice fields inundated by clear and calm water […] with the inevitable coconut palms […] or bamboo groves with blue-shimmering mountains in the background. Similarly there are paintings of women who must have red shawls fluttering in the wind, or, shaded by an umbrella, wear a blue jacket—everyday *lebaran* [celebrations following Ramadan] poetry.

> Everything is very beautiful and romantic, paradisical, everything is very pleasing, calm, and peaceful. Such paintings carry only one meaning: the beautiful Indies.


Victorio C. Edades, “Liberating ourselves from Academism,” This Week, 19 September 1948, as published in Rod. Paras-Perez, Edades and the 13 Moderns (Manila: Cultural Center of the Philippines, 1995), 35.


This statement by Sudjojono reveals an extremely modern image of the artist and a philosophical understanding of art, staring hard at the reality of one’s own foundation and creating an individualised aesthetic of beauty inspired by one’s own internal beliefs and feelings.

The essay in which these statements were made was released in Keboedayaan dan Masjarakat magazine in October 1939. However, this was not simply an attempt to incite the younger generation. In October of the previous year, he had already rallied what he called a “new generation” (consisting of about 15 people, including Ramli, Otto Djaya, S. Tutur, Emiria Sunassa and Suromo) in Jakarta, positioning Agus Djaya Suminta as the chairman and assuming for himself the position of secretary in the formation of a group of Indonesian painters known as the Association of Indonesian Drawing Masters (Persatuan Ahli-Ahli Gambar Indonesia, PERSAGI, fig. 9.2). It was through this group that Sudjojono strove to realise his own artistic philosophy.

PERSAGI has been positioned as the first modern art movement in the history of Indonesian art, although we do not know with certainty much about the works that were likely to have been presented at PERSAGI exhibitions at the time. Exactly how well the members’
works satisfied Sudjojono’s expectations or to what extent the artists comprehended his harsh words and took them to heart is uncertain. Regardless, Sudjojono called for painting to be a medium of personal expression that looked reality straight in the eye, even if one’s reality was a poor and pitiful one, painting it as it was rather than producing lifeless souvenirs that catered to foreign tastes. In his own work, he attempted to put his ideas into practice as well.

The Bandung Group of Five

Bandung, a city in the western part of Java in the Dutch East Indies, was a highland metropolis developed by the Dutch and one of Southeast Asia’s leading modern cities. A department store was established in 1910, and other modern buildings designed by Dutch architects in the Art Deco style stood side by side on its streets. A group of artists known as the Bandung Group of Five (Kelompok Lima Bandung) formed and established their base here in 1935, three years before the formation of PERSAGI. The five members were Affandi (1907–1990), who would later gain national popularity for his “tropical expressionism,” Hendra Gunawan (1918–1983), the milkman Sudarso (1914/1916–2006), Wahdi Sumanta (1917–1996) and Barli Sasmitawinata (1921–2007). Affandi was the eldest member at 28, and the youngest, Barli, was just 14 years old.

This group did not wield the same influence as PERSAGI, but at a time when landscape paintings had always been painted from memory by artists indoors, they introduced to Indonesia for the first time an Impressionist-style *plein-air* painting practice. According to Barli, they sought to capture reality in their works by going to the actual location they were painting. They were also said to have been the first to paint not only landscapes but figures as well. In fact, many figure paintings by Affandi survive from the years 1938 and 1939.

One could argue that the efforts of the Bandung Group of Five to pursue a real connection with the ground beneath their feet, rather than paint idealised romantic scenery, could be seen as the stirrings of modern art. Because they had no spokesman like Sudjojono was for PERSAGI, their names were not etched as deeply into the narrative of art history. Nonetheless, it is worth reflecting on their activities which preceded those of PERSAGI, even if in a limited way.

In light of the group’s contribution to modern art in Indonesia, however, Wahdi’s presence as its member is curious. Wahdi (fig. 9.3) is an artist whose oeuvre was known to be dominated, almost in its entirety, by *Mooi Indië* paintings. From conversations with him, it is clear that Wahdi originally considered himself a *tu-kang gambar* (artisan draughtsman), and it was only when the term *pelukis* (painter) was coined during Japanese military rule (1942–1945) that
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he came to see himself, for the first time, as an artist. Wahdi had trained for five months under Abdullah Suriosubroto (1878–1941), an established painter of Mooi Indië landscapes, before striking out on his own. At an open-call exhibition under the Japanese military government, Wahdi claimed that his master’s son, Basoeki Abdullah (1915–1993), who had recently returned from his studies abroad in Europe, had denounced him as a thief and accused him of stealing his father’s style. Wahdi’s paintings were sometimes also mistaken as Affandi’s: Having collaborated with Affandi on several projects, Wahdi seemed to have also absorbed his partner’s style.

From these examples it seems apparent that to Wahdi, who held the perspective of a tukang gambar, paintings were artisanal crafts that could be copied. However, to Basoeki, who had just returned from Europe, and to Sudjojono, who extolled the aesthetic individualism of the artist, paintings were executed in a style unique to the individual artist. It is here that we can perhaps identify a historical turning point.

The Pledge of Youth

Let us return to Sudjojono’s manifesto. In its last paragraph, Sudjojono’s words take on a still more impassioned tone:

Painters of Indonesia!
If there is still any of your own blood in your breast, carrying seeds of visions from your Goddess of Art, leave your tourist-like sphere, break the chains that restrain the freedom of your blood, so that the seeds I have spoken of become a large Garuda with strong wings who can carry you up to the blue sky. He then closes his essay with this: “Probably you will suffer, be burned by the heat of the sun […] but when you die you’ll not journey in vain to the palace of the Goddess of Art in the land of eternity […] the Goddess will open the door and joyfully invite you herself to enter.”

I would like to call attention to the fact that Sudjojono addressed his fervent call to the painters of “Indonesia,” because the Republic of Indonesia did not yet exist at this point in time. In fact, at the time in the Dutch East Indies, the faint shadow of a sovereign Indonesia was just raising its head, defining itself in opposition to the exotised East Indies of the Western imagination. In 1928, a group of nationalist youth leaders (including Sukarno, who would later become the nation’s first president) declared the Youth Pledge (Sumpah Pemuda), vowing to uphold an Indonesia of “one motherland, one people, and one language.” It was an indubitably symbolic event, using the term “Indonesia” as a slogan signifying independence from Dutch colonisation. Sudjojono’s call, then, made pointed reference to this slogan in anticipation of the future state that was beginning to emerge even amidst colonial rule.

The establishment and activities of PER-SAGI represented an artistic movement and, at the same time, signified a form of activism that looked proudly towards national independence.

Bangkok, 1933

In Thailand, which had preserved its independence from the aggressions of major powers, ‘fine art’ was a system to be institutionalised by the government. Thailand had pursued modernisation since the second half of the 19th century, during the reigns of King Mongkut (Rama IV) and King Chulalongkorn (Rama V). As criticism of the autocratic monarchy intensified, a constitutional revolution was sparked in 1932, changing the political system from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy.

As modernisation through Westernisation advanced, the government invited Europeans to Thailand and tried to import various Western institutions, including that of ‘fine art.’ The figure who came to play a major role in this
field was Corrado Feroci (1892–1962), an Italian national who adopted Thai citizenship in 1944 and took the Thai name Silpa Bhirasri. Feroci was brought in by the Thai government in 1923 to teach Western sculpture at the Fine Arts Department; in 1933 he established the School of Fine Arts (reorganised as the Praneet Silpakam School the following year). In 1943, the status of the school was elevated and it became Silpakorn University.

Unlike other colonial regions, ‘fine art’ in Thailand was, more than anything, introduced in emulation of the West and a means of reinforcing national authority through the creation of national monuments and sculpture. For this reason, sculptors were more essential than painters. Feroci, together with the first generation of students of the Silpakam School, were responsible for the production of statues of the King, such as Rama I (1932), and national monuments, such as the Democracy Monument (1939) and the Victory Monument (1941, fig. 9.4). Before long, Feroci was nurturing young artists who would go on to write the history of modern art in Thailand.

After the war, Feroci inaugurated a nationwide open-call competition that culminated in the National Exhibition of Art in 1949, expanded the provisions of Silpakorn University, and authored many books on the history of Thai art. Through such initiatives, he played a major role in forming the concept of and establishing a basis for ‘fine art’ institutions in Thailand.

Early graduates of his school came to be heralded as pioneers of Thai modern art. National demand dictated that many of them, unlike artists in most other Southeast Asian countries, be sculptors. In addition to the Western-style art curriculum, learning from nature and studying traditional Thai arts were encouraged at the school. Feroci taught that originality was of foremost importance to a modern artist, although he did not advocate formalism or strict universalism:

The laymen who are usually so attached to traditional art do not accept new forms easily; it is an understandable sentimentality which is gradually overcome only through new aesthetic appreciation arising from the same modern surroundings as those of the artist. To appease the layman’s anxiety, it is important to understand that if a Thai (or any artist belonging to a distinct ethnic group) does not purposely imitate works of foreign artists, he will always express, under any new style, the individuality of his race, which is formed by peculiar natural temperament, climate, religion, atavistic feelings and thoughts, and other factors.

Feroci’s tutelage produced exceptional sculptors such as Khien Yimsiri (1922–1971), who fused the grace and refinement of Sukhothai Buddhist statuary with the rational realism of Western sculpture.

Hanoi, 1925

In 1921, French painter Victor Tardieu (1870–1937) visited French Indochina, an entity which at the beginning of the 20th century comprised Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Tardieu’s entry to the Paris Salon had received the colonial art prize, the Prix de l’Indochine, in 1920, awarding him a stipend for his deployment to Indochina. Recipients of the prize received free passage between Paris and Indochina and travel within the French territory, but the allowance for expenses incurred during travel was fairly limited, so it was customary for stays to be cut relatively short. In Tardieu’s case, construction of the University of Indochina (l’Université Indochinoise) was being planned at the time of his visit and he took on the project of producing a large mural for one of the buildings immediately after arriving in Hanoi, allowing him an extended stay. As a result, he was able to gain an understanding of the state of Viet-
namese art and come into contact with local artists (fig. 9.5). Tardieu commented: “I had the opportunity to interact with eager young Vietnamese artists who wished to revive traditional Vietnamese arts and at the same time sought ongoing instruction in Western arts.” Tardieu must have cherished the same hope himself, because he later received approval from the colonial government to establish the School of Fine Arts of Indochina (l’École des beaux-arts de l’Indochine) in 1925 with the support of the painter Nguyễn Nam Sơn (1890–1973). The stated objective was to train locals to produce handicraft items for export, but the school provided an art education that followed a standard Western-style curriculum. The first batch of students graduated from the school in 1930 and over the course of the 1930s, alumni of the programme established the institution of ‘fine art’ in Indochina. At the same time, a form of “tradition” inherent to Vietnam was discovered and forged under the guidance of their French instructor. Nguyễn Phan Chánh (1892–1984) and Nguyễn Gia Trí (1908–1993) were both instrumental in negotiating this strand of “tradition” in the mediums of silk and lacquer painting respectively.

Singapore, 1935

While there were oil and watercolour paintings produced by European artists who travelled the Malay Peninsula in the 19th century, the transfer of ‘fine art’ from the West to the local community came late. Apart from the traditional paintings and calligraphies produced by the Chinese in the British Straits Settlements of Singapore, Malacca and Penang, only a minimal number of oil paintings were made. By the 1930s, however, Chinese who had studied art in France and China came to settle in the Straits Settlements, and others journeyed to Shanghai to further their education in art. As more artists gathered in Singapore, the Society of Chinese Artists (formerly the Salon Art Society) was formed in 1935 (fig. 9.6) and began to hold annual exhibitions the following year. In 1938, the first tertiary art school in the British territory of Malaya, the Nanyang Academy of Fine Arts, was founded for the purpose of educating young immigrant Chinese in the arts. Lim Hak Tai (1893–1963) served as the first principal of the school, and its establishment further stimulated other artistic activity in Malaya. The oil paintings by members of the Society of Chinese Artists were heavily influenced by Post-Impressionism and the School of Paris, due to the large number of members who had studied in France and Shanghai. They, alongside other ethnic Chinese artists in Malaya, were sometimes categorised as belonging to the Nanyang School of art. “Nanyang” (South Seas) was the Chinese term for the Southeast Asian region, suggesting that those living there did not yet consider Singapore their homeland. Lim leveraged this condition unique to Singapore to create a Nanyang art that was neither wholly dongfang (Eastern) or xifang (Western).
The Greater East Asia War, 1941–1945

At the end of 1941, when ‘fine art’ was germinating and on the very verge of blossoming in Southeast Asia, the Japanese Army invaded. The army rapidly occupied the greater part of the region, laying down military governments and exerting Japanese influence. Although this occupation lasted for a relatively short period of time—it was slightly over three years before the war ended in Japan’s defeat—it nonetheless created great disturbances within the region.

The Japanese occupation policy was not consistent in all localities due to the differing objectives of each of the occupation armies as well as the distinctive features of each area, and it is not befitting to speak of them together in general. However, it is safe to say that throughout the region the Japanese enlisted the cooperation of residents in the military government and deployed “pacification strategies” (or less euphemistically, propaganda) with the goal of mobilising locals in the war effort. In addition to the establishment of the Keimin Bunka Shidosho (Cultural Centre, Poesat Kebdedajaan, fig. 9.7) in Java, where art classes were also held, regular open-call art competitions and other kinds of exhibitions were organised. In Manila and Hanoi, the Japanese sponsored nationwide public art exhibitions and competitions, and exhibitions of local artists were held in Singapore as well. Japanese cultural centres were also established in various parts of Southeast Asia and Japanese artists were dispatched to staff them.

While such cultural components of occupation policies made certain contributions to the process by which ‘fine art’ was able to take root in Southeast Asia, it is undeniable that there were also ways in which the Japanese Army and its occupation crushed the germinating seeds of ‘fine art’ and largely inhibited its growth. One obvious example of this was the execution of the central figure of the Society of Chinese Artists in Singapore, Tchang Ju Chi (1905–1944) and his associates.

Importing ‘Fine Art’ and the Search for Individuality, then Redefining ‘Fine Art’

Victor Tardieu wrote the following on the occasion of the construction of the l’École des beaux-arts de l’Indochine:

The most urgent task for the founder of this school and his collaborators is to assist the artists and handicraftsmen of Annam to discover the deep meaning of their own tradition and finding [sic] fundamental inspiration. In order to achieve these ends, numerous models of old Annamese art should be displayed before their eyes. This return to the past, however, can be productive only if it serves as a departure point to new researches and only when we confront the present exigency to cultivate a path leading to future developments. In short, the issue lies at how we are going to achieve a modern development along the continuing line of tradition.14

This question of “how we are going to achieve a modern development along the continuing line of tradition” was a common concern throughout Southeast Asia and, undoubtedly, the Asian continent as a whole. For example, although at a slightly later date than Tardieu, the aforementioned Feroci, who established the School of Fine Arts in Bangkok under the national policy of the Thai government and worked tirelessly to establish the system of ‘fine art,’ similarly stressed the importance of Western-style art education while also encouraging learning from nature and the traditional arts. He asserted that “If sincerely expressed, a work done by a Thai or by any other Eastern artist must be different from one made by a European. The difference will correspond to the individuality of race.”15 While respecting the originality of the artist, he called for art that reflected the traditions and characteristics of the artist’s own people. Even Edades, the quintessential Philip-
pine modernist who studied in America, advocated “find[ing] pleasure in the visible qualities of even the commonest objects of everyday life” and the importance of “integrat[ing] all of our impressions with our own Oriental heritage and our traditional Christian culture.” Meanwhile in Indonesia, Sudjojono fervently insisted upon beauty that conformed to the personal aesthetic of the individual artist while maintaining a spirit that looked reality straight in the eye, to achieve artworks that are based on our daily life as transmuted by the artist and that must be absolutely free.

In the first half of the 20th century, under the colonial rule or strong influence of European powers, Southeast Asian artists learnt about the new concept and medium of ‘fine art’ as imported from the West and used it within the context of rising nationalism to fix their gaze upon their individual reality, tradition and cultural heritage, seeking to discover their own ‘fine art’ in the process.

The birth of ‘fine art’ also engendered definitions of what was not considered ‘fine art.’ The process by which ‘fine art’ was imported from the West and became entrenched in the various localities was, by the same token, also a process of marginalising and disqualifying the diverse creative arts that had previously existed in this region and fell outside the umbrella of ‘fine art.’ Any discussion of the concept of ‘fine art’ today in the 21st century is also necessarily an act of re-examining these marginalised forms of creation, in order to redefine once more what constitutes ‘fine art.’ This essay has provided an overview of the process by which ‘fine art’ was imported to Southeast Asia, but I believe that the ultimate task for National Gallery Singapore and those of us concerned with the art of this region is, more importantly, to re-examine that which has been discarded and forgotten in the process of defining ‘fine art’ in this region.

This essay was originally written in Japanese, translated by Maiko Behr and assisted by Horikawa Lisa.

This essay uses single quotation marks to highlight the term ‘fine art,’ as an equivalent of the Japanese punctuation (「」) used by the author.
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