

Mobility, Contacts, and the Formation of Multi-ethnic/racial Empires
across the Pacific

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Cornell University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Noriaki Hoshino

August 2014

© 2014 Noriaki Hoshino

Mobility, Contacts, and the Formation of Multi-ethnic/racial Empires
across the Pacific

Noriaki Hoshino, Ph. D.
Cornell University 2014

My dissertation examines Japanese and American intellectual discourses, including discourses by Christian leaders, on the topic of Japanese transpacific migrations, and sets such discourses in conjunction with related Japanese migrant practices from the beginning of the twentieth century through World War II. I focus on how both Japanese and American intellectual discourses with regard to Japanese migration reflected keen interest in the integration of heterogeneous populations in both empires. In particular, I analyze the emphasis in these discourses on the multi-ethnic/racial character of the intellectuals' own nations and consider Japanese migrants' responses to such discourses. I argue that the Japanese transpacific migration is an important historical factor in the development of discourses on the broader nation formation in the twentieth century. My study bridges the fields of Japanese studies and American studies and reveals new points at which transnational studies of Japanese migrations and comparative studies of racism in the Japanese and American empires converge.

Overall, my study illuminates not only the parallel mechanisms of Japanese and American imperial nation formations but also the role of transpacific Japanese migration as an important site of interaction between the two countries. Such an analysis has not, to the best of my knowledge, been undertaken in either Japanese studies or American studies.

Thus, my thesis offers new perspectives on existing nationalized disciplines and articulates the critical potential of transpacific studies.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Noriaki Hoshino was born in Morioka, Japan. After obtaining a B.A. from the University of Tsukuba in Japan, he joined the University of Tokyo, where he completed an M.A. in 2004. He joined the PhD program in History at Cornell University in 2006. He will start teaching at Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, in the fall of 2014.

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents and my wife

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation has been written after a long intellectual inquiry and many fruitful encounters with various scholars, teachers, and friends on both sides of the Pacific. Therefore I owe the completion of my thesis to many people, who helped either directly or indirectly. However, I would like to express my exceptional gratitude particularly to my main advisers.

Professor J. Victor Koschmann kept encouraging me to pursue my interdisciplinary research throughout my Ph.D. years. With his wide range of knowledge as a distinguished scholar in the field, he always gave me careful and intellectually stimulating advice and patiently kept supporting the slow pace of my dissertation writing. He also offered warm support when I encountered difficulties in everyday life as an international student. Without his academic and non-academic mentorship, I could not have finished a Ph.D. program in a foreign country.

Professor Naoki Sakai is the source of my intellectual inspiration. Any conversation with him always opened my eyes and expanded my research perspective. Although my dissertation framework itself is influenced by his previous studies, what stimulated me even more is his intellectual integrity as a thinker. He kept showing me the importance of thinking and acting beyond a narrowly bounded discipline or academia itself.

Professor Derek Chang introduced me to the world of Asian American Studies. He gave me a supportive push when I started engaging in transnational research and kept offering me his warm support. His distinguished knowledge of American history and strong interest in minority politics helped me develop my understanding of the history of Japanese immigrants.

I also owe the successful pursuit of my research to the help of Professors Brett de Bary and Katsuya Hirano at Cornell University and Professors Yoichi Komori and Yasuo Endo at the

University of Tokyo. Although I cannot mention everyone by name, I have also been supported by a number of faculty members in the Department of History at Cornell University.

I am also indebted to various institutions and their financial support for my research project: a Fulbright Scholarship, a Honjo Scholarship from the Japanese American Association of New York, a Robert Smith Fellowship from the East Asian Program at Cornell University, and a Sage Dissertation Fellowship from the Graduate School at Cornell University enabled me to concentrate on coursework and dissertation writing.

Collegiality and friendship were also important sources of my intellectual curiosity and the motivation throughout my dissertation-writing process. It is impossible for me to mention all the friends who supported my research all over the world, but I feel obliged at least to mention many of my wonderful colleagues and friends at Cornell: Takeshi Kimoto, Jeff DuBois, Deokhyo Choi, Christopher Jones, Masaki Kinjo, Seokwon Lee, Akiko Ishii, Annmaria Shimabuku, Gavin Walker, Soo Kyeong Hong, Min-Hwa Ahn, Yuanchong Wang, Junliang Huang, Pedro Erber, Christopher Ahn, Sujin Lee, Mari Crabtree, Trais Pearson, Yoon Jeong Oh, Josh Young, Jorge Rivera Marin, Hajimu Masuda, John Duong Phan, Lisa Onaga, Peter Lavelle, and Taomo Zhou.

Last but not least, I cannot help feeling grateful to my parents Katsutoshi Hoshino and Tamiko Hoshino for their steadfast encouragement and support. One of the biggest delights of the completion of this dissertation is that I can now start repaying the infinite debt I owe to them. I also want to give my heartfelt thanks to my wife Arina Rotaru. Her insightful advice and cheerful smile always help me keep moving forward. It is to my parents and my wife that I dedicate this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Biographical Sketch	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
Introduction: Approaching the Formation of Empires across the Pacific	1
Chapter 1: Migrations and the Expansive Formation of the Japanese Nation: The Evolution of Japanese Migration Discourses	31
Chapter 2: Imperial Subject Formations across the Pacific: Transpacific Network of Japanese Social Reform and Problem of “Assimilation”	73
Chapter 3: Japanese Immigrants/Americans and American Theory of Racial Contacts: Missionary, Social Scientists, and Question of Loyalty	111
Chapter 4: Transpacific Migrations and the Creation of <i>Minzoku</i> : Japanese Sociological Discourse on Racial/Ethnic Contacts	155
Chapter 5: Between Nightmare and Daydream: Shibutani Tamotsu and Affective Traces of a Participant Observer	188
Conclusion	219
Bibliography	226

Introduction:

Approaching the Formation of Empires across the Pacific

After the modern Japanese nation-state ended its strict regulation of emigration in the late nineteenth century, Japan's population started circulating with increased frequency into and out of the main islands. The United States was one of the earliest destinations for such Japanese migrants, whose flow later extended into South America, the South Pacific Ocean (Nanyō), and Manchuria. At the same time, the presence of Japanese immigrants in the United States provoked strong exclusionary reactions in the early twentieth century, and led to a restrictive immigration law issued in 1924, which was preceded by a series of specifically anti-Japanese immigrant laws. However, during the 1920s and 1930s, issues related to Japanese migrants also stimulated intellectual discussions of what appeared to be emerging multi-racial/ethnic nations in Japan and the United States. Both countries had been forming their own empires across the Pacific from one another and were attempting simultaneously to incorporate and differentiate new peoples and territories. What exact impact did the geographic shifts and activism of Japanese migrants have on intellectual discussions of nation formation and racial/ethnic relationship in both countries? How did the migrants cope with life at the intersection of two expanding empires? My dissertation investigates these questions.

The central aim of this research is to reveal the unexamined intersection between the history of transpacific migration and the formation of empires. For that purpose, I explore Japanese and American intellectual discourses, including discourses by Christian leaders, on

Japanese transpacific migrations and examine related Japanese migrant/immigrant practices mainly from the beginning of the twentieth century through World War II. I also devote some attention to post–World War II discourses as well. I focus on how both Japanese and American intellectual discourses on Japanese migration reflected a keen interest in the integration of heterogeneous populations in both empires. In particular, I analyze the emphasis in these discourses on the multi-ethnic/racial or mixed race character of the intellectuals’ own nations and consider Japanese migrants’ responses to such discourses.

The perspective of my research grows out of recent methodological developments in studies of empires and migrations across the Pacific. My approach builds in particular on recent comparative studies of racism in the Japanese and American empires and transnational explorations of Japanese migrant history. These methodologies have emerged as critical responses to the predominant forms of knowledge production and social regimes in the United States and Japan. Therefore it is important to clarify the context of these methodological developments.

A Comparative Study of Empires

The first core feature of my research perspective is a comparative approach to the study of the Japanese and American empires. Empire studies have experienced important developments and diversification over the last two decades, in parallel with the rise of postcolonial and cultural studies. In a recent article on the historiography of the Japanese empire, the authors locate the beginning of the publication of influential monographs in

Japanese empire studies (particularly by scholars in Japanese academia) in the 1990s.¹ The list includes the works of Takeshi Komagome, Ichirō Tomiyama, and Eiji Oguma.² The previous generation's theory of imperialism tended to lead to economism and overlook imperial penetrations into colonies at the political and sociocultural levels. However, these new scholars examine the close interaction between the metropole and the colonies at many levels. For example, the role of culture and the idea of a nation in the context of the hierarchical ordering of identities in an empire has become an important topic. Studies offering such a perspective have been produced not only in Japanese academia, but also by scholars working in English-speaking countries.³

Such themes also became important in American empire studies in the 1990s. For example, in 1993 Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease edited a well-known collection of papers on the culture of American imperialism, addressing the “absence of the United States from the postcolonial study of imperialism” and challenging the notion of American exceptionalism.⁴ The included essays covered various topics such as race, gender, empire-building, visual culture, and colonial resistance. Other collections of papers in empire studies from the perspectives of postcolonial and cultural studies were also first being published

¹ Ryuta Itagaki, Satoshi Mizutani, and Hideaki Tone, “Japanese Empire,” in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Modern Imperial Histories*, ed. Philippa Levine and John Marriott (Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012), 283–4.

² Takeshi Komagome, *Shokuminchi teikoku nihon no bunka tōgō* (Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten, 1996); Ichirō Tomiyama, *Kindai nihon shakai to “Okinawajin”*: “nihonjin” ni naru to yū koto (Tōkyō: Nihon keizai hyōronsha, 1990); Eiji Oguma, “*Nihonjin*” no kyōkai: okinawa, ainu, taiwan, chōsen, shokuminchi shihai kara fukki undō made, shohan (Tōkyō: Shinyōsha, 1998).

³ Tessa Morris-Suzuki, *Henkyō kara nagameru: ainu ga keikensuru kindai*, trans. Masahiko Ōkawa (Tōkyō: Misuzu shobō, 2000); Leo T. S Ching, *Becoming “Japanese”: Colonial Taiwan and the Politics of Identity Formation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Louise Young, *Japan’s Total Empire Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

⁴ Amy Kaplan and Donald E Pease, eds., *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 11.

around that time.⁵ In this new trend in empire studies, many scholars have paid attention to the role of culture in the empire in its complicated relationship with economic, political, and ideological practices. One of the leading scholars of empire studies in the United States, Ann Laura Stoler, edited a volume titled *Imperial Formations* in 2007 and she and her co-editor, Carole McGranahan, explained that the title came from “Louis Althusser and Etienne Balibar’s use of ‘social formation’ to signal the ‘concrete complex whole comprising economic practice, political practice, and ideological practice’” and they included “cultural practice in this configuration to stretch our concerns to a broader set of practices structured in dominance.”⁶ Such approaches expanded empire studies to include micro-analysis of imperial subjects’ identity formations, the function of universalism, and “intimate” relationships between colonizers and the colonized (or the metropole and the colony).

Out of this context emerged the comparative study of the Japanese and American empires. Although a comparative approach to the study of empires itself is not altogether new, a comparative analysis of Japan and the United States as comparable empires has not been a popular research topic, for reasons I explain later in this introduction. Among representative and pioneering studies that take such a critical perspective, I particularly highlight the works of Naoki Sakai and Takashi Fujitani, who are both working in the United States. Importantly, both scholars focus, to a greater or lesser degree, on the function of

⁵ As representative works, I think about the following edited volumes: Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, eds., *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1997); Ann Laura Stoler, ed., *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); Ann Laura Stoler, Carole McGranahan, and Peter C Perdue, eds., *Imperial Formations* (Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press ; James Currey, 2007).

⁶ Ann Laura Stoler and Carole McGranahan, “Introduction: Refiguring Imperial Terrains,” in *Imperial Formations*, eds. Ann Laura Stoler, Carole McGranahan, and Peter C. Perdue (Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 2007), 8.

racism and national integration in both empires.⁷ Fujitani's comparative study was recently published as *Race for Empire*, in which he compares the integration of Koreans into the Japanese empire with that of Japanese immigrants into the United States from the late 1930s through World War II.⁸ Adopting the format of a social and cultural historiography, Fujitani traces the process of the inclusion of minorities in both empires.

One of Fujitani's main theoretical frameworks in this book is the conceptual binary of "vulgar racism" and "polite racism." The former indicates the orthodox image of the practices of racial discrimination, which are based on the exclusion of minority members from the social and political sphere. The latter directs our attention to a more complicated function of racism. While this type of racism argues for the inclusion of minority members under the ideal of universalism, it differentially reproduces racial/ethnic hierarchies among the members of the empire. Fujitani identifies the development of this form of inclusion in both countries, once they mutated into a total war regime.⁹

Sakai also explores similar themes, but his analysis tends to be directed more at philosophy, intellectual history, and literature/film.¹⁰ One of the mechanisms he aims to reveal in his works is what he calls "imperial nationalism," in which various people of the empire are subjectified as members of the same nation. This analysis is not necessarily limited to the examination of nation formation in the 1930s and 1940s in both countries. For

⁷ Although the theoretical perspective here is a bit different from that of these scholars, there were some earlier works which focused on racism in/between both countries. John W Dower, *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986); Yukiko Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific Racisms and the U.S. Occupation of Japan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

⁸ Takashi Fujitani, *Race for Empire: Koreans as Japanese and Japanese as Americans during World War II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

⁹ For the analysis of total war regimes, see J. Victor Koschmann, Ryūichi Narita, and Yasushi Yamanouchi, eds., *Total War and "Modernization"* (Ithaca, N.Y.: East Asia Program, Cornell University, 1998).

¹⁰ Naoki Sakai, "Imperial Nationalism and the Comparative Perspective," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 17, no. 1 (2009): 159–205; Naoki Sakai, "Two Negations: Fear of Being Excluded and the Logic of Self-Esteem," *Novel; a Forum on Fiction*. 37, no. 3 (2004): 229; Naoki Sakai, *Kyōkan no kyōdōtai to teikokuteki kokumin shugi: nihon/eizō/beikoku* (Tōkyō: Seidosha, 2007).

example, one of his main insights regarding Japanese intellectuals in the empire comes from his analysis of the philosophy of Tanabe Hajime, the famous Kyoto school philosopher, and one of the implications of this analysis is its comparability to the contemporary discourse of multi-culturalism in North America such as the one theorized by Charles Taylor.¹¹ Thus Sakai's comparative approach opens to a wider range of phenomena, but both scholars share the insight that critical analysis of the Japanese empire is very important for the analysis of American society, and vice versa. What is the significance of this insight?

In order to understand this, we have to examine the role of the method of comparison itself. As I mentioned, the comparative study of empire itself is not new. For example, it is well-known that a model that juxtaposes direct rule and indirect rule was used to compare the British and French empires. As this approach shows, the significance of the method of comparison seems to be a practice of "sorting out" independent terms/items into separate categories or types. However, we should examine the process of comparison more carefully. In regard to the detailed mechanism of comparison, Sakai's analysis shows us its critical implications.¹²

Sakai first reminds us of the fact that there are two moments in the act of comparison. The first one is similar to what I have just tried to describe, that is, what he called "the postulation of the class of *genus* among compared items." In this moment, we identified and compared two unified objects as belonging to the same *species*. This act simultaneously constituted the higher class genus in which those *species differences* were measured. Meanwhile, the second moment is more originary for the process of comparison. This is the

¹¹ Naoki Sakai, "Subject and Substratum: On Japanese Imperial Nationalism," *Cultural Studies* 14, no. 3-4 (2000): 462-530.

¹² Naoki Sakai, "The Microphysics of Comparison: Towards the Dislocation of the West," *Eipcp*, June 2013, <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0613/sakai1/en>.

moment when we encounter an incommensurable difference. Sakai calls this “the occasion or locale where we are obliged to compare” and this is a “locale of incomprehension, perplexity, or helplessness.” In this moment, “we are at a loss” as to if, when we meet someone emitting sound from her mouth, we cannot understand what she wants to do with it. The determination of *species difference* (we don’t understand it because she spoke a national language that is different from mine) is a response to this moment of encounter with the incommensurable difference and there is a gap between the two moments.

Importantly, it is based on this transition from the second moment to the first moment that we compare the differences between nation-states or empires. For example, Sakai overlaps the distinction between those two moments with that between *internationality* and *transnationality*. *Internationality* is a historically particular regime of comparison in which we can compare, categorize, and hierarchize the various nationalities. Under this regime, the set of *national* and *international* is based on the logical economy of *species* and *genus*. In contrast, *transnationality* is the modality of sociality prior to *internationality* and Sakai exemplifies it as the locale of *translation*. This is irreducible to *internationality*.

Sakai’s analysis clarifies the complicated process of comparison. From his analysis, I can draw out the following two insights for the comparative study of empires. First, the comparison of distinct national characteristics or imperial regimes is based on the regime of *internationality* and this regime conditions the production of the popular comparative binaries of the modern/premodern and Western/non-Western between corresponding societies as *species differences*. At the same time, sensitivity to the role of *transnationality* could contribute to undermining and reconfiguring such relationships based on *internationality*, the logical economy of species and genus.

With the abovementioned insights in mind, we can grasp the significance of the comparison of Japanese and American empires more successfully. In the case of that comparison, these two countries/empires tend to be categorized into distinct groups/types based on so-called Western and non-Western distinctions. In that sense, it seems that, unlike previously dominant perspectives, Sakai's and Fujitani's attempts at comparison aim to put both imperial regimes into the same category. However, I do not regard this as the most radical aspect of their comparative studies. Importantly, for both scholars, the purpose of their research does not seem to be to claim that those two empires were entirely the same.¹³ Their interest in this method seems to indicate something else.

At this point, I return to the relationship between *internationality* and *transnationality* in the method of comparison. As we have seen, *transnationality* indicates the prior condition based on which the comparison of *species differences* such as the binary of modern/pre-modern or Western/non-Western is possible. This *transnationality* perspective opens up a space in which such a binary of *species difference* can be reconfigured. In our context, this indicates a locus of dialogic conversation between the study of the Japanese empire and the study of the American empire, which simultaneously reexamine the contours of the identified objects, that is, imperial formations. Taking this aspect of comparison into account, we notice that an important contribution of these scholars' comparative approach is to create a dialogic circuit in the studies of empires across the Pacific. Nevertheless, it is still not apparent why this intervention for dialogue is so important for the study of both empires. In order to understand this, we have to quickly trace the history of comparative studies of Japan and the United States and consider how the two societies have been co-figured.

¹³ Fujitani, *Race for Empire*, 25–26, 29–30.

Until the early twenty-first century, the comparative study of Japanese and American societies/cultures had tended to reinforce the abovementioned binary formulations. To present the conclusion first, this binary did not depend on a simple hierarchy between two societies. Rather it is much closer to the relationship between a model and copies. While the model society is a singular referential point, there are many variable copies. What represents this hierarchical formulation of societies in the world is the perspective of modernization theory, in which the values and social formations that have *originated* in a specific “Western” country become standards against which to measure the civilizational developments of non-“Western” countries. Modernization theory was a popular comparative framework that was introduced to Japan mainly by American scholars in the 1960s when Japan became a strategic model of modernization within Cold War politics.¹⁴ In this theoretical framework, as the famous American modernization theorist in Japanese Studies and scholar of sociology of religion Robert N. Bellah once emphasized, compared with the importance of the idea of universalism in “Western” countries such as the United States, Japanese cultural identity had been found in its particularism.¹⁵

Such a characterization of the particularistic nature of Japanese culture contributed significantly to the scholarly understanding of Japanese racial/ethnic ideology. According to this binary, Japanese society has displayed highly closed, exclusive, and mono-ethnic cultural characteristics, while the United States has pursued the ideal of a multi-racial/ethnic society based on its universalism. Such a binary understanding is not limited to a few

¹⁴ For interaction between Japanese and US intellectuals on modernization theory, see J. Victor Koschmann, “Modernization and Democratic Values: The ‘Japanese Model’ in the 1960s,” in *Staging Growth: Modernization Development, and the Global Cold War*, ed. David C. Engerman (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 225–49.

¹⁵ Robert N. Bellah, *Imagining Japan: The Japanese Tradition and Its Modern Interpretation* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003), 114–139.

scholarly approaches, but presents rather a variation on other interpretative binaries such as West and non-West, modern and pre-modern, liberal US society and fascistic Japanese society. This *separation* between the societies has prevented us from engaging in a critical analysis of each society based on the experience of the other society.¹⁶

On the one hand, Japanese racial/ethnic policy has been regarded as traditionally particularistic/exclusive and the role of power relationships based on universalism in comparison with their function in US society has not been pursued adequately. On the other hand, it has become rare for scholars in Japanese studies to use their knowledge of Japanese history to analyze American society.¹⁷ Although this *separation* has obviously relied on the scheme of what Edward Said once called “Orientalism,” it should not be immediately thought that this view was entirely the product of American scholars.¹⁸ It has instead been maintained by scholars in both countries. The post–World War II popularity of “discussions about the Japanese” (*nihonjinron*), a genre of texts that focus on the particularistic Japanese national and cultural identity, clearly indicates how the idea of particularistic Japanese culture was welcomed by the Japanese people and intellectuals.

An important historical fact that has been ignored under this regime of *separation* is the existence of universalistic discourses in terms of nation formation within the Japanese empire. Since Japanese culture has been regarded as particularistic and its society has been regarded as traditionally mono-ethnic during the postwar period, a more complicated brand

¹⁶ Here, I borrow the word “separation” from Johannes Fabian’s famous analysis of the politics of time. Fabian critically examined the method of anthropology that denies the actual practical relationship between the observer and the observed by differentiating the time of the Others. This mechanism is the “separation.” Obviously, this analysis implies a critique of the entangled history of enlightenment and colonialism. “(I)ttle needs to be said, I assume, about separation and distancing in colonialist praxis which drew its ideological justification from Enlightenment thought and later evolutionism.” Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), 27.

¹⁷ Sakai pursues precisely this comparative exploration in Sakai, “Imperial Nationalism and the Comparative Perspective.”

¹⁸ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).

of politics related to a multi-racial/ethnic population inside of the empire has been ignored. As I have mentioned, this situation has recently changed because of the new current in empire studies and this change has also synchronized with comparative studies of Japanese and American empires. The important research outcome of this new current is not only that both empires shared historically comparable universalistic discourses but also that they historically coexisted and interacted across the Pacific. This insight allows us to look back on episodes of twentieth-century transpacific history and observe the two empires' competition around the ideal of universality. In particular, the discussion about racial equality and issues involving the integration of racial/ethnic minorities in each country became an important point of convergence for the ideological discourses of both empires. The symbolic evidence of this transpacific tension in terms of competing racial discourses is the involvement of many African American intellectuals with the discussion of race issues in Asia.¹⁹

Thus my dissertation examines both countries' racial/ethnic discourses by considering this context of transpacific political and ideological tension. At the same time, in regard to this interaction, my study introduces a new aspect into the comparative study of empires and racism. In addition to the topic of the color line regarding African Americans, there is also another important racial issue which affects both countries' racial/ethnic discourses across the Pacific. That is the transpacific movement of Japanese imperial subjects between the Japanese empire and the United States. My dissertation approaches the comparative study of racism in both countries through this issue of transpacific migrations.

Transnational Studies of Japanese Emigrants/Immigrants

¹⁹ This relationship recently attracted the interest of many scholars. For one of the earliest works on this topic, see Marc S. Gallicchio, *The African American Encounter with Japan and China: Black Internationalism in Asia, 1895–1945* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

The second core methodological perspective my dissertation follows is a transnational approach toward the study of migrations. My dissertation focuses particularly on the history of Japanese migrations to the United States.²⁰ The history of Japanese immigrants in the United States itself has long been a subject of research for scholars in the field of Japanese/Asian American Studies. One of the pioneering historiographies of early Japanese immigrants in the United States was Japanese American historian Yuji Ichioka's *The Issei*.²¹ In this book, he traces the history of first-generation Japanese Americans/immigrants. Although Japanese American history has tended to focus on the experience of those immigrants in the United States, Ichioka also examines the immigrants' relationship with their home country and their complicated connection to Japanese imperial expansion.²²

In this way, early Japanese American historiography shows potential interest in an immigrant transnational relationship with the Japanese empire. This exploration is further developed by a scholar of the next generation, Eiichirō Azuma. In 2005, he published *Between Two Empires*, in which he explored Japanese American identity formation in the first half of the twentieth century.²³ Azuma's historiography breaks new ground by situating the experience of Japanese immigrants not only in regard to their relationship with American society but also in relation to their constant interaction with the Japanese empire through social reform practices, children's education, and war support. In other words, Azuma

²⁰ Here I have to emphasize that these "Japanese migrants" emerged within the process of contemporaneous colonization and imperial subject formation by the Japanese empire and contained a heterogeneous population such as migrants from the Okinawan islands.

²¹ Yuji Ichioka, *The Issei: The World of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants, 1885-1924* (New York; London: Free Press ; Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1988).

²² Yuji Ichioka, "Japanese Immigrant Nationalism: The Issei and the Sino-Japanese War, 1937-1941," *Calihist California History* 69, no. 3 (1990): 260-75; Yuji Ichioka, "The Meaning of Loyalty: The Case of Kazumaro Buddy Uno," *Amerasia Journal*. 23, no. 3 (1997): 45. Also, there is another early work that traces the relationship of Japanese immigrants and their home country's imperialism, see, John J Stephan, "Hijacked by Utopia: American Nikkei in Manchuria," *Amerasia Journal*. 23, no. 3 (1997): 1.

²³ Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

emphasized that the Japanese American identification process was heavily conditioned by the immigrants' position between the two empires and their history was one of constant negotiation with the incorporating interpellation of the two countries. For example, Azuma picks up the oscillation of the first generation Japanese immigrants' public expression of national allegiance between Japan and the United States in the 1930s and 1940s, particularly their "sudden 180-degree turn from Japanese patriotism to American loyalty in early 1941."²⁴ This implicitly reminds us how the life of the immigrants had been exposed to the violence of states and their survival depended on the appropriate negotiation with them. At this point, we cannot ignore that, in the context of Azuma's research on identification issues the Japanese immigrants faced, there existed an accumulation of scholarly works on American racialization from the perspective of cultural and postcolonial studies in the field of Asian American Studies.²⁵

At the same time, Azuma's study also indicates the point of convergence between the Japanese empire's racial/ethnic policy and its migrants' lives. He analyzes the Conference of Overseas Japanese held in Tokyo in 1940, to which Japanese migrants from all over the world were invited by the government.²⁶ He finds here the integration of the narrative of migrants into the ongoing imperial slogan of "*hakkō ichiu* (unifying every corner of the world under one roof)." Although Azuma's main focus here is the relationship between

²⁴ Ibid., 186.

²⁵ For representative works on Asian American racialization based on the framework of cultural and postcolonial studies, see Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996); Robert G Lee, *Orientalism: Asian Americans in Popular Culture* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999); David Palumbo-Liu, *Asian/American Historical Crossings of a Racial Frontier* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1999). For the previous representative Japanese American historiographies, see Brian Masaru Hayashi, *For the Sake of Our Japanese Brethren: Assimilation, Nationalism, and Protestantism among the Japanese of Los Angeles, 1895–1942* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995); Lon Kurashige, *Japanese American Celebration and Conflict: A History of Ethnic Identity and Festival, 1934–1990* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

²⁶ Eiichirō Azuma, "'Pioneers of Overseas Japanese Development': Japanese American History and the Making of Expansionist Orthodoxy in Imperial Japan," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 67, no. 4 (2008): 1187–1226.

migrants and the Japanese empire, his reference to the idea of “*hakkō ichiu*” implies a deeper connection with Japanese racial/ethnic policy as well. In this way, the recent development of transnational studies of Japanese immigrants in the United States gives us an insight into how to bridge racial/ethnic issues in both empires.

In the meantime, the interconnected issues of migrations, racism, and nationalism associated with the Japanese empire concerned not only Japanese migrants across the Pacific. Instead, the dynamic population movement occurred all over the empire including movements of both settlers/colonizers and the colonized. At first, colonization cannot be achieved without the settlement of colonizers, usually following a military occupation. Furthermore, the development of capitalism produces a flow of migrants as, to borrow the popular Deleuze-Guattarian terminology, the mode of indeterminacy created by “deterritorialization” in relation to their home territory.²⁷ These movements have caused a variety of encounters and conflicts within the Japanese empire and stimulated discussion about racial/ethnic relationships. For example, recent studies examine the racial/ethnic minority population flow in and out of the Japanese empire in relation to the formation of capitalism.²⁸ The study of Japanese settler colonialism and settlers’ relationship with the colonized population also becomes an important topic in studies of the Japanese empire.²⁹

²⁷ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983). The point is that this deterritorialization is immediately followed by “reterritorialization,” but there is a certain degree of contingency involved. Therefore the process of migration often includes carries “hope” with it as well.

²⁸ For example, Ken C. Kawashima, *The Proletarian Gamble: Korean Workers in Interwar Japan* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009); Ichirō Tomiyama, *Ruchaku no shisō: “Okinawa mondai” no keifugaku* (Tokyo: Inpakuto Shuppankai, 2013); There are other works on the history of minority population movements in and out of the Japanese empire, though their approaches are a bit different from that of the abovementioned works,. See Tōru Sugihara, *Ekkyōsuru tami: kindai ōsaka no chōsenjin shi kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Shinkansha, 1998); Andrea A. E Geiger, *Subverting Exclusion: Transpacific Encounters with Race, Caste, and Borders, 1885–1928* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).

²⁹ Jun Uchida, *Brokers of Empire: Japanese Settler Colonialism in Korea, 1876–1945* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center : distributed by Harvard University Press, 2011).

In this way, the issues of migrations and racial/ethnic encounters/conflicts in and out of the Japanese empire are being examined at various sites. With this context in mind, my dissertation also turns its attention to the historical relationship between Japanese transpacific migrations and nation formation and racial/ethnic encounters in the Japanese empire.

Knowledge Production and Christian Leaders

As we have seen, my dissertation's originality lies in its focus at the intersection of a comparative study of racism and a transnational historiography of Japanese migrations. In other words, although my research is related to recent Japanese American transpacific historiography, I emphasize other aspects and thematic concerns. For example, Azuma's *Between Two Empires* has also examined transpacific migrations of Japanese between the two empires, but his main focus is on how those migrants historically formed the *Japanese American identity*. Although my research also touches on this process, I focus more particularly on how both countries' intellectuals and religious leaders tried to respond to migration-related issues and how it contributed to nation formation in both empires. In that sense, I am more interested in how the transpacific migrations stimulated the incorporative discourses of empires, in which those migrants had to form their strategies of identification. Nevertheless, this does not mean that my research ignores migrant practices. Rather, my research also traces Japanese migrant practices and their responses to the incorporating discourses. My study examines in particular both the role of subjectivity in the broader nation formation in the two empires (I call it "imperial nation formation"), and the moment of rupture in such a process of integration. It is at this moment that the examination of racism

and discrimination becomes crucial for my study. Overall, my research demonstrates the significance of migrants' practices in imperial nation formations across the Pacific.

In order to approach these themes, my research examines the history of knowledge production in both countries, particularly the study of race/ethnos and migrations. In the Japanese empire, since its early stage of nation formation in the late nineteenth century, issues of racial/ethnic differences have been an important subject of academic research. For example, one of the earliest modern academic disciplines that contributed to ordering knowledge of racial/ethnic others in Japan around this time is anthropology. For both foreign scholars, so-called *oyatoi gaikokujin* (hired foreigners), and early Japanese anthropologists, the study of racial/ethnic groups such as the Ainu people is fundamental. As many scholars have already clarified, this process of accumulating knowledge of others in the expanding territory of the Japanese empire is also a process of registering, classifying, and hierarchizing various populations as well as simultaneously exploring Japanese identity.³⁰ In my dissertation, with this history of the development of Japanese knowledge production on race/ethnos in mind, I examine the discourses of sociologists from the 1920s through World War II. Sociological discourse on race/ethnos in Japan emerged after those anthropological achievements, but I can still find strong connections with them. The importance of such sociological discourse on race/ethno is not only that it shows the connection with the abovementioned history of the contribution of Japanese knowledge production to colonialism,

³⁰There are several works on this topic. For the representative examples, see, Ichirō Tomiyama, “Kokumin no tanjō to ‘nihon jinshu,’” *shiso*, November 1994, 37–56; Eiji Oguma, *A Genealogy of “Japanese” Self-Images* (Melbourne; Portland, Or.: Trans Pacific Press ; Distributor, International Specialized Book Services, 2002); Tōru Sakano, *Teikoku nihon to jinrui gakusha: 1884–1952* (Tōkyō: Keisō shobō, 2005). For more comprehensive research on anthropology and colonialism around Asia, see Jan van Bremen and Akitoshi Shimizu, eds., *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania* (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 1999).

but also that it reveals a link between Japanese migration issues in the United States and racial/ethnic problems within the Japanese empire.

At the same time, the Japanese transpacific migration also stimulated academic research in the United States. Although the migration from East Asian countries began in the late nineteenth century, around the 1920s American scholars started to engage in the study of Asian migrants. In the United States, research on East Asian immigrants was also initiated by sociologists; sociology was introduced in the late nineteenth century and the study of racial relationships had flourished at the University of Chicago since the early twentieth century. One of the significant aspects of the Chicago sociologists' study of race relations is that their concern is deeply related to the modern transformation of society, or, in short, the phenomenon of modernity. In particular, they were curious about the development of the city, mobility, and new human relationships there.³¹ Therefore, the problem of race relations emerged from concern about the formation of community in modern society.

My research focuses particularly on these Chicago sociologists' discourse on Japanese migrants. As I mentioned, the Chicago sociologists were the first academic researchers who were heavily involved in research on Asian immigrants to the United States.³² In that sense, as Henry Yu argued in his pioneering book on Chicago sociology, it is possible to regard their discourse as an American version of Orientalism. In particular, the

³¹ Regarding the development of Chicago sociology, many scholarly books have been published. Robert E. L. Faris, *Chicago Sociology, 1920-1932* (San Francisco: Chandler Pub. Co., 1967); Martin Bulmer, *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984); Stow Persons, *Ethnic Studies at Chicago, 1905-45* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987). For the relationship between Chicago Sociology and urban sociology, see, James F. Short, *The Social Fabric of the Metropolis: Contributions of the Chicago School of Urban Sociology*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971).

³²The pioneering work that explores the Chicago sociologists' knowledge production on Asian immigrants is, Henry Yu, *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001). The following work also traces the relationship between Chicago sociologists' discourse on Asia and American racial formation. David Palumbo-Liu, *Asian/American Historical Crossings of a Racial Frontier* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1999).

assimilation theory adopted by those sociologists contributed to constructing a dominant framework within which to interpret American racial/ethnic relationships. Interestingly, after they engaged in research on the West Coast, their scholarly exploration of Asian migrants extended to Hawaii. The presence of Japanese migrants in Hawaii and on the American West Coast had attracted the interest of American scholars before and during World War II for security concerns. However, there is also another reason those scholars were interested in Asian immigrants in the United States. They regarded racial contacts across the Pacific and ongoing racial mixing as indicative of the future direction of the development of American society and found in this transpacific encounter the future of the American nation. Therefore, the examination of studies by Chicago sociologists of Japanese migration brings us to the question of nation formation and racial/ethnic issues in the United States.

In this way, my dissertation analyzes both countries' knowledge production in order to reveal the interaction of Japanese transpacific migrations with the development of discourses on race/ethnos and nation. Meanwhile, my transpacific research examines other important actors in migration studies: Christian reformers and activists.

It is well-known that Christian missionaries played an important role in the “Western” enlightenment project all over the world, which was parallel to “Western” colonization, and they initiated various encounters with *the other*. In the United States, Christian leaders played an important role in countering the Japanese exclusion movements. Furthermore, as Yu mentions in his book, Christian missionaries were the core group which organized the early research on Asian immigrants in the United States in the 1920s; for this research Chicago sociologists were mobilized as well.³³ Yu's study shows that Christian missionaries had been at the forefront of this cultural encounter before anthropologists and sociologists

³³ Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, Ch.1.

stepped into their shoes.³⁴ The Asian American historian Gary Okihiro categorized the representative Christian leader around this time, Sidney Gulick, and Chicago sociologists in the same category of “liberals” in his textbook on Asian American history, arguing that those two groups played to some extent a similar role in Asian American history.³⁵

In Japan, although Christianity did not successfully convert many, some Japanese Christian leaders and organizations became important actors in the modern history of Japanese migrations as well as enlightenment and colonization.³⁶ My dissertation focuses in particular on Japanese Christian social reform groups and examines some members’ activity in the first half of the twentieth century from a transpacific perspective. The reason I include the analysis of Japanese Christian activists is that they tell us how their support for Japanese migrations and reform practices within their community in the United States was deeply interconnected with their civilizing mission in East Asia. Furthermore, Christian leaders’ activities in both countries also give us insight into the early twentieth-century relationship between transpacific migrations, race, and nation formation. They complement to some extent my analysis of knowledge production across the Pacific since the 1920s.

Racism, Subjectivity, and Contact

The main theme permeating all chapters of my dissertation is the function of racism in the American and Japanese empires. By exploring the abovementioned developments through comparative/transnational approaches, my research returns again and again to an analysis of

³⁴ For the history of thought on the American foreign mission from the colonial period to the current era, see, William R. Hutchison, *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

³⁵ Gary Y Okihiro, *The Columbia Guide to Asian American History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 207–9.

³⁶ Regarding the relationship between Christianity in Japan and Japanese colonialism, See Sang-jung Kang, “Kirisuto kyo, shokuminchi, kenpō,” *Gendai shiso* 23, no. 10 (October 1995): 62–76.

racism and racial discrimination. My view of the racism present in both empires appropriates the theoretical framework of previous studies. As I have already mentioned, Sakai's and Fujitani's analyses focused on the function of discrimination within inclusive discourses. If I can call it inclusionary racism, my research also targets this function of racism. One important point of dispute in the analysis of this type of racism is the relationship between universality and particularism in the function of nationalism. In my thesis, the function of universalism in imperialist discourses in Japan and the United States is a core issue. In their process of expansion, both empires had to incorporate heterogeneous populations and create the idea of a broader or multi-racial/ethnic nation. In this history of inclusion, universalistic ideas such as equal rights and racial equality played an important role in both countries. Therefore, it is important to clarify the role of universality in order to analyze inclusionary racism.

Regarding this point, as both Sakai and Fujitani mentioned in their texts, the French philosopher Etienne Balibar's analysis is quite useful. According to Balibar, racism is a *supplement* of nationalism.³⁷ Balibar uses this famous Derridian term in order to describe the specific relationship between seemingly contradictory ideas. In terms of this supplementary relationship, racism is an excess of nationalism, but it is indispensable to the constitution of the nation.

Let me explore this point in greater detail, with the help of Balibar's analysis. As a starting point, we have to address why racism, as a variety of discriminatory practices, is particularly linked to the question of the nation. First of all, what is racism? In response to this question, Balibar explains that it is a "genuine mode of thought," which connects not

³⁷ Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (London; New York: Verso, 1991), 54.

only words with objects but also words with images in a specific way. It is related to our mode of thinking. Therefore, racism is not simply a matter of prejudice or blindness to the true reality. This mode of thinking is actualized when we try to understand the phenomena in our social world because racism embodies an “insistent desire for knowledge.” It takes the form of asking and answering questions. For example, why does he/she behave that way? Why is there a certain social antagonism? Racism gives a specific answer to this. That is, “because we are different” and because “difference is the essence of what we are.” This difference is not a singular/individual difference but relies on collective differences. The point is that these differences are differences between “sets of similar individuals.”³⁸

At this point, we have to notice that this mode of thinking is also used to build a community. Racist thinking creates its own community, a racist community, by creating ties among people in a society. Although there are various historical communities in our society, in the modern world where kinship has ceased to be a dominant social structure, nations have replaced this central position. Racist thinking contributes to this formation of national unity. One of the effects of this is what Balibar calls *fictive ethnicity*, which is imagined to belong to all the people of the same nation. Although the modern nation has no ethnic basis (rather, it destroyed many communal ties in the process of its emergence), all modern nations have more or less created this fictive ethnicity. This imaginary community is reproduced by various institutions such as the army and schools.³⁹

Nevertheless, this process of nation building “almost succeeds, but not quite.” According to Balibar, there exists class antagonism here. Class domination and the idea of social equality cause an internal contradiction. The point is that the universalistic idea of

³⁸ Etienne Balibar, *Masses, Classes, Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy before and after Marx* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 200.

³⁹ Balibar and Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class*, 96.

social justice and equality for all the nation's *sons*, the core idea of nationalism, denies class differences. This situation causes displacement and needs the excess/supplement of nationalism, that is, as we have seen, racism.⁴⁰

According to Balibar, this supplemental racism tends to both universalize and particularize nationalism. In the latter case, it presents itself as “super-nationalism,” which induces an excess of purism. It is particularly important here that in this purifying process “true nationals” remain invisible. True nationals are rather inferred by the visibility of “false nationals” such as racial/ethnic minorities, sexual minorities, the mentally ill, etc. Therefore, there is a certain power relationship between these two terms, “true nationals” and “false nationals,” what Balibar calls a “projection mechanism.”⁴¹

Meanwhile, racism as a *supplement* also inscribes nationalism in a broader network as “supranationalism.” This racism, potentially universalistic, emphasizes the “ideal entity” which goes far beyond itself, such as “Indo-European,” “the West,” and “Judaeo-Christian civilization.” This excess of racism is similar to universalist theologies and could give us a hint for understanding the history of imperial expansions justified as a civilizing mission.⁴²

In this way, racism and nationalism have a close relationship. One of the important points to learn from this analysis of racism is the intractable characteristic of universalism. What we have to keep in mind here is the difficulty of finding the essence of universality. As the discussion of supplementarity indicates, “as soon as the universalism ceases to be a mere word” and “becomes an effective system of concepts,” it incorporates its extreme opposite.

⁴⁰ Balibar, *Masses, Classes, Ideas*, 203.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 59–60.

⁴² Balibar and Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class*, 61–2.

Therefore we have to always be cautious about the fact that it never simply does what it says, or says what it does.⁴³

My dissertation examines this function of racism as an important aspect of the process of integration of minorities in the Japanese and American empires. I analyze this process as imperial nation formation and my dissertation covers various historical phenomena. For example, I examine the discourse of “assimilation (*dōka*),” but the understanding of this word varies from author to author. To some it means biological or somatic transformations while to others it implies the changing of customs of minorities into those of majorities. People sometimes regard the formation of the self-disciplined personality as an important component of that process. Meanwhile, the possession of nationality or the demonstration of loyalty is usually regarded as another type of integration or belonging. In this dissertation, I examine these various forms of the integration process as aspects of imperial nation formation. Nevertheless, if I were to pick one common aspect of the discourses or practices of integrations I analyze in this study, that would be the justification of integration by respecting minorities’ culture or their spontaneity (at least on the level of discourse), instead of exterminating or ignoring them.

In regard to this spontaneity in the process of imperial nation formation, I focus in this dissertation on the role of (individual) subjectivity, particularly that of minority members in the empires. As for the importance of subjectivity in minority integration, particularly in the name of universality, this is again explained by Balibar. In his philosophical essay in *Politics and the Other Scene*, Balibar analyzes the concept of universality and articulates the structures of integration in the nation-state.⁴⁴ He calls this mechanism “fictive universality”

⁴³ Balibar, *Masses, Classes, Ideas*, 197.

⁴⁴ Etienne Balibar, *Politics and the Other Scene* (London; New York: Verso, 2002), 146–75.

and overlaps it with the Hegelian construction of political universality. In doing so, he first clarifies the intrinsic relationship between individuality and totality in the formation of the modern nation-state (Balibar calls those two terms *hegemony* or *total ideology* and *autonomous individuality* or *person*, respectively).

The point of this fictive (or Hegelian) universality is that it encompasses various identities and memberships. It means that this mechanism transcends the opposition of holism and individualism but it cannot be reduced to a totalitarian social formation. It is “pluraristic by nature.” Balibar says:

This amounts to saying that ‘total’ ideologies are intrinsically connected with the recognition of the individual as a relatively autonomous entity: not one which is absolutely free from particular identities and memberships, but one which is never reducible to them, which ideally and also practically transcends the limitations and qualifications of particular identities and memberships. This is precisely what should be understood as (fictive) universality.⁴⁵

What he explains here is that in fictive universality individuals are supposed to *be able to* transcend their particular identities or, in other words, this is the condition of individual subjectivity within this mechanism. As Balibar emphasizes, “individualized individuals do not exist by nature.” There should be a process of individuation through the deconstruction of primary identity, whether it is religious, regional, ethnic, or class-based. In this process, the wider community plays the role of a “liberating agency” through which individuals can free themselves from the primarily identified group. This is the mechanism that has been working in the formation of the nation-state.⁴⁶

At this point we should note that Balibar’s explanation of the mechanism of universality may help us articulate the integration of minority members in the modern empire as well. In particular, from the perspective of my study, the main concern is its applicability

⁴⁵ Ibid., 157.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 160.

to the integration of racial/ethnic minorities. It is worth noting that Balibar himself emphasizes the effective role of (fictive) universality in the case of the integration of minority ethnic groups:

Fictive or total universality is effective as a means of integration— it demonstrates its own universality, so to speak—because it leads dominated groups to struggle against discrimination or inequality in the very name of the superior values of the community: the legal and ethical values of the state itself (notably: justice).(…) It is also the case when dominated ethnic groups or religious denominations demand equality in the name of the pluralistic or liberal values which the state officially incorporates in its constitution.⁴⁷

In this way, with the function of universality, the modern nation-state can incorporate ethnic minorities and this same structure can be found in the integration of minority populations in the empires across the Pacific. In other words, this mechanism also explains the logic of the formation of multi-racial/ethnic empires.

Based on Balibar’s way of understanding national integration, my analysis of imperial nation formation will demonstrate how model minority subjects were historically produced in both empires. The issue of the model minority itself has been a quite popular topic for Asian Americans during the post–WWII period, but I find the archetype of the model minority subject at the core of the mechanism of imperial nation formation.⁴⁸ Therefore, this type of subjectivity can also be found in other empires.⁴⁹ In my dissertation, I demonstrate that the discourses and practices of social scientists and Christian leaders in both empires were deeply involved in the promotion of such subject formation.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 161.

⁴⁸ For Asian American model minority discourse, see Keith Osajima, “Asian Americans as the Model Minority : An Analysis of the Popular Press Image in the 1960s and 1980s,” in *Reflections on Shattered Windows: Promises and Prospects for Asian American Studies*, ed. Gary Y Okihiro et al. (Pullman, Wash.: Washington State University Press, 1988); Gary Y Okihiro, *Margins and Mainstreams: Asians in American History and Culture* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994), Ch.5.

⁴⁹ In particular, the case of minority soldiers in empires should become an important topic for the study of model minority subjects. For an interesting attempt at this, see Luke Gibbons, “Guests of the nation : Ireland, immigration, and post-colonial solidarity,” *Traces: A Multilingual Journal of Cultural Theory and Translation* 2 (2001): 79–102.

Meanwhile, my study also pays attention to the role of “contact” in the function of racism. As we have already seen, in the early twentieth century, intellectuals in both countries had to face increasing population movements and the transformation of society/community. With this context in mind, I examine how such intellectuals described and reacted to the racial/ethnic contacts in their own societies. In this dissertation, I use the word “contact” mindful of its various connotations, such as encounter, contagion, bodily affection, and sexual intercourse. In general, close contact on the one hand induces anxiety over the possible threat of a conventional relationship, but on the other hand it is also regarded as an opportunity for the dislocation of related subjects. In that sense, the racial/ethnic contacts I examine in this study are also important battlefields in terms of the formation of multi-racial/ethnic empires. Those contacts are possible sites for both incorporation and antagonism. In my research, I keep focusing on this ambiguous nature of contacts in relation to racism in empires.

Chapter Summary

My dissertation consists of five chapters. My exploration begins with the examination of Japanese Christian activists’ discourses on Japanese migration from the turn of the century toward the 1940s. In the first chapter, “Migrations and the Expansive Formation of the Japanese Nation: The Evolution of Japanese Migration Discourses,” I discuss the Japanese Christian organization *Nihon rikkō kai* (Japanese Striving Association). This organization is famous for its support of Japanese migration to the United States beginning in the late nineteenth century. This chapter focuses on the second leader of this organization, Nagata Shigeshi, but I trace the discourses and activities of his predecessors, too, in order to clarify

Nagata's thought genealogically. This examination demonstrates the characteristic evolution in the discourse on Japanese migration, from the early migration to the United States, followed by that to South America, the South Pacific, and finally to Manchuria. I particularly show the point of intersection between the issues of migrations and those of race/ethnos in their discourses and activities. What is most interesting and has been ignored in previous studies regarding Nagata's and *Nihon rikkō kai*'s activities is the close relationship between this organization's involvement with transpacific migrations and its longstanding concern with East Asian colonies. As a significant link between them, I focus on Nagata's discourse against racism and the support for the universal ideal of racial equality. By exploring this connection, I demonstrate how Japanese discourses on transpacific migrations were deeply related to the Japanese imperial mission in East Asia.

The second chapter, "Imperial Subject Formations across the Pacific: Transpacific Network of Japanese Social Reform and Problem of 'Assimilation,'" extends my analysis of Japanese Christian activities in the first chapter to the social reform practices in the immigrant community on the American West Coast and in the Japanese colonies. I examine those practices particularly in the context of the formation of *respectable* subjects in both empires. In that sense, this chapter shows not only the transpacific range of migrant activities but also the mechanisms of imperial nation formations in both empires. In the chapter I focus on the Japanese Christian reformer, Kobayashi Masasuke, who was a Japanese immigrant in the United States and worked in the Japanese division of the Salvation Army in California. Kobayashi is one of the leaders of the early Japanese immigrant community in the United States and promoted the social reform movement there. My dissertation, however, introduces his close relationship with his home country, the Japanese empire, through the network of

Japanese social reformers, which actually even extended to the Japanese colonies. By examining this transpacific network, I will draw connections between Japanese migrants' reform practices in the United States and in the Japanese colonies. In so doing, I also demonstrate the comparable mechanisms of imperial nation formation in both countries, particularly the relationship between *normalization* and minority subject formation. Overall, this chapter indicates the point of intersection between Japanese and American imperial subject formations.

In the following chapter, "Japanese Immigrants/Americans and American Theory of Racial Contacts: Missionary, Social Scientists, and Question of Loyalty," I move on to the analysis of American intellectual discourses on Japanese migrants and examine how their reactions to Japanese migrations were related to the formation of a broader American nation. In other words, I continue the analysis of previous chapters in a new context, that is, American discourses. This chapter examines in particular the discourses of American missionaries and Chicago sociologists, both of whom were involved in early research on Japanese immigrants in the 1920s and were concerned about racial relationships until World War II. I particularly focus on a Christian missionary, Sidney Gulick, the leader of the Chicago sociologists; Robert Park; and his student and leading figure in research on Japanese immigrants in Hawaii, Andrew Lind. This chapter aims to uncover how those leading figures in the organization of the knowledge of Japanese migrants invented the framework based on which they could explain the integration of those people into the American nation from the 1920s through World War II. In my analysis, I demonstrate that those two groups produced the idea of a new American nation and promoted the formation of model minority subjects

who were loyal to the United States. I also reveal those Americans' affective traces, such as the anxiety and fears underlying their desire for knowledge of migrants.

The fourth chapter, "Transpacific Migrations and the Creation of *Minzoku*: Japanese Sociological Discourse on Racial/Ethnic Contacts," returns to the analysis of Japanese discourses on migrations and race/ethnos in the Japanese empire. This time I focus on knowledge production in Japanese social science. Although many scholars were involved in Japanese race/ethnic studies, I focus on Koyama Eizō because he is one of the few scholars who paid attention to Japanese migration problems and the corresponding American knowledge production. I trace his intellectual activity from around the 1920s and examine how he discussed problems associated with Japanese migration and how these were related to the broader concern of Japanese intellectuals with racial/ethnic problems within the Japanese empire. Importantly, Koyama's work shows us a transpacific link between Japanese race studies and Chicago sociologists' discourses. At the same time, I will also demonstrate that Koyama had developed a theory of a multi-racial/ethnic empire relying on his wartime discourses and activities. His theoretical justification of the Japanese imperial expansion and the mobilization of minority populations confirms a contemporaneous social scientists' engagement in imperial subject formations across the Pacific.

In the final chapter, "Between Nightmare and Daydream: Shibutani Tamotsu and Affective Traces of a Participant Observer," I explore the effect of such minority integration in the empire using the example of Japanese American soldiers in the United States. While the previous chapters focus on the development of imperial nation formation, this final chapter turns our eyes to the problematic of that process and examines the manifestation of its contradiction. In regard to the object, this chapter expands on my analysis of the

discourses of Chicago sociologists in the third chapter and examines the experience of a Japanese American Chicago sociologist, Tamotsu Shibutani, during World War II. As a participant observer, Shibutani experienced the internment of Japanese Americans and life in a Japanese American military unit. This chapter examines his retrospective sociological study of this experience and the violence inherent to the logic behind the emergence of model minority subjects. At the same time, I analyze the same materials Shibutani used in his text and draw out an alternative interpretation, which does not reduce the discourse to a narrative of the formation of a multi-racial/ethnic nation. In the end, while this chapter addresses one of the most intense experiences of imperial nation formation, it also demonstrates the rupture in the process of model minority subject formation.

In this way, my dissertation examines the various aspects of imperial nation formations in Japan and the United States during the first half of the twentieth century. Overall, I demonstrate that both formations were deeply interconnected with the Japanese transpacific migrations and had comparable mechanisms of integration.

Chapter 1

Migrations and the Expansive Formation of the Japanese Nation:

The Evolution of Japanese Migration Discourses

Beginning with the Meiji period, Japanese population movements outside of the country followed the narratives that accompanied the expansion of the Japanese empire. Beyond the development of settler colonialism in Japanese colonies in East Asian countries, Japanese migrations to North American countries were also regarded as a process that would establish a “new Japan (*shin nihon*)” across the Pacific.⁵⁰ In this context, recent studies of Japanese migration to the United States have started focusing on the connection between Japanese transpacific migrations and the Japanese imperial expansion in East Asia. For example, a representative work of this phenomenon, written by historian Eiichirō Azuma, reveals how the experience of Japanese migrants in the United States was later appropriated by Japanese imperialists to support and promote the Japanese colonial migrations to Manchuria in the 1930s.⁵¹

In view of such discussions of the close relationship between transpacific migration and Japanese imperial expansion in East Asia, this chapter introduces another thematic concern: the problem of racial/ethnic relationships in the Japanese empire. Migration and racial/ethnic contacts are popular topics, usually studied jointly, in the study of colonialism, but previous studies of Japanese migrations have not examined how this issue should be situated in the evolution of discourse on Japanese migrations.

⁵⁰ For example, one of the early Japanese socialists described the Japanese immigrant community in the United States at the turn of the century as a new Japan. See Isoo Abe, *Hokubei no shin nihon* (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1905).

⁵¹ Azuma, “Pioneers of Overseas Japanese Development.”

This chapter pursues such an inquiry by examining the discourses and activities of Nagata Shigeshi (1881–1973), the second president of the Japanese Christian organization, *Nihon rikkō kai*. *Nihon rikkō kai* is a private Japanese organization that is known best for its long-time involvement with Japanese migrations to North/South America and Manchuria. Following its creation by its first president Shimanuki Hyōdayū (1866–1913) in 1900, this organization facilitated Japanese migration to the United States by offering education and training to migrants. Although Shimanuki’s commitment to the facilitation of early Japanese migrations to North America is an important topic in the study of Japanese migrations, my study focuses on the later development of this organizations’ activity in order to clarify its relationship with Japanese migrations in East Asian colonies.⁵² In particular, Nagata’s involvement with migration policies and his discourse on migrations provide an illustrative example of the evolution of Japanese discourses on migration. Nagata, who had been a Japanese immigrant in the United States, succeeded Shimanuki in 1913. When Nagata initiated the organization, migration to the United States was restricted by the US government and the organization changed its focus on migrations to South America and later to Manchuria. As this fact suggests, during his presidency, Nagata and *Nihon rikkō kai*’s work reflected the changing trend that had been marking Japanese migrations since the 1920s and marked points of convergence between transpacific Japanese migrations and colonization in East Asia.

⁵² There are many previous studies on the relationship between Shimanuki/*Nihon rikkō kai* and Japanese migrations to North America. Naohiko Okumuta, “Shimanuki hyōdayū no rikkō kyōiku shisō: sono keisei katei to imin jigyo heno tenkai,” in *Hokubei nihonjin kirisutokyō undōshi*, ed. Dōshisha daigaku jinbunkagaku kenkyūjo (Tokyo: PMC shuppan, 1991), 497–549; Kenji Tachikawa, “Meiji kōhanki no tobeinetsu: america no ryūkō,” *Shirin* 69, no. 3 (May 1986): 383–417; Teruko Imai, “Meijiki ni okeru tobei netsu to tobei annaisho oyobi tobei zasshi,” *Journal of Tsuda College*, no. 16 (March 1984): 305–42; Kenji Tachikawa, “Shimanuki hyōdayū to rikkō kai:shinkō, seikō, america,” *Shirin* 72, no. 1 (January 1989): 106–33.

Importantly, in his concern with Japanese migrations, Nagata inevitably faced the issue of racial/ethnic contacts in the Japanese empire. As this chapter later demonstrates, his view of Japan's relationship with colonized populations superseded that of Shimanuki and other early Christian activists. In other words, Nagata to some extent worked in the context of Japanese Christians' longstanding missionary activity in East Asia. At the same time, as I show, the evolution of Japanese migration policies, such as a shift from North America to Manchuria, affected his view of racial/ethnic relationships within the Japanese empire. In that sense, any analysis of Nagata's involvement with racial/ethnic issues should incorporate both historical contexts. By doing so, this chapter traces the development of Nagata's views on racial/ethnic relationships in the Japanese empire from the 1910s through World War II, revealing how a representative discourse on Japanese transpacific migrations crisscrossed the issues involved in imperial nation formations.

Based on these concerns, the first part of this chapter addresses the activity of Nagata's predecessors, Shimanuki and his mentor Oshikawa Masayoshi (1850–1928), another early Japanese Christian activist. I focus in particular on the fact that both engaged in the enlightenment of the Korean people and this attitude toward the colonized population carried over to Nagata's philosophy. This examination reveals a tradition of Japanese Christian activists that dates to the turn of the twentieth century, in the context of which Nagata's work can be situated. I devote the second part of the chapter to analyzing Nagata's early works in the 1910s and 1920s. While it covers Nagata's discourse on Japanese migrations in general, this part focuses on how Nagata's experience as a Japanese immigrant in the United States intersected with the colonial problems of the Japanese empire. The final part of the chapter addresses the later development of his discourses on migrations and

racial/ethnic relationships in the empire. In the 1930s, increased migration into Manchuria directed Nagata's attention to managing the diverse populations within the empire through Japanese migrations. This shift in his view also resonated with the ongoing formation of the East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere.

The Predecessors of Nagata

In 1930 Nagata wrote an article titled "Just follow our masters' footsteps" in *Nihon rikkō kai*'s monthly magazine *Rikkō sekai*.⁵³ In this article, Nagata directed his readers' attention to the forgotten relationship between his organization and Korea. While he admitted that his organization's work had focused on migrations to North and South America for a while, he insisted that his predecessor, Shimanuki, had never forgotten about the situation in Korea. Importantly, Nagata's statement reveals his Japanese Christian predecessors' longstanding commitment to East Asian affairs. In this article, in addition to Shimanuki, Nagata mentioned Oshikawa Masayoshi, a leading early Japanese Christian priest. When Nagata wrote this article, he was involved in building a new village in Korea and he made his ongoing project overlap with the activity of his Christian predecessors in East Asia from the late nineteenth century. What was their original mission and what insight does this genealogy of Japanese Christians' activities give us into Nagata's later practices?

Oshikawa and Shimanuki, the two Japanese Christians mentioned by Nagata, were in a mentoring relationship at Sendai in the late nineteenth century. Shimanuki was born in 1866 to the family of a samurai in Miyagi prefecture and was baptized by Oshikawa in 1886. He studied at the Sendai Divinity School (*Sendai shin gakkō*), which was founded by

⁵³ Shigeshi Nagata, "Zenshi no kokorozashi o okonau nomi," *Rikkō sekai*, no. 306 (June 1930), 4-8.

Oshikawa and the American missionary William Edwin Hoy in 1886.⁵⁴ Thus, Shimanuki was heavily influenced by Oshikawa early on in his career. In the 1890s, Shimanuki started working for relief of the poor and his activities extended to Korea. Shimanuki's interest in Korea, however, was parallel to that of his mentor, Oshikawa, who was active in Korean missionary work.

Oshikawa Masayoshi, one of the early Christian leaders in modern Japan, was born in 1850 in Ehime prefecture. After studying at Kaisei gakkō, one of the predecessors to the University of Tokyo, he moved to Yokohama and studied at Yokohama shūbunkan, an English school. In Yokohama, he studied with American missionaries such as Samuel Robins Brown and James Hamilton Ballagh and became a Christian in 1872.

During this early Meiji period American and European Christian missionaries started working in Japan after the long-time oppression of Christianity there. During the Tokugawa period, the government had banned Christians for more than two centuries. Even the new Meiji government at first tried to carry on this suppressive policy toward Christians in Japan. For example, immediately after the collapse of the Tokugawa regime, there emerged Japanese Christians who had hid their belief during the previous regime, but the new government reacted to them in an oppressive way. In 1868, more than three thousand Catholics were arrested and imprisoned. Regarding the foreign Christian missionaries, they were confined to the treaty ports and were not allowed to work with the Japanese people. However, under pressure from “Western” countries, the Meiji government had to modify its policy. Those arrested Japanese Christians were released within two years and, in the context of Japan's sensitive relationships with foreign countries, the Japanese government lifted the ban on Christianity in 1873.

⁵⁴ Sendai Divinity School is now Tōhoku Gakuin University.

In such a changing environment for Christianity in Japan, there emerged three early representative groups of Japanese Christian converts. One is known as the “Kumamoto band,” which denotes a group of Japanese Christian converts from Kumamoto prefecture in the Kyūshū region. They were students at the Kumamoto Western Learning School (*Kumamoto yōgakkō*) and studied with an American missionary, Leroy Lansing Janes. This group includes such Japanese Christian leaders as Ebina Danjō. Another group is known as the “Sapporo Band,” which includes students at the Sapporo Agricultural School (*Sapporo nōgakkō*) in Hokkaidō. Uchimura Kanzō and Nitobe Inazō are particularly well-known members of this group and they studied with William Smith Clark. The third group is known as the “Yokohama Band” and Oshikawa is included in this group. His colleagues in Yokohama included early Christian leaders such as Uemura Masahisa and Honda Yōitsu.⁵⁵ After he became one of the early Christian converts in Yokohama, he started missionary outreach work in Nīgata in 1876 and, in 1880, he moved to Sendai, where he established a church and Christian school. Oshikawa actively engaged in Christian missionary and educational work there and became the president of Tōhoku Gakuin University, previously the Sendai Divinity School.

However, Oshikawa was not merely a local religious activist and the territorial range of his activity went far beyond the Tōhoku region. He planned to establish a private Christian university in Hokkaidō and organized a group called the Comrades for Education in Hokkaidō (*Hokkaidō dōshikyōikukai*) in the 1880s and 1890s. He also came into the business after he retired as president of the University in 1901 and got involved in oilfield development in Sakhalin. Among the wide range of his activities, what is particularly

⁵⁵ F. G. Notehelfer, *American Samurai: Captain L.L. Janes and Japan* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1985); Irwin Scheiner, *Christian Converts and Social Protest in Meiji Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970).

interesting for my study is his commitment to education outside of Japan. In fact, Oshikawa was one of the first Japanese Christians who actively engaged in the expansion of its missionary activity into East Asia. He was deeply involved around the turn of the century in education in Korea, one of the destinations of future Japanese colonization.

The relationship between Japanese imperialism and Japanese Christianity is itself an important topic in Japanese empire studies. For example, in a recent study of this relationship, Emily Anderson traces the activity of the Japanese Congregational Church (*Nihon kumiai kirisuto kyōkai*) in colonial Korea as an important case study of Japanese Christian involvement with Japanese imperial subject formation.⁵⁶ Anderson's main analysis focuses on the church's activity after the annexation of Korea, such as the work of the newly appointed director of the Japanese Congregational Church in colonial Korea, Watase Tsuneyoshi. However, as she also briefly mentions, Watase and Japanese Christian missionary practice in Korea had already begun before the annexation and Oshikawa took the initiative in this pre-colonization period's penetration of Japanese Christians into Korea beginning in the 1890s.⁵⁷

In regard to the period's historical background, Oshikawa's promotion of early Japanese Christian foreign enterprise in the early 1890s ran in parallel to the emergence of "foreign emigration/colonization (*kaigai shokumin*, 海外殖民)" discourse. In a previous study of this Christian foreign mission, Yun Koncha regards the Japanese leaders' interest in foreign migration/expansion after the first Japanese economic crisis in 1890 as an important

⁵⁶ Emily Anderson, "Christianity in the Japanese Empire: Nationalism, Conscience, and Faith in Meiji and Taisho Japan" (Ph.D. diss, UCLA, 2010), Ch.4; As another recent work on the Japanese imperialism and Christianity, see Yosuke Nirei, "The Ethics of Empire: Protestant Thought, Moral Culture, and Imperialism in Meiji Japan" (Ph.D. diss, University of California, Berkeley, 2004). Nirei's work focuses more on the ideological function of Japanese Christianity during the Meiji period.

⁵⁷ Anderson, "Christianity in the Japanese Empire," 173.

part of the historical context. For example, while the prominent economist Tsuneya Seifuku encouraged movement outside of Japan by publishing *Theory of Foreign Emigration/Colonization (Kaigai shokumin ron)* in 1891, a leading social activist Ōi Kentarō, who had argued for domestic migration to Hokkaidō, organized the Eastern Liberal Party (*Toyō jiyūtō*) in 1892 and planned for expansion into other parts of Asia.⁵⁸ Furthermore, in 1893 the Colonization/Emigration Society (*Shokumin kyōkai*) was established and overseas development started to become an important topic among Japanese leaders.⁵⁹

Oshikawa started to develop his idea of a foreign mission when the Sino-Japanese War increased the momentum toward foreign expansion. Oshikawa regarded the foreign mission by Japanese Christians in the East as an important extension of “Western” Christian missionaries’ earlier activities in Japan. For him, this mission was an “obligation” of Japanese Christians.⁶⁰ With such a motive, in 1894 Oshikawa established the Greater Japan Overseas Education Society (*Dai nihon kaigai kyōiku kai*) with other Christians such as Honda Yōitsu and Iwamoto Yoshiharu. This organization was first called the Foreign Mission Society (*Kaigai dendōkai*), then the Greater Japan Christian Education Society (*Dai nihon kirisutokyōto kyōikukai*), indicating that the organization was first invented as a Christian organization but was later modified in order to fit a broader mission.

In December 1894, in the middle of the Sino-Japanese War, the society publicized the following statement:

The basis of national independence is the independence of national spirit and the basis of national enlightenment is the development of their education. Therefore, unless they gain fast-evolving knowledge of the world, learn the arts of civilization, elucidate morality, embrace the spirit of charity, cultivate a humble and awe-inspiring

⁵⁸ Seifuku Tsuneya, *Kaigai shokuminron* in *Nikkei Imin Shiryōshū*, dai 3-kan (Tokyo: Nihon tosho sentā, 1991).

⁵⁹ Koncha Yun, “Nihon shihonshugi no zenshinkichi to shite no keijō gakudō: nihon no ajia shinshutsu no kiseki o fumaete,” *Kaikyō* 11 (November 1982): 45.

⁶⁰ Eizō Ōtsuka, *Seiyū Oshikawa Masayoshi : denki Oshikawa Masayoshi* (Tokyo: Ōzorasha, 1996), 49.

spirit out of fear of Heaven's will, it is difficult to maintain the true and eternal independence of the country. Now that we try to solidify the true independence of Korea and promote its reform, the expansion of education and cultivation of their spirit is inevitable. The East and the West have different histories and their cultures are different. Each culture has certain developments. Both of them have advantages and disadvantages. Therefore, they realize complete beauty by embracing each other. Now the West learns a lot from the East and vice versa. Isn't it the moment of cultural renovation based on the encounter between the East and the West? For this reason, the mission of the Japanese empire this time is grand and glorious. That is, by synthesizing the Eastern and Western cultures, it has to realize the morality of the world. (. . .) Therefore, we now sympathize with the contemporary situation of Korea and cordially plan their education in order to guide their spirit, cultivate the national power, enlighten their patriotism, and build the basis of truly good and strong national independence.⁶¹

What does this statement tell us about the perspective of this organization? Although this statement subtly shows the traces of the organization's Christian origin in its use of the word "spirit (*shinrei*)," it also gives the appearance of a more general enlightenment project. What is more interesting in this articulation of their mission is their interpretation of contemporaneous world politics and the exceptionalization of the status of the Japanese empire. First, the statement expresses sympathy with the difficult situation in Korea and emphasizes the importance of the enlightenment of the people through education in order to maintain "national independence (*ikkoku dokuritsu*)." The national independence of their own country was one of the most important themes in Japanese enlightenment discourse. For example, when Fukuzawa Yukichi, the representative modern Japanese enlightenment thinker, discussed the value of civilization, he set national independence as a goal of such a discussion.⁶²

At this point, we cannot ignore the fact that this is a critical reflection of the ongoing worldwide politics of great powers. However, once such an argument for the importance of

⁶¹ Tsugio Inaba, *Dainihon kaigai kyōikukai no kyū kankoku ni okeru kyōiku katsudō: shōwa rokuju nen tsukuba daigaku gakunai purojekto kenkyū hōkoku sho* (Sakuramura, Ibaraki, 1986), 1–2.

⁶² Yukichi Fukuzawa, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009).

national independence is extended to the protection of the independence of other countries, it could easily justify the necessity of one country's intervention into another. In fact, while this matter of independence had been utilized by the Japanese government to limit Chinese influence since the Treaty of Ganghwa Island, it helped Japan play a leading role in the name of East Asian security.⁶³ In this sense, the way this group defined the position of the Japanese empire in the international world is crucial. In this statement, they exceptionalized the position of the Japanese empire as a mediator of Eastern and Western cultures and justified the expansion of education to foreign territories as an important mission of a new civilization.⁶⁴

Such a characterization of Japan—which I examine further in later chapters—is called “harmony theory (*chōwa ron*)” and was quite common among Japanese intellectuals around the turn of the century. Based on this theory, Japanese intellectuals argued that Japan lies at the crossroads of the expansion of both Eastern and Western cultures or civilizations and had a special mission to realize a new civilization. This idealistic mission obviously played a role in generating support for the active intervention of Japanese intellectuals into foreign affairs. Nonetheless, it did not mean that Japan was the only country with a special mission as an empire. Rather, empires must all embrace such an ideal in order to promote their national destinies. In the end, the perspective of the founders of this organization shared much in common with their European and American counterparts' justification of their civilizing mission.

This organization had many supporters in political and business circles, such as Konoe Atsumaro, Itō Hirobumi, Ōkuma Shigenobu, and Shibusawa Eiichi. This fact

⁶³ Yun emphasized the popularity of the logic of Asianism as an important context of their missionary activity. Yun, “Nihon shihonshugi no zenshinkichi to shite no keijō gakudō: nihon no ajia shinshutsu no kiseki o fumaete,” 46, 50.

⁶⁴ Michio Kawai, *Bushi no natta kirisutosha Oshikawa Masayoshi kanken* (Tōkyō: Kindai bungeisha, 1991), 76–8.

indicates that the activity of the Overseas Education Society was expected to contribute to ongoing Japanese national policy. The most important achievement of the organization's activity in Korea was the establishment of the Keijō gakudō (Keijō School) in Seoul, a Japanese language school. Around the turn of the century, the establishment of Japanese language schools in Korea had been promoted by Japanese civilians and some Japanese organizations with ambitions to expand into East Asia, such as the Higashi Honganji Buddhist Temple and the East Asia Common Culture Association (*Tōa dōbunkai*). Among them, the Keijō gakudō was regarded as the most representative school. For example, the first Japanese Residents-General of Korea, Itō Hirobumi, stated that Keijō gakudō was the only truly successful enterprise in Korea established by the Japanese.⁶⁵

This school was opened in April 1896 and pursued general education in Japanese. In addition to the study of the Japanese language, the subjects included mathematics, geography, history, and gymnastics. Until it ended its operation when Korea became a protectorate of Japan, this school had educated at least one thousand students. Some graduates continued their studies in Japan and others became businessmen, officials, religious leaders, and educators in Korea.⁶⁶ In this way, this school contributed to the early introduction of modern education in Korea, but what we cannot ignore here is the potential of this attempt to serve as a precursor of Japanese colonialism and its project of colonial subject formation. In fact, this organization's missionary practice overlapped with the ongoing expansion of the Japanese empire which, after victories in the First Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War, officially incorporated Korea in 1910. Importantly, according to Ōtsuka's biography of Oshikawa, this organization's educational enterprise was also supposed to expand into

⁶⁵ Tetsuzō Okada, *Honda Yōichi den : denki Honda Yōichi* (Tokyo: Ōzorasha, 1996), 99.

⁶⁶ Tsuneyoshi Watase, *Chōsen kyōka no kyūmu* (Tokyo: Keiseisha, 1913), 69–70,

China.⁶⁷ This expansion plan was not realized and the Overseas Education Society had to stop managing the Keijō gakudō in 1906 for financial reasons. However, it cannot be denied that the establishment of this school was a cornerstone of the development of modern education in Korea and, as Watase's later contribution to colonial missionary outreach certifies, it laid the groundwork for subject formation in Japanese colonies.

In this way, Oshikawa's social activity showed his strong interest in Asian affairs early on in his career and it paralleled the expansion of the Japanese empire. Nevertheless, his activity cannot be summed up as simple support for Japanese colonial exploitation. In another biographical study of Oshikawa, Fuji Kazuya explains that the philosophy of Oshikawa includes both nationalistic and international aspects and Oshikawa was not simply an exclusive nationalist.⁶⁸ This "international aspect" indicates Oshikawa's concern with the independence of Asian countries in the era of imperialism and it is at this point where his philosophy crisscrosses the currents of Asianism (*ajia shugi*).

Indeed, Oshikawa engaged with many foreign issues other than Korea. It has been noted that, when Emilio Aguinaldo, the leader of the Philippine independence movement, sent Mariano Ponce to Japan to purchase arms in 1899, Oshikawa gave him support. Oshikawa also joined the Manchuria–Mongolia Independence Movement (*manmō dokuritsu undō*) which was initiated by a continental adventurer, Kawashima Naniwa, and the Japanese army. In 1918 he founded the All Asian Association (*Zen ajia kai*) with Ōkawa Shūmei and criticized the Japanese people's neglect of their responsibility for the improvement of Asian societies. In this way, Oshikawa's later activity was no longer limited to a simple Christian

⁶⁷ Ōtsuka, *Seiyū Oshikawa Masayoshi : denki Oshikawa Masayoshi*, 51.

⁶⁸ Kazuya Fuji, *Oshikawa masayoshi: sono nashonarizumu o haikei to shite* (Tokyo: Sanyō shuppansha, 1991), 210.

civilizing mission; instead, he actively intervened in Asian politics with strong antipathy for the politically oppressive situation in Asia.

Oshikawa's Asianistic perspective gives us an important insight when we examine *Nihon rikkō kai*'s transpacific activities. As I show in detail later, Nagata's concern with Asian politics in terms of Japan's potential hegemonic competition with American empire across the Pacific was an extension of Oshikawa's Asianistic view. I now turn to the activity of Shimanuki and *Nihon rikkō kai*. I will demonstrate how their enterprise operated in parallel to Oshikawa's Asianistic project.

After graduating from the Sendai Divinity School in 1891, Shimanuki entered the Department of English and Theology at Tōhoku Gakuin University. Here, Shimanuki created the Tōhoku Salvation Army with his colleagues and started missionary outreach among the poor. Relief for the poor was one of the most important concerns for Shimanuki. His philosophy can be expressed as “spiritual and material salvation (*rei niku kyūsai*)” and he thought that Christianity should be involved in helping people not only spiritually but also economically or materially. That is why he was attracted to the activity of the Salvation Army and created a similar organization. In fact, Shimanuki maintained a close relationship with the Japanese Salvation Army throughout his life. At the turn of the century many Christian activists, as Japanese industrialization led to the emergence of slums and left many in poverty, started committing to social reform and socialism was growing in popularity among young intellectuals.⁶⁹ Shimanuki's philosophy therefore resonated with contemporaneous intellectual currents.

⁶⁹ For an analysis of early Japanese Christian social reform practices (anti-prostitution movement), see Elizabeth Dorn Lublin, *Reforming Japan the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in the Meiji Period* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), Rumi Yasutake, *Transnational Women's Activism: The United States, Japan, and Japanese Immigrant Communities in California, 1859-1920* (New York: New York University Press, 2004); For the relationship between

After graduating from Tōhoku Gakuin University in 1893, Shimanuki moved to Tokyo and started working to salvage “poor students (*kugakusei*).” In this process, he found migration to the United States to be an effective way to solve the problem and established the organization *Nihon rikkō kai*, in 1900, which supported Japanese migration to North America. Such a private organization’s support for Japanese migration in this time period was quite unique and there are many scholarly works on Shimanuki’s support for Japanese migrations across the Pacific. The question these studies leave unanswered, however, is what his relationship was with Asia.

Interestingly, just like his mentor Oshikawa, Shimanuki was also involved in missionary activities in Korea early in his early career. When he was working as a member of the student-based group, the Tōhoku Salvation Army, they traveled around the Tōhoku region preaching the gospel and salvaging the poor. However, their missionary activity was not limited to Tōhoku. They extended this activity during free time into the broader population of the poor all over the country and even to neighboring countries. In this context, Shimanuki traveled to Korea during the summer in 1892 and studied the situation of the poor there.

After he returned from this trip, Shimanuki published an article in the Christian journal, *Fukuin shinpō* (*Gospel News*), in which he demonstrated his view on the significance of mission outreach in Korea:

Our greater Japan is the leader of the East (*tōyō no meishu*), the pioneer of the East, in terms of religion, politics, education, arts, and hundreds of other fields. Japan is superior to other Eastern countries. We are responsible for guiding Eastern countries. We are responsible for inventing the strategy of mission outreach in the East. I have believed for a while that we had a calling to preach the gospel in Eastern countries. This summer I had some spare time, so I immediately traveled to Korea and observed

Christianity and socialism in Japan, see Nobuya Bamba and John F Howes, eds., *Pacifism in Japan: The Christian and Socialist Tradition* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978).

its situation. I stayed in Busan, Incheon, and Keijō. I talked with merchants, peasants, students, noblemen, and bureaucrats and was able to clarify pretty much the contemporary situation of Korea. (. . .) I would appeal to the Japanese young people with a “chivalrous spirit (*gikyōshin*)” in order to move their spirit. I decided to encourage them to travel to the country and engage in mission outreach by becoming the friend and master of this really pitiful nation.⁷⁰

As this quote shows, Shimanuki’s emphasis on Japan as “a leader of the East” and its responsibility for guiding Eastern countries repeats Oshikawa’s Asianistic perspective. In this article, he deplores Korea’s despotic political regime and the lack of a viable educational system. At the same time, Shimanuki points out the decrease in religious influence of Buddhism and Confucianism in Korea and its unstable situation in terms of religious hegemony. In this context, he urged the Japanese people to show their “chivalrous spirit (*gikyōshin*)” to save Koreans. According to Shimanuki, Korea was much like Japan had been thirty years earlier. Therefore, Japan can understand the Koreans’ situation much better than other countries and, he argued, it was a good moment to intervene in Korea in order to improve the society through missionary activity.

Although his proposal for establishing a mission in Korea was not immediately realized, his interest in Eastern missions did not disappear. His graduate thesis at Tōhoku Gakuin University in 1894 is titled “Eastern Mission and the Problem of Poor Relief (*Tōyō dendō to kyūhin mondai*)” and it showed that he kept thinking about the project of foreign missions in Asia. After he moved to Tokyo, in response to Oshikawa’s request, he was also involved in the activity of the Japan Overseas Education Society.

In 1895, when Shimanuki was a Christian priest in Tokyo, he started publishing a Christian journal, *Kyūsei* (Salvation). The first issue of this journal starts with a discussion of

⁷⁰ Hyōdayū Shimanuki, “Yukite chōsen ni dendō seyo,” in *Nikkan kirisutokyō kankeishi shiryō: 1876-1922*, ed. Keiji Ogawa and Myōng-gwan Chi (Tōkyō: Shinkyō shuppansha, 1984), 18.

Japanese Christian mission outreach in the East and shows how important this topic is for Shimanuki. Referring to Oshikawa's activity in the Overseas Education Society, this article discussed the method of mission outreach and its future prospects:

I once thought that the Japanese was a pioneer of Eastern countries. Now that we are totally self-conscious of it, we do not have to explain "why our nation is a pioneer of Eastern countries." Neither do we have to explain "why the Christians in this country have to engage in mission outreach in Eastern countries." What we have to articulate now is the method of it. We have to discuss how we are able to achieve it. (...) We should not become satisfied with the launch of education and mission outreach in Korea. From Kamchatka, Sakhalin, and Vladivostok in the north, to Korea, occupied territory, China, Annam, Burma, and India, we have to organize our mission outreach. The Eastern mission is the responsibility of Japanese Christians. Contemporary Japanese Christians should make the beginning of this project. Now God gave us a great opportunity. Japan won the war against China not simply for the conquest of China, but for the conquest of the East. Japanese expansion just began and this expansion is a good opportunity for the Eastern mission. We have to immediately make a start.⁷¹

As this quote shows, with the publication of this journal, Shimanuki aimed to stimulate the discussion of Japanese Christian missionary work, but the significance of the mission in Asia is already self-evident for him at this point and his main concern is how to achieve it. For Shimanuki, the foreign mission is the de facto practice of Japanese Christians. Importantly, after the victory in the first Sino-Japanese War, he seemed to regard the development of the foreign mission along with Japanese imperial expansion as a quite natural move. As the leaders of the Overseas Education Society looked beyond Korea in their future prospects, Shimanuki also dreamed of Japanese Christians' ambitious mission in the broader area of Asia.

In this way, it is difficult to ignore the close collaboration between those advocating for the Japanese Christian civilizing mission and those advocating for Japanese imperial

⁷¹ "Dendō," *Kyūsei* 1 (1895): 1–2. The author's name of this article was not written, but, since the editor of this journal is Shimanuki, I regard this first article as his statement. Compared with the content of his earlier argument, it is also certain that he wrote this article.

expansion around the turn of the century. At the same time, we should not ignore the fact that this process was also supposed to form a modern subject, which would internalize enlightenment values and the idea of civilizational differences among the audience of this mission outreach. For instance, one of the Korean graduates of the Keijō gakudō, Go Hui-jun (高義駿), who is now known as an early Chinilpa (people friendly to Japan), wrote an essay on volume two of *Kyūsei*. Under the title “Education in Korea,” Ko analyzed the situation in Korea in comparison with that of Japan:

Recently I look around the schools in Tokyo and, when I think about the contemporaneous situation of Korea, I cannot help but crying. Our Korea is an independent country in the East and Japan too. However, I deplore that, while both countries are independent in name, Japan is a respectable civilized country and Korea is a barbarian country being defeated by foreign powers. This is because Koreans have been lazy. Therefore, we have to start studying hard as soon as possible in order to make a great country and not to succumb to foreign countries. That is why I came to Japan and abandoned my household affairs.⁷²

In Ko’s statement, we can see that the civilizational hierarchy between Japan and “Western” powers is reproduced among Asian countries. Ko blames the “barbarian” characteristics of his own country for the laziness of the Korean people and justifies missionary intervention for enlightenment. Thus the Asianistic perspective of Oshikawa and Shimanuki found its collaborative counterpart in Korea. Although the later formation of pro-Japanese subjects in Japanese colonies is a crucial topic for my study of imperial nation formation, we can find the precursor of such a theme already in this early encounter.

As I have mentioned, Shimanuki founded the *Nihon rikkō kai* in 1900 and his work gradually focused on migrations to North America as a solution for poor students. However, even then the organization’s magazine regularly posted articles on East Asia and, as Nagata reflected, Shimanuki seemed to keep his missionary interest in Asia. The point is that, behind

⁷² Hui-jun Go, “Chōsen Dendō,” *Kyūsei* 2 (1895): 16.

Shimanuki's now well-known commitment to migration to America, there also existed long-standing concerns with the other side of the Pacific, the Eastern mission. The significance of this connection between transpacific migrations and intervention in Asia has not been closely examined before. However this relationship helps us articulate the meaning of contemporaneous racial/ethnic issues across the Pacific. In particular, the activities and discourses of the second president of the *Nihon rikkō kai*, Nagata, show us a more clarified and integrated view of this transpacific relationship.

Nagata's Early Discourses

After Shimanuki's death in 1913, it is Nagata who succeeded in the management of *Nihon rikkō kai*. Nagata was born to a peasant family in Suwa county, Nagano prefecture. He entered Waseda University in 1901 but left the school for financial reasons. He joined the Japanese military in 1902 and experienced the Russo-Japanese War in Manchuria. After the war, he first stayed in a frontier settlement in Hokkaido, but moved to Tokyo with the hope of migrating to the United States. It was at this moment that Nagata joined *Nihon rikkō kai* and became a Christian. He migrated to the United States in 1908 and, after performing a variety of jobs around San Francisco, he became an editor of the agricultural magazine *Hokubei nōhō* (*North American Farming*). *Hokubei nōhō* was an official publication of the California Central Farmers' Association (*Kashū chūō nōkai*), which was organized by Japanese farmers in California. When Shimanuki passed away, Nagata was playing an active role in this organization.

Nagata came back to Japan in 1914 in order to take over Shimanuki's role in *Nihon rikkō kai*. Under Nagata's leadership, *Nihon rikkō kai* successfully continued its activity and

expanded its perspectives. In terms of new activities for the organization, he first focused on the education of migrants. In 1915, had he already started to plan the establishment of a “school for migrants (*imin gakkō*).”⁷³ Nagata, having been a Japanese migrant himself, felt keenly the need to educate migrants before they encountered problems in foreign countries. The salient context of Nagata’s particular feeling was the rising tide of Japanese exclusion movements. In particular, when Nagata lived in the United States, the situation of Japanese migrants was becoming considerably more difficult. In 1907, one year before his migration, in response to an exclusion movement on the American West Coast, Japan and the United States entered into a Gentleman’s Agreement under which the Japanese government was supposed to restrict migration to the United States. In 1913, the state of California enacted the Alien Land Law, which denied to aliens who were ineligible for citizenship the right to own or lease land. This affected Japanese farmers in California. When Nagata started his activity in Japan, he was concerned about this difficulty for Japanese migrants.

For Nagata, facing overpopulation and a limited amount of land, overseas development (*kaigai hatten*) was the inevitable key to the future of Japanese society and the solution to the exclusion movement was an urgent task. How, then, did he identify the rationale for the Japanese exclusion movement? According to his article of July 1915, he emphasized the lack of training and education among Japanese migrants. In other words, he found that the problem lay on the Japanese side.⁷⁴ He stated that the Japanese people were not prepared for living together with other racial groups. He focused especially on the existence of differences in languages, customs, and habits between racial groups, which the Japanese could not avoid at their migration destinations. Nagata regarded misunderstandings

⁷³ “Zappo,” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 135 (July 1915): 4.

⁷⁴ Shigeshi Nagata, “Kaigai tokōsha kyōikuron,” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 135 (July 1915): 1.

or miscommunication caused by the lack of preparation for these differences as an important source of the recent exclusion movement. In order to deal with this problem, he proposed building a school for prospective migrants in which the inadequacy of contemporaneous national education would be addressed. In his first proposal, the educational curriculum would include not only languages and foreign affairs but also religion, music, hygiene, history, geography, law, and domestic work.

He enacted his plans very quickly. By September 1915, he had already received support from many people and organizations including the members of the Japan Emigration Association (*Nihon imin kyōkai*). Then, the next year, the Japanese Emigration Association built the school in Yokohama and Nagata became temporary manager of the institution. In addition to this project, in the early years of his leadership at *Nihon rikkō kai*, Nagata also hosted lectures on migrations at his home, Nagano prefecture, which later led to his steadfast support for migrations to South America and Manchuria from this prefecture.

In this way, Nagata's new policy was already being realized in the 1910s. Another important change under his leadership was a shift in destinations for Japanese migration. In the context of the Japanese exclusion movement in the United States, Japanese migration to the United States had decreased and, instead, South America became an important new destination for Japanese migration. Nagata and *Nihon rikkō kai* became involved in this change by establishing the Shinano Overseas Association (*Shinano kaigia kyōkai*) in 1922 and promoting migration to Brazil. *Nihon rikkō kai* particularly supported settlement in a village named Alianca beginning in 1925, a process that had been documented in *Rikkō sekai* as an important example of overseas migrations.

However, Nagata's turned his attention beyond the overseas destinations of Japanese migrations during this time period. Like his predecessors, Nagata also showed strong concern for the colonial population in the Japanese empire, particularly the Korean people. Nagata was quite critical of the Japanese colonial policy in Korea and he showed his indignation when the policy faced a crisis. In April 1919, one month after the March 1st Movement began, Nagata published articles in *Rikkō sekai* in which he expressed his disappointment with the Japanese people's reaction to the Korean resistance movement:

Since the recent emergence of the Korean problem, I have explored the arguments of the people who discussed this topic, in magazines, newspapers, and everything, like a wolf searching for meat. In the end, I cannot help feeling unspeakable disappointment. People say "Koreans are difficult to rule," "Koreans raise a rumpus when the Japanese army withdraws," "if we take an oppressive attitude, they shrank back, and if we become kind to them, they got used to it." With a question of what era is the easiest time for the rule of different ethnic groups, I look back into history and find the case of Poland. Or I find that the world's most experienced country with colonization, Britain, suffers from the problem of Ireland. Thus I learn that the assimilation of ethnic groups always ends in failure. Now thinking about the rule of Korea, I cannot help but sigh.⁷⁵

Sympathizing with the statement of Korean students published in Tokyo, the source of the March 1st Movement, Nagata calls for a reexamination of Japanese colonial policy. Where did he locate the problem of Japanese colonial policy and how did he think it should be changed?

For Nagata, colonial rule can be broadly categorized into three forms. The most brutal form is the policy of conquest (*seifuku seisaku*), which he finds in the early Spanish colonization in America. The second focuses more on building an economy by exploiting the resources of colonies. Referring to the British style of colonial governance, he calls this colonial practice economic policy (*keizai seisaku*). The last form of colonial rule is cultural

⁷⁵ Shigeshi Nagata, "Chōsen to filipin," *Rikkō sekai*, no. 176 (April 1919): 1.

policy (*bunka seisaku*). Such a policy prioritizes winning the hearts and minds of people, through religious missions, educational policies, and social relief and Nagata found the example of this policy in the United States. Among the three, he felt that adopting a cultural policy would be more in keeping with the currents of the time. Behind this evaluation, there lies his concern with the rise of the “self-awareness of nation/ethnicity (*minzokuteki kokuminteki jikaku*)” and his idea that rulers should avoid subverting the self-esteem of colonial subjects.

However, Nagata argued that Japanese colonial policy in Korea had opposed this current of the times. For Nagata, Japan’s annexation of Korea was no doubt a policy of conquest and Japanese governance in Korea under military police was far from a cultural policy. Taking into account this constant presence of state violence, it is quite understandable that for him the Korean people’s frustration had accumulated under Japanese rule and that Japan had failed to win their hearts and minds. In addition to the oppressive arrangement of military violence under Japanese colonial rule, Nagata also criticized the moral ideology of the empire:

The one thing I cannot understand is that “the national morals (*kokumin dōtoku*)” are held in high esteem. What is the meaning of the morals to which only the Japanese people have to conform? I cannot understand it. In an era like today, each civilization is getting close to each other and morality becomes almost identical all over the world. Then, why does only Japan have to praise so-called national morals? In particular, the very narrow ideas of “loyalty and patriotism (*chūkun aikoku*)” and “ancestor worship (*soseu sūhai*)” become obstacles for the advocates for Japanese expansion such as me. If Japan cannot help expanding its territory, it necessarily causes contact (*shokusetsu* 触接) with other ethnic groups or colonization of their territory. In these cases, moral education in the mainland should be also introduced to the colonies. Korea is a good example of this. If we offer moral education based on the ideas of loyalty and patriotism or ancestral worship to Koreans, what will happen? Doesn’t it actually mean that we will teach them “cheer for independence (*dokuritsu banzai*)”? If so, Japanese so-called national morals can be taught only in the mainland, cannot be applicable to colonies. It goes without saying that there must be a kind of exclusive reaction against the national morals. Then, where should we place the principle of

moral education in the colonies? Have the Japanese people ever carefully explored this point and used it for colonial rule in Korea? ⁷⁶

Although behind this analysis we can find the motive for a Christian critique of other nationalized religious doctrines in Japan, Nagata clearly differentiates his perspective from narrowly defined patriotism and emphasizes the importance of the realization of a “new ideal (*shin risou*)” or a “new civilization (*shin bunmei*).”

Instead of the abovementioned Japanese colonial policies, Nagata proposes offering equal education to Koreans and giving them the opportunity to have equal status, not to mention the right to vote. He even suggests allowing self-rule for Korea as a future possibility. In this way, Nagata exhibited a quite liberal view, around this time, of Japanese colonial policy. At the same time, his argument reflected his inherited missionary mentality. He defined one of the fundamental ideas of modern colonialism as the guidance and enlightenment of the native population and did not reflect on the status of colonizers as educators. In his view, the problem of Japanese colonial policy should be solved by better guidance by the Japanese. As I examine later, this missionary attitude is one of the key elements of Nagata’s thought. Meanwhile, his criticism of Japanese colonial policy shows another important aspect of his argument, which is the comparison with the United States.

Based on his own involvement with migration movements to the United States and its presence as the other imperial power across the Pacific, the United States is an important point of reference for Nagata’s discourse. In the same volume from *Rikkō sekai*, Nagata compares Japanese colonial policy in Korea with the American policy in the Philippines.⁷⁷ This comparison was another attempt to reflect on Japanese colonial policy in Korea after the

⁷⁶ Shigeshi Nagata, “Chōen o tōshimitaru nihon no shokuminteki nōryoku,” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 176 (April 1919): 2–3.

⁷⁷ Nagata, “Chōsen to filipin.”

March 1st Movement, but it also indicates that this problem was related to a much bigger concern, that is, how to gain imperial hegemony in Asia.

Nagata's interest in the situation of the Philippines was created by, again, the issue of self-determination. Referring to the fact that Wilson admitted the possibility of future Filipino independence, Nagata shows that Japanese and American colonial policies were at a crossroads. While the former wanted to create one state from two nations, the latter allowed for the formation of the state for one nation. At this point, he did not determine which option was better. He also explains the difference in importance of those colonies to each empire. What interests us here, however, is that he emphasized the existence of spectators to this potential imperial competition:

No matter how different those empires' positionalities or situations are, independence movements in Korea and Philippine are drama (*engeki*) opened to the Chinese, who live in a semi-protectorate, and Indians, who hope for independence from the British empire. Since both of them are in similar situations, they felt much more sympathy with Filipinos and Koreans than Japanese and Americans. Therefore, they are watching both independence movements with strong interest.⁷⁸

For Nagata, the problem of Korea is not simply a matter of Japanese imperial policy. It is rather related to the future of Asia. This drama is enacted by two "candidates (*kōhōsha*)" for the future leader of Asia, Japan and the United States. In this way, Nagata's view of the Japanese colonial problem is conditioned also by his attention to potential transpacific competition with the American empire.

Behind his analysis of imperial competition, there exists both Nagata's critical understanding of European and American imperial policies and his expectation of the growth of the Japanese empire as a more independent power with universal mission. For example, in the same year, Nagata wrote an article on the ongoing assimilation movement among the

⁷⁸ Ibid.

Japanese immigrant community in the United States.⁷⁹ As I explore in detail later, in this article he criticizes Japanese immigrants' obsessive engagement with assimilation as a compromised attitude. Nagata instead problematizes American discrimination as a more fundamental problem. Then, expanding his critique to American and British propaganda, he deplores the isolation of Japan in the international world. Nagata, however, finds hope for the future in the major worldwide trend toward the emergence of counter-powers in the American and European empires. In addition to anti-colonial movements in Egypt and India, he mentions the rise of the anti-Monroe doctrine movement in South America and the problems of Ireland or African Americans. In this way, Nagata recognizes the crisis that European and American empires were facing all over the world. Obviously, his critical statement on ongoing Japanese colonial policies was based on his concern with this global trend.

For Nagata, however, this crisis was in fact an important chance for the Japanese empire to get out of its isolated position in the international world. In fact, Nagata argues that, if Japan “nobly takes the lead with the banner of racial and ethnic equality (*jinshu byōdō*, *minzoku taitō*),” Japan will not be alone.⁸⁰ Nagata implies the possibility that the Japanese empire will become not only one of the great powers in the world but also the leading country with a higher mission in world politics.

His ambitious expectations for the Japanese empire also sharpened his critique of American racism and imperialism. He paid particular attention to other countries or people suffering from American policies, with which he planned to create alliances. For example, when the situation of the Japanese immigrants in the United States was becoming more

⁷⁹ Shigeshi Nagata, “Hidōka ron,” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 182 (November 1919): 1.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

severe in the 1920s, he proposed forming an alliance with Mexico to counter American imperialism.⁸¹ Importantly, Nagata also emphasized that African Americans could become an important partner in Japanese opposition to the United States. Referring to the ongoing segregation and the existence of the Ku Klux Klan, Nagata noted how much antipathy African Americans had toward “White” people.

There was a historical precedent which allowed him to expect that an alliance with African Americans was possible, which was the racial equality clause proposed by the Japanese delegation at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. This proposal, which would require equal treatment of people of color and colonized populations in the countries of the League of Nations, appealed to oppressed people around the world.⁸² For example, Philip Randolph and Chandler Owen, the writers of *The Messenger*, a leading African American magazine at that time, responded to this proposal with enthusiasm.⁸³ Although the proposal was finally rejected by the committee, this event held symbolic significance in the struggle against American racism and imperialism.⁸⁴ Based on these facts, Nagata insisted that the Japanese should also reach out to African Americans in order to counter American imperialism. He affirms, “it is as clear as day (*hi o miruyori akiraka*)” that the “African American people would immediately respond” to the Japanese people’s call for alliance.⁸⁵

The group’s magazine *Rikkō sekai* also reflected Nagata’s interest in African American

⁸¹ Shigeshi Nagata, “Nichiboku kōshu dōmei,” *Rikkō Sekai*, no. 229 (January 1924): 1; Shigeshi Nagata, “Nichiboku kōshu dōmei ron,” *Rikkō Sekai*, no. 234 (June 1924): 2–29.

⁸² Regarding the racial equality proposal of 1919, the following work tries to approach this event from various perspectives. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race, and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London; New York: Routledge, 1998).

⁸³ “Peace Conference,” *The Messenger*, March 1919, 5.

⁸⁴ For an analysis of the connection between Japan and African American politics around this time, see Yuichiro Onishi, “The New Negro of the Pacific: How African Americans Forged Cross-Racial Solidarity with Japan, 1917–1922,” *The Journal of African American History* 92, no. 2 (2007): 191–213. For a broader survey of African American relationships with East Asia, see Gallicchio, *The African American Encounter with Japan and China*.

⁸⁵ Nagata, “Nichiboku kōshu dōmei ron,” 28.

politics in the United States around this time. After the formulation of the Immigration Act of 1924, the magazine published a series of biographical articles profiling American leaders fighting against racism such as Booker T. Washington, Marcus Garvey, and William Lloyd Garrison.⁸⁶

In this way, Nagata's concerns with the problems in the Japanese colonies and the issues of Japanese immigrants in the United States in the 1910s and 1920s were directly connected on the level of international politics, transpacific imperial competition given the worldwide trend toward national self-determination, and anti-colonial movements. At the same time, his experience as an immigrant in the United States also gave him a comparative perspective on ongoing immigration in the Japanese mainland. In his article from 1929, Nagata mentions the story of *hakka* (turning into white, 白化) that he heard from a person in Osaka. *Hakka*, unlike the more popular term *sekika* (turning into red, 赤化), which indicates the rise of communism among the Japanese people, refers to Korean migrations into the Japanese mainland. According to this story, while people in Tokyo were concerned about *sekika*, Osaka suffered from *hakka* at this time. This person in Osaka deplored the miserable situation of Koreans living in the suburbs of Osaka city.

This story, however, reminded Nagata of the similarity between the situations of Japanese migrants in Hawaii and the American mainland and those of Korean migrants. When compared with the American standard of living and wages, the life of Japanese migrants in the United States at that time was quite modest. However, Nagata argued that, for the people living in Japan, the amount of money those migrants sent to their home country

⁸⁶ Don Mizusaki, "Kokudo no kokujuin:būkātē washinguton," *Rikkō sekai* 237 (September, 1924): 32-36, Don Pilot, "Mākasu gābē: kokujuin afrika jiyūkoku no kensetsusha," *Rikkō sekai* 238 (October, 1924): 27-31, Nanmeian shujin "kokujuin kaihō no senkaku roido garrison," *Rikkō sekai* 240 (December, 1924): 10-16.

had undeniable value. Nagata found a similar structure in Korean migration into the Japanese mainland and showed an understanding of the rapid increase in Korean migrations. In the context of the Governor-General of Korea's ongoing enforcement of regulations pertaining to Korean migrations, Nagata instead supported free migrations and insisted that the Japanese should exert a greater effort to nationalize Korean migrants:

I am a proponent of people's free migrations. Therefore, I argue for free overseas migrations of the Korean people as well as Japanese free overseas migrations. In a manner similar to the American effort to nationalize immigrants, the Japanese people have to make a much stronger effort to make Korean migrants in the Japanese mainland a "good Japanese nation (*yoki nihon kokumin*)."⁸⁷ The assimilation (*dōka*) of the Ainu people into the Japanese nation seems to be a special case in the world history of migration/colonization (*ishokumin*). It is a good thing that a different racial group was assimilated peacefully. Therefore, in regard to Korean migration to Japan, while we don't need to encourage it, we should not block it and make much more effort for those migrants.⁸⁷

Nagata's perspective does not reflect on the violent acquisition of the lands of Ainu people or the transformation of the Korean society and economy through Japanese colonization, which conditioned the migrations from Korea. In that sense, his understanding of "peaceful assimilation" looks very optimistic. Nevertheless, what I would like to confirm here is that Nagata had already shown that a vision of a diverse Japanese nation emerged from dynamic population movements inside the empire around this time and he found a possible example of such nation formation in American society.

In this way, Nagata's early discourses on migrations showed both antipathy against the racial discrimination and imperialism of "Western" countries and his missionary gaze on other Asian people. These writings already indicated some of the logics by which the later expansion of the Japanese empire would be justified. In the next part of this chapter, I trace

⁸⁷ Shigeshi Nagata, "Chōsen jin no kaitakusha tachi," *Rikkō sekai*, no. 296 (August 1929): 2–7.

how Nagata's activities and discourses paralleled the later development of the Japanese empire.

Toward the Principle of National Foundation

In the series of events that ran from the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1924 to the Manchurian Incident in 1931, destinations for Japanese migrations had shifted from North America to South America, the South Pacific Sea, and Manchuria. During this time period, Nagata's philosophy and activity had also evolved. In particular, as a leader of *Nihon rikkō kai*, he expanded the organization's activity into East Asia. As I briefly mentioned in the first part of this chapter, when he wrote about his mentors in 1930, he was in the process of building and managing a village in Korea. This village was located in North Hamgyong Province (presently in North Korea, close to the border with China) and *Nihon rikkō kai* established the Nihon rikkō kai Institution of Reclamation Practice in Korea (*Nihon rikkō kai chōsen takushoku renshujo*) there in May 1930. In this institution, *Nihon rikkō kai* offered practical training for reclamation and the members also included young Koreans. It was a test case of Nagata's ideal of "cooperation between Japanese and Koreans (*nissen kyowa*)."⁸⁸ Thus, before the Manchurian Incident, Nagata already started to expand *Nihon rikkō kai*'s activity into East Asia.

After the Manchurian Incident, migrations and colonial settlements into North East China became national concerns in the context of the 1930s farm crisis that was caused by population pressure and economic decline in rural areas. In 1932, the Kwantung Army held a meeting on migrations and planned to promote them. In particular, the Kwantung Army

⁸⁸ Nihon rikkōkai sōritsu hyaku shūnen kinen jigyō jikkō iinkai kinenshi hensan senmon iinkai, ed., *Nihon rikkōkai hyakunen no kōseki : reiniku kyūsai, kaigai hatten undō, kokusai kōken* (Tokyo: Nihon rikkōkai, 1997), 218–9.

Major Tōmiya Kaneo and the agrarianist Katō Kanji played a central role in forming the early Japanese migration groups. In 1933, in order to promote the migrations, the Ministry of Colonial Affairs issued the *Outline of the Migrations to Manchuria* (*Manshū imin yōkō*) and held a Meeting on Migration Projects (*imin jigyō kaigi*). In this context, Nagata was involved in the government's migration policies for Manchuria. He became a non-regular staff member of the Kwantung Army Special Affairs Unit and attended the Meeting on Migration Projects as a committee member. He also traveled to Manchuria at the request of the Ministries of Colonial Affairs and Foreign Affairs.⁸⁹ The construction of the village in Korea was just the beginning of *Nihon rikkō kai*'s activity in East Asia. Nagata established the Rikkō Agricultural Farm in Manchuria (*Manshu rikkō nōen*) in 1934 and the Rikkō Village in Hsinking (*Shinkyō rikkō mura*) in 1938. In this way, Nagata and *Nihon rikkō kai* developed its project in response to changing trends regarding migrations. What, then, was the relationship between this new trend in continental migrations and the earlier transpacific migrations?

Although Nagata's commitment to supporting migrations changed with this change in historical conditions, he referred to previous experiences of Japanese migrations in the United States as representing an important lesson for ongoing migrations. When Nagata visited the United States in 1931, he was already emphasizing that California was the only place where people could learn from all kinds of experiences associated with Japanese overseas migrations involving politics, religion, education, and economics.⁹⁰ In that sense, Nagata argued, the exploration of the historical experiences of those migrants would be a key

⁸⁹ However, it does not necessarily mean that Nagata's idea was welcomed by the Army. *Nihon rikkō kai*'s chronicle instead emphasized the gap between his argument and the Army's. Ibid., 219–20.

⁹⁰ Shigeshi Nagata, "Kashū ni manabu," *Rikkō sekai*, no. 313 (January 1931): 2–7.

to future Japanese overseas development.⁹¹ Various experiences of Japanese migrants were then integrated into the narrative of national development and became important referential sources in the context of which ongoing practices were examined.

To take a good example of this way of learning from experience, when Nagata supported Japanese migrations to Manchuria in the late 1930s, he was inspired by the slogan “Making North Manchuria a California State (*hokuman o kashū ni*),” which was originally created by Matsuoka Yōsuke, the president of the South Manchurian Railway Company at that time and once a Japanese migrant himself in the United States. In response to this slogan, Nagata offered his own interpretation,⁹² expanding on its message by including the case of the Mormons’ settlement in Utah led by Brigham Young. In so doing, he emphasized the importance of religious guidance for such a pioneering mission. He then drew on what he saw as a few comparable issues between the settlements in the American West and Manchuria, such as improvements in transportation, effective water policy, and the rationalization of agriculture. Nagata thought that such aspects were important elements of the success of American settlements in the West and should be considered in Manchuria as well. However, in addition to these issues, Nagata also picked up one more important element to apply to the pioneering settlement, the “mind-set of national foundation (*kenkoku ishiki*).” Nagata emphasizes that, if migrants lack this mind-set, even millions of them cannot contribute to the success of settlements. Why is such a mind-set so important for Nagata? In fact, his emphasis on national foundation that appeared in his later discourse on Japanese

⁹¹ For a previous work that treats the relationship between Nagata’s argument on migration to Manchuria and that of United States, see Yūichi Hasegawa, “Hainichi iminhō to manshū, brazīlu: chiba toyōji to nagata shigeshi no iminron o chūshin ni,” in *Nichibei kiki no kigen to hainichi iminhō*, ed. Kimitada miwa (Tokyo: Ronsōsha, 1997), 43–87. By contrast to Hasegawa’s work, my study covers a much longer time span and analyzes the relationship between migrations and racial/ethnic issues with a stronger focus on his complicated relationship with Japanese colonialism/imperialism.

⁹² Shigeshi Nagata, “Hokuman o kashū ni: sabaku o hanazono ni,” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 381 (September 1936): 2–8.

migrations and was behind his focus on national foundation marked the shift in direction in Japanese migration discourses from the 1930s.

Although the mass migrations from Japan to Manchuria in the late 1930s were well known, the incoming transition of the trend in Japanese migration had already been predicted in Nagata's historical analysis of the ideology of Japanese migration and colonization in 1932. His article entitled "Ideological development of migration and colonization" looked back on the history of Japanese migrations from the Meiji period, and condensed the ideologies behind these migrations into a single developmental narrative.⁹³ In his historical perspective, the experience of Japanese migrants in the United States became an important mediator for the development of ideology.

Nagata categorized ideologies of migration and colonization (*ishokumin no shisō*) into three types depending on the time period. First, there was what he called "migratory labourism (*dekasegi shugi*).” He thought this ideology undergirded the Japanese migrations during the Meiji period. A typical example of this ideology is seen in the phrase “the returner from Hawaii (*hawaii gaeri*).” This word refers to Japanese migrant workers in Hawaii from the beginning of the Meiji period, but its implication is that the higher wages of migrant workers in Hawaii and their return to the poor villages in Japan became a success story and attracted Japanese interest. This story fit into a popular pattern of “making a triumphant journey back home (*kokyō ni nishiki o kazaru*).” The story shows that these migrant workers were not permanent settlers but rather temporary sojourners at overseas work sites. Nagata found this pattern to be dominant not only in Hawaii but also in other places including the US mainland until 1904–5.

⁹³ Shigeshi Nagata, "Ishokumin no shisōteki shinten," *Rikkō sekai*, no. 336 (December 1932): 2–7.

According to Nagata, this ideology turned into “assimilationism (*dōka shugi*)” after the Russo-Japanese War. What matters here is the emergence of strong racial antipathy against Japanese immigrants on the American West Coast as Japan gained ascendancy in international politics after the war. This antipathy against Japanese immigrants is well-known as an example of the effect of the image of the “yellow peril,” a scare tactic that was utilized when the exclusion of Japanese immigrants became a serious issue. What Nagata emphasizes here is the logic of American exclusionists according to which Japanese immigrants are not assimilable into American society. Since this “assimilability” became an important focal point for the exclusion movement, the Japanese immigrant community reacted to this accusation with the promotion of their assimilation into American society. This is what Nagata calls the second ideology of Japanese migrations, assimilationism. This ideology is represented by the immigrants’ promotion of the use of English, adoption of the American lifestyle, and their children’s selection of American citizenship (abandoning their Japanese nationality).

Nagata was quite critical of this ideology. His critique can be broadly divided into two points. The first point is related to the actual consequence of this assimilationist movement in the United States. He emphasized the continuity of American discrimination against Japanese immigrants and the sense of exclusion that their children, born American citizens, should hold in US society. At the same time, he introduces another critique of assimilationism by relying on a civilizational hierarchy. This second critique reflects the geographical expansion of Japanese migrations in the 1920s and 1930s. By mentioning the ongoing Japanese migrations to Brazil, China, and South Pacific, Nagata questioned whether it was necessary for Japanese migrants to assimilate into the society of the “lower cultural

level.” He argued that, unlike the case of migrations to a society of “higher culture” such as the United States, there is no reason to promote assimilationism for recent migrations.

It is at this point that Nagata introduced his important ideology from the 1930s, which he called the “principle of national foundation (*kenkoku shugi*)”:

Since the Meiji period the ideological trend of our migration and colonization has developed from migratory labourism to assimilationism, furthermore now to the principle of national foundation. Japan, in many ways, becomes a world power and, in some ways, takes a step further. Similarly, in terms of migration and colonization, we can see that we become more independent, are in a leadership position, and play a central role in the world. This is what we have to celebrate.⁹⁴

From this quote, we can infer Nagata’s description of Japan as an autonomous and independent subject and its imperial ambition to lead the people through Japanese migrations and colonization. Under this third ideology, the mission of migrants is not limited to maintaining their own identity or improving their lifestyle but is rather related to cultivation and enlightenment of the “native islanders” and colonized population. Although in the philosophy of Nagata and his predecessors the enlightenment of the colonized population had been an important issue, this principle bridges his longstanding concern with the enlightenment of people of “lower culture” and the movement of the Japanese population. At this point, it becomes obvious that Japanese migration is not only a matter of the survival of the homogeneous Japanese nation. It also raises the question of how to live together within a diverse population within its broader imperial territories. In this way, Nagata’s interpretation of the historical development of the ideology of Japanese migrations offers a perspective from which to consider the mission of Japanese migrations in a multi-racial/ethnic empire.

How did Nagata describe the process of migrants’ contact with the colonized population? In his discourse on colonial encounters, there is one typical concern shared by

⁹⁴ Ibid., 7.

the colonizer—the fear of degeneration. In his articles on the education of Japanese migrants, he kept promoting the awareness of the possible degeneration of migrants:

It often happens that indigenous people at migration sites hold inferior customs and habits as well as superior ones. If we leave Japanese migrants who are liberated from their homeland, they tend to immediately *get infected* with those indigenous people's bad customs. Therefore we have to make some effort to lead those migrants to be aware of this point and to learn good habits of indigenous people, instead of bad ones. Since the Japanese people now have to migrate to places where inferior people are living, it is not enough to guide only Japanese migrants. In many cases, it is difficult for Japanese migrants to improve unless other ethnic groups around them are enlightened. Therefore we also have to think about the education of indigenous but inferior ethnic groups.⁹⁵

In this way, migrants were regarded as fragile subjects exposing themselves to possible infection/contagion (*kansen*) at migration sites. From Nagata's perspective, if we let them go, they “tend to degenerate to the level of indigenous people (*dojin no seikatsu ni mukatte teikashiteiku keikō*).” Therefore, first, this matter of degeneration is a problem of the Japanese migrants themselves. It is interesting to see how worried Nagata was about the untamable desire of Japanese migrants. In the same article, he regards the basic motives of migrations as primarily financial and explained that people migrated in order to look for a better life. However, what upset him was that the actual content of such a better life was ambiguous and was understood differently by each person. Some people want money and nice houses and others want delicious food and better lands. Nagata did not find a clear goal in those migrants to which they could discipline themselves for self-improvement. Nagata identified the source of migrant “infection/contagion” in the inferior customs of this undisciplined migrant subjectivity. In this context, he argued that any migration policy is flawed if it does not include the education of those migrants. He calls this “migrant guidance

⁹⁵ Shigeshi Nagata, “Ijyūsha shidō no ichimokuhyō,” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 389 (May 1937): 2–5.

(*ijūsha shidō* or *ijūteki shidō*)” and emphasizes its importance in addition to other aspects of migrations such as transportation, settlement, and the purchase of lands.

In the context of this “migrant guidance,” how was the solution to the problem of ambiguous migrant goals addressed? Nagata did not mention a concrete goal, but he articulated it as “a new ideal of new national foundation (*shinkenkokū no shinrisō*)” when he explained the content of migrant guidance in the case of Japanese migration to Manchuria.⁹⁶ As this phrase implies, what he once called the “principle of national foundation” was closely integrated with his idea of migrant guidance. In the case of Manchuria, the key point of this “new ideal” should be that migrants have to renew both their lifestyle and the style of thinking to which they were accustomed in their home countries. He even calls on them to reconsider the idea of the Japanese spirit (*nihon seishin*) in a narrow sense because what they were expected to create was a “more advanced Manchurian spirit.”

In this way, Nagata presented this new ideal of national foundation as a key element of migrant guidance that would contribute to regulating migrants’ ambiguous desires. Under this ideal, migrants who come in contact with indigenous populations would be expected to draw out a better result based on the type of encounter they had. On the one hand, he urged migrants to assimilate an inferior indigenous population into a high-grade Japanese culture. On the other hand, in case the population has a superior nature, Nagata promoted the assimilation of migrants into the host culture. Therefore, for Nagata, assimilation should be an interactive process, unless it causes degradation of the migrants.

Such a flexible view of assimilation can be found in Nagata’s discussion of mixed-race populations. Nagata and *Nihon rikkō kai* were also involved in Japanese migration to the colonies in the South Pacific in the 1930s and 40s and, among other things, what was at issue

⁹⁶ Shigeshi Nagata, “Ijūsha no shidō ni tsuite,” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 366 (June 1935): 2–7.

in this migration were the rights and wrongs of race mixing. Because of the fear of the possible degradation of Japanese migrants in the South Pacific, there emerged a discourse that insisted on the preservation of the pure blood of the Japanese *minzoku* (race/ethno/nation). Nagata presented an alternative view by emphasizing the longstanding history of the adjustment and amalgamation of the Japanese *minzoku*.⁹⁷ By referring to the historical movement of the Japanese people and amalgamation in that process, he concluded that the Japanese had not degraded their culture. Instead of opposing interracial contacts and Japanese migrations to the South Pacific, he instead regarded them as providing important opportunities for the Japanese to “become a greater nation (*sarani idainaru minzoku to naru*).”

As Nagata mentioned the prospect of the Great East Asia War in relation to this issue of amalgamation in the South Pacific, his discussion of racial contacts resonated deeply with the ongoing ideology of the Japanese empire.⁹⁸ In response to the call for the establishment of a “new order (*shin chitsujo*)” by the government, Nagata took the slogan of the Japanese empire “*hakkō ichiu*” seriously.⁹⁹ He interpreted this slogan as a “Japanization of the different ethnic/racial groups (*iminzoku no nihonka*).” However, as we saw regarding Nagata’s earlier discussion of assimilation, Japanization was not simply a one-way process of imposing Japanese cultural habits on a subject population. He explained that the Japanese spirit was not a static, frozen, or solidified one. Rather it should incorporate other groups’ strengths and eliminate its own weaknesses. Nagata also called this process the

⁹⁷ Shigeshi Nagata, “Nanpō shin kenkoku no katei,” *Rikkō sekai* 455 (February, 1943): 2-6.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁹⁹ Shigeshi Nagata, “Tōakyōeiken yōin no rensei,” *Rikkō sekai* 448 (July, 1942): 2-8.

“globalization of the Japanese *minzoku* (*nihon minzoku no sekaika*).” Therefore, for Nagata, the Japanese spirit was matter of not of ancient tradition but of the “future.”¹⁰⁰

From Nagata’s perspective on the interactive process of Japanese nation formation, Japanese migrations could offer a great contribution to the Japanese empire. In the face of an urgent need for the establishment of a co-prosperity sphere, Nagata discussed the “guidance of other ethnic/racial groups (*iminzoku shidō*)” and found a weakness in Japanese guidance in the lack of experience living together with foreigners.¹⁰¹ He insisted that the Japanese should live and eat together with other *minzoku*, wear similar clothes, and speak their languages. Such a deep engagement with others’ lifestyle was regarded as an important means of winning their hearts and minds. In this way, Japanese migrants were to be important agents for the expansion of the Japanese nation.

Nagata’s view of assimilation and diverse nation formation seemed to cohere completely with the development of Japanese imperial ideology in the 1930s. However, this does not necessarily mean that Nagata drastically changed his argument in response to contemporaneous political ideology. We can rather find the reflection and development of his longtime concern and old perspective there. In particular, the Asianistic definition of Japan as the leader of Asia and the ideal of racial equality kept inspiring his interpretation of racial/ethnic relationships around the Japanese empire.

For example, at the beginning of World War II, Nagata published books on Japanese migrants in East Asia, *Cultivation of Mengjiang and Migration to China* (*Mōkyō konshoku to taishi imin*) in 1939, and the United States, *Talking with the Japanese Brethren in the United States* (*Zaibei dohō to kataru*) in 1940. In those works, Nagata demonstrated that he had held

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 8.

¹⁰¹ Shigeshi Nagata, “Kokumin reisei no mondai,” *Rikkō sekai* 451 (October, 1942): 4-10.

the abovementioned views. In *Cultivation of Mengjiang and Migration to China*, he explained that the quest for peace in the East was the reason for the ongoing Second Sino-Japanese War. According to him, the annexation of Korea and the war against China were justified in order to pursue the peace and security of the East.

It is not difficult to find an extension of Asianistic logic in his explanation. In offering this justification, Nagata ignored the violent colonization of Korea and emphasized the overall view (*daijō teki tachiba*) to explain the reason for the annexation.¹⁰² At the same time, he advocated the abolition of racial discrimination as a worldwide mission of the Japanese empire. He complained that, while the “Western” countries superficially chant ideas of justice and benevolence, they actually take an unrighteous attitude into international relationships. In this context, he expected Japan to eliminate unrighteousness and pursue its sacred mission. He particularly criticized the Nordic European theory of racial superiority. According to his analysis, while European people are fascinated with this theory of superiority, “yellow” and “black” people have internalized this view and underestimate themselves. However, Nagata claimed that, as part of its worldwide mission, the Japanese nation would change this situation and achieve humanistic equality.¹⁰³ In this way, the ideal of racial equality becomes the mission which exceptionalizes the status of the Japanese empire.

Such a perspective is repeatedly demonstrated in alternative form in *Talking with the Japanese Brethren in the United States*. In this text, which gives advice to Japanese immigrants in the United States, Nagata explains the special characteristic of the Japanese nation (*minzoku*). Interestingly, at this point, the ideal of racial equality turned into one of the

¹⁰² Shigeshi Nagata, *Mōkyō konshoku to taishi imin* (Tokyo: Fuzanbō, 1939), 6.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 2–3.

essential components of the Japanese nation. In this book, Nagata describes the formation of the Japanese nation as a history of the assimilation of diverse racial/ethnic groups. Although he admits that there emerged certain inequalities and complaints in that process of assimilation, he insists that he could not find intense discrimination in Japan. He even defines the Japanese as “people who do not know the existence of discrimination (*sabetsu no sonzai o shiranai kokumin*).”¹⁰⁴ Nagata traces the spirit of racial equality as a special characteristic of the Japanese nation to ancient Japanese history. In particular, he draws on historical examples of Japanese rulers’ benevolent treatment of local tribes and other racial/ethnic groups.¹⁰⁵ Thus he finds that the idea of racial equality not only informs a future ideal to be realized but also is the cultivated characteristic of his own nation.

In this way, Nagata’s perspective in the 1930s succeeded his earlier thought, perhaps even reflecting his predecessors’ ideas. During the war, Nagata had supported the Japanese expansion based on the abovementioned logics. At a later stage of the war, Nagata kept urging the Japanese to devote themselves seriously to the guidance/salvation of various racial/ethnic groups and even deplored the lack of such sacrificial persons in the colonies and encouraged more Japanese migrations.¹⁰⁶ After the war, Nagata continued to engage in Japanese migration, but his strong concern with colonized populations disappeared. His ambitious prospect for a future Japanese nation along with the migrants’ contacts became one of the forgotten imperial projects in postwar discourse.

Conclusion

¹⁰⁴ Shigeshi Nagata, *Zaibei dōhō to kataru* (Tokyo: Nhon rikkōkai, 1940), 5.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 17–8.

¹⁰⁶ Shigeshi Nagata, “Iminzoku no kyusai ni teishin suru mono,” *Rikkō sekai* 470 (May, 1944):3.

Nagata's discourse and activity provide us with an characteristic intellectual reaction to the shift in Japanese migration during the first half of the twentieth century, from the movement toward American continents to later mass migration to Japan's colonies. What Nagata's activity particularly shows us is that the discussion of migration addressed the expansion of the Japanese nation and racial/ethnic contacts caused by migrants' movements. In other words, intellectuals and activists who were involved in migration issues had to think about relationships with other racial/ethnic groups and the future form of the Japanese nation. In terms of these issues, we can find the point of convergence between the Japanese missionary perspective toward Asia and the critique of racism and imperialism of American and European powers.

In particular, Nagata, who himself was once a Japanese migrant in the United States, noticed that racial/ethnic issues in East Asia and Japanese colonies were directly related to racial issues in the American empire. This is why he was able to articulate the transpacific relationship of the Japanese and American empires as a drama of competition played out in front of colonized populations all over the world. As his racial equality proposal at the Paris Peace Conference also indicates, the countercurrent movement toward the world powers' racism and imperialism was an important mediating factor in the development of Nagata's thought. In that sense, his later discourse on the Japanese nation in the context of the government's promotion of the idea of the East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere had already been subjected to critical reflection on international politics.

At this point, we also discover how Nagata's Christian predecessors' perspective was superseded by Nagata. In particular, their involvement with the "enlightenment" project in Korea and a sense of mission about Asian liberation, well represented by Oshikawa's

Asianism, formed an undercurrent of Nagata's activity. In a sense, he developed his predecessors' perspective with his own experience of transpacific migrations and long-time engagement in migrant support.

In this way, the analysis of Nagata's work clarifies the connection between the Japanese migrations and Japanese imperial nation formation and, moreover, expands our interpretive framework to a transpacific scale. In the next chapter, I trace the activity of Japanese Christian migrant reformers and examine how imperial nation formations across the Pacific were linked through migrant reformers' activity.

Chapter 2

Imperial Subject Formations across the Pacific:

Transpacific Network of Japanese Social Reform and Problem of “Assimilation”

In early twentieth century Japan, Christian social reformers were important actors in the regulation and discipline of society. In his study of modern Japanese social policy, historian Sheldon Garon emphasized the significant role played by middle-class Japanese Christians in the development of a governmental program of social management in modern Japan. For example, the Japanese Home Ministry, in order to utilize their knowledge and experience in social work, had since 1900 hired a number of prominent Christians, such as Tomeoka Kōsuke, an influential Protestant social reformer, Namae Takayuki, and Yamamuro Gunpei, a leader of the Japanese Salvation Army, to assist the Ministry’s efforts. Garon situates such collaboration between the state and private groups or practitioners within a larger process through which the mobilization of the Japanese nation played out during World War II.¹⁰⁷

Garon’s study shows us that the Japanese Christian social reformers had historically played an important role in the social disciplining of the Japanese nation and in the Japanese population’s active participation in state policies. However, his study of Christian social reformers focused on a limited range of their activities. In fact, the Japanese Christian reformers were active in the Japanese colonies and migrant communities in the foreign countries as well. In those places, they also became an important mediator of state policies or nationalist ideologies. When we consider the actual broad territorial range of those

¹⁰⁷ Sheldon M Garon, *Molding Japanese Minds: The State in Everyday Life* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997).

reformers' activities during the first half of the twentieth century, there remain many unexamined locations to explore historically.

In the previous chapter, I examined how Japanese Christian activists were deeply involved in supporting the Japanese migrations to both sides of the Pacific, particularly the United States and East Asia. Now I further develop this transpacific inquiry by turning my attention to the social reformers' activities. That is, I examine how the history of the Japanese Christian social reformers crisscrossed the Japanese transpacific migrations, including both to the United States and East Asia, particularly colonial Korea. Actually, recent studies have begun demonstrating that such reform practices were transnationally extended into the colonies and foreign countries.¹⁰⁸ They also show us that this extension of social management was somehow related to the Japanese imperial domination of the migrants and colonized populations. However, unlike the authors of previous studies, I focus on these transpacific reformers' practices in order to shed new light on the comparative study of empires on opposite sides of the Pacific. Through my study, I clarify how the transpacific activities of social reformers contributed to the production of imperial subjects of both empires (that is, not only of the Japanese empire, but also of the American empire), particularly model minority subjects. Social reform movements and practices are important historical sites for the production of such subjects.

In this chapter I focus on two separate sites where Japanese social reformers played an important role: the community of Japanese migrants in the American West, where

¹⁰⁸ There are many recent works examining transnational works of Japanese Christian social reformers. See Dawley Evan, "Strengthening and Expanding Japan through Social Work in Colonial Taiwan," in *Tumultuous Decade: Empire, Society, and Diplomacy in 1930s Japan*, ed. Masato Kimura and Toshihiro Minohara (Toronto ; Buffalo ; London: University of Toronto Press, 2013); Kazuhiro Oharazeki, "Anti-Prostitution Campaigns in Japan and the American West, 1890–1920," *Pacific Historical Review* 82, no. 2 (2013): 175–214; Anderson, "Christianity in the Japanese Empire"; Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

community elites worried about the respectability of the Japanese nation, and the colonies of the Japanese empire in Asia. Recent scholarship has begun examining the transnational role of social reformers at those sites, but we know very little about how the social reform activities in the American West and the Asian colonies were related.¹⁰⁹ However, the social reform of Japanese immigrants undertaken by Japanese reformers in these foreign locations was not only quite comparable to a tool for the mobilization of populations colonized by the Japanese, but also linked them transnationally. This chapter demonstrates these links.

This chapter therefore focuses on the activity of a Japanese immigrant Christian social reformer, Kobayashi Masasuke (1883–1940), and the activities of his fellow reformers in Korea. Kobayashi was a leader of the Japanese Division of the Salvation Army in San Francisco in the 1920s and 1930s. Not only had he worked on the American West Coast but he was also connected to the network of social reformers within the larger Japanese Empire from the early twentieth century to the 1930s. Also, his theory of harmony between the Eastern and Western civilizations indicated the potential affinity of his argument with Japanese imperial expansion.

Through an analysis of Kobayashi's activity and writings and the writings of his fellow reformers in the Japanese colonies, this chapter examines, first, how social reform practices in the American West and the Japanese colonies were deeply related to the question of the integration of minority members in each country, especially that of Japanese immigrants into US society and that of colonized populations into the Japanese empire. In order to clarify this issue of minority integration, I examine the production of a particular mode of subjectivity in their social reform activity. Such subject formation in the context of

¹⁰⁹ For another study of transnational Japanese social reform activities in colonial Korea, see Uchida, *Brokers of Empire*.

social reform is strongly promoted and articulated in the discussion of “assimilation” in both cases. Although the word “assimilation” indicates phenomena that vary depending on the speaker or the historical context, this chapter demonstrates in the end the close relationship between subject formation and the social reform practices, particularly through *normalization*. In that sense, these social reform practices contributed to the integration of minorities as imperial subject formations in both countries.

In regard to this mechanism of integration, the French philosopher Etienne Balibar offers a theoretical foundation. As I mentioned in the introduction, his philosophical essay in *Politics and the Other Scene* analyzes the concept of universality and subjectivity. In the same essay, however, he also articulates the normative structures of the nation-state.¹¹⁰ To review his logic briefly, the essay explains the mechanism of universality in the nation-state, particularly its way of encompassing various identities and memberships, by focusing on the relationship between individuality and totality (what he calls *hegemony* or *total ideology* and *autonomous individuality* or the *person*). Balibar emphasizes that, in this mechanism, there should be a process of individuation through the deconstruction of a primary identity with the help of the wider community playing the role of “liberating agency.” He explains why individual subjectivity is crucial for the process of integration. As I have already argued, this logic is very useful for explaining the mechanism of minority integration in an empire.

Now we can return to the issue of this chapter, that is, the relationship between social reform practices and subject formation in empires. In Balibar’s theoretical analysis of integration, the role of subjectivity is crucial. As he shows us, the individual subjectivity’s deconstruction of primary identity is the necessary moment in this integration process. However, we have to examine here what type of subjectivity this is. It is exactly at this point

¹¹⁰ Balibar, *Politics and the Other Scene*, 146–75.

that *normality* comes into play. *Hegemony* or *total ideology* requires a *normal* subject. This normality may include mental health, a dominant sexual pattern, and legal and moral behavior. According to Balibar, such normality is “the standard price to be paid for the universalistic liberation of the individual from the immediate subjection to primary communities.”¹¹¹ From this theoretical perspective, it is understandable that social reform practices, which often involve self-reform, represent an important site for the production of imperial subjects. Tracing the activity of Christian social reformers in relation to minorities in both empires, I reveal the comparative mechanism of minority integration in both countries.

Second, this chapter shows how those seemingly independent social reform practices were linked through transpacific networks of Japanese (Christian) social reformers, particularly networks involving the American West Coast and colonial Korea. While the chapter takes into account recent comparative approaches in the study of empires across the Pacific, I trace the neglected links between these disparate elements of integration.¹¹² In the end, my particular angle of analysis contributes to understanding the complicated position of migrant reformers across the two empires, elucidating the effects of these often obscured relationships.

Early Social Reform on the American West Coast

Following the invention of the modern Japanese nation-state, the flow of migrants and their contacts with heterogeneous populations provided an opportunity for the ruling elites of the country to reflect on their own national image in the broader world. In the case of migrants to

¹¹¹ Ibid., 162.

¹¹² For recent comparative work on racism between the Japanese empire and the American empire, see Fujitani, *Race for Empire*; Sakai, “Two Negations.”

the United States, the Japanese government had already taken a series of regulatory measures during the late nineteenth century. The motivation behind this effort by the Japanese government was the anti-Japanese climate on the American West Coast which was then taking shape, a climate that emphasized what was seen as a rapid influx of “prostitutes” or “lower class” people from Japan. Beginning with the Emigrant Protection Ordinance (*Imin hogokisoku*) in 1894, this process of Japanese governmental regulation of migrants led in 1908 to separate passport categories: “migrant (*imin*)” and “non-migrant (*hi-imin*).” The “migrant” category was created in order to differentiate people such as students, merchants, and professionals from laborers (categorized as *imin*) and to restrict the emigration of the latter.¹¹³ This governmental effort provides an example of how the image of a nation seeking international respect is constantly haunted by the prospect of losing its good reputation in the process of nation formation.

Yet, in terms of managing the emigration of “undesirable” Japanese migrant populations, the government was not the only faction interested in repairing their bad reputation at that time. For example, when the rapid increase in the worldwide flow of female prostitutes, the so-called *karayuki san*, became an issue after the Russo-Japanese War, Japanese Christian social reformers began to actively intervene to solve this problem.¹¹⁴ Christian socialism and Christian social reform in particular began flourishing in Japan around the turn of the century and the reformers directed their attention overseas as well.¹¹⁵ For example, famous early Christian activists such as Shimada Saburō, a journalist and politician, Abe Isoo, a Christian socialist, Ymamoto Gunpei, and Yajima Kajiko, the

¹¹³ Mitziko Sawada, *Tokyo Life, New York Dreams: Urban Japanese Visions of America, 1890–1924* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 41–56.

¹¹⁴ Tamio Takemura, *Haishō undō* (Tokyo: Chūō kouron sha, 1982), 25–39.

¹¹⁵ Kyūichi Yoshida, *Nihon shakai jigyo no rekishi, revised edition* (Tokyo: Keiso shobō, 1994), Ch.8.

founder of the Japanese chapter of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, had committed to the anti-prostitution movement and founded *Kakusei kai* (The Purity Society) in 1911. What concerned them at the time was the rapid spread of *karayuki san* into the Chinese continent after the Russo-Japanese War. Shimada and Abe visited Dairen in 1908 in order to check on the situation of the prostitutes and Yamamuro even established a Salvation Army's Women's Home there and helped prostitutes who tried to escape the brothels. In *Kakusei* (The Purity), the monthly magazine of *Kakusei kai*, one can also find many reports on Japanese prostitutes across the Pacific. Christian reformers filed reports not only on prostitutes in Manchuria and Korea, but also on those in Singapore, Hawaii, and the North American West Coast. Shimanuki Hyōdayū, whose works I examined in the previous chapter, also wrote a report on the existence of Japanese prostitutes in the United States.¹¹⁶

Even as the respectability of the migrant population drew the attention of government and social reformers in Japan at the turn of the century, immigrant leadership arose simultaneously from within the ranks of the Japanese immigrant community in the United States and began organizing for moral reform. As Eiichiro Azuma has described in considerable detail, between the 1890s and 1910s Japanese officials and immigrant leaders in America sought to collaborate, which Azuma termed “the transnational elite partnership,” in order to produce self-governing imperial subjects. The bad reputation of “undesirable” Japanese immigrants had already concerned the Japanese consul in the United States as early as the 1890s. In addition, an aggressive response from the immigrant community emerged in the 1900s. What triggered this movement was a San Francisco city official's decision to issue a compulsory inoculation of the Japanese when the first victim of bubonic plague was found

¹¹⁶For example, see, Hyōdayū Shimanuki, “Beikoku ni okeru shūgyō to fūki,” *Kakusei* 1 (1911): 54–57; Hiromichi Kozaki, “Kaigai shūgyōfu no sanjyou,” *Kakusei* 1 (1911): 51–54.

in Chinatown in 1900. Along with the fear of “Sinification (identification with ongoing stereotypical images of ‘uncivilized’ Chinese immigrants),” Japanese immigrant leaders organized the Japanese Deliberative Council in America. The purpose of this institution was “to expand the rights of imperial subjects in America and to maintain the Japanese national image.”¹¹⁷ During the negotiation of the Gentlemen’s Agreement of 1907–8 between Japan and the United States, this group faced serious discord among community members and lost influence. Then, after its disintegration, the Japanese Association of America, having a much closer connection with the Japanese government, was formed in 1908.¹¹⁸ Supported by the Japanese government, this group started the first statewide moral reform campaign in 1911, focusing especially on Chinese gambling.

Kobayashi Masasuke moved to the United States just as this turn to moral reform appeared most urgent among immigrant communities. Kobayashi, a son of a samurai-turned-politician in Yamaguchi prefecture, left to pursue his studies in San Francisco in 1902 at the age of twenty.¹¹⁹ Kobayashi did not stay in California long, but started working at a bank branch in Ogden, Utah. During his time, he was baptized and became a Christian. He also graduated from Westminster College in Ogden. While in school, he established a YMCA for Japanese students in the area. After marrying a Japanese woman named Tokuko, Kobayashi returned to California and worked as a pastor in Salinas beginning in 1909.

After working in Salinas, Kobayashi was introduced to the Interdenominational Japanese Evangelistic Board (*Dendō dan*) by Ōkubo Shinjirō, one of its leading members. This group was a Japanese Christian organization that had developed out of the Japanese

¹¹⁷ Azuma, *Between Two Empires*, 35-60.

¹¹⁸ Ichioka, *The Issei*, 156–64.

¹¹⁹ Buho Yamamuro, *Zaibei dōhō no senkaku Kobayashi Masasuke den: Kyūseigun zaibei nihonjinbu no katsudō* (Tokyo: Yamamuro gunpei senshū kankōkai, 1963), 10-15. This biography was written by Yamamuro Buho based on Kobayashi’s diaries. The diaries had been stored at Oberlin University in Tokyo, but they are now missing.

Interdenominational Temperance Organization in 1911 in response to a call for the moral reform of Japanese immigrants. The purpose of the board was to evangelize the Japanese immigrants who were suffering in the United States and to demonstrate their “assimilability” by eliminating heavy drinking, gambling, and prostitution.

In the 1910s, along with the rapid increase of farming and the spread of Japanese immigrants into many local areas, the Japanese Christian churches started to engage aggressively in local mission outreach and succeeded in affiliating many immigrants with the churches. These Christians started to play an important role in Japanese immigrant communities. In that sense, this Christian organization developed in parallel with the community’s effort to invent representative institutions such as the Japanese Association of America. In fact, the committee of the Evangelistic Board passed a resolution that clarified its support for the Japanese Association of America’s activity: “this organization would give full support for the anti-gambling movement of the Japanese Association of America and other groups, and try to achieve its success together. On the other hand, we promote the reform of our brethren’s social situation and, by doing it, try to solve the problem fundamentally.”¹²⁰ In 1912, Kobayashi was voted in as Secretary General (*sennin kanji*) of this board, and started to work as a central member. He also became an editor of the organization’s journal *Shintenchi* (New World).

In order to pursue the mission of moral reform, in addition to its traditional mission, the Japanese immigrant community began inviting famous Japanese Christians from Japan to join them. For example, the Japanese Association of America invited a well-known Christian leader, Ebina Danjō in 1915. The Evangelistic Board also decided to invite prominent

¹²⁰ *Shintenchi*, March 1, 1912.

Japanese Christians to join the cause.¹²¹ The board invited to the United States a rising star in Japanese Christianity, Yamamuro Gunpei of the Japanese Salvation Army. At this time, the Japanese Salvation Army was becoming one of the most active Christian groups committed to social reform. In the 1920s, under Yamamuro's leadership, the Japanese Salvation Army spread through 110 so-called "corps" from Hokkaidō in the north to Kyūshū in the South to Tokyo in the east, and over to Manchuria. In addition to these corps, the Salvation Army employed over two hundred seventy Japanese officers and cadets, and had over 15,000 members.¹²²

Yamamuro found himself unable to manage his busy schedule, however, so he sent Kanamori Tsūrin to America instead. Kanamori, who had been a member of Kumamoto Band, the famous company of young Japanese Christian men, established an extremely successful mission in California. He followed the style of the Salvation Army, which based its sermons on the personal experiences of its preachers. Kanamori also preached the "movement of one person becoming two (*hito hitori baizō undō*)," which required each believer to convert one new believer every year. Kobayashi organized Kanamori's mission in the United States, and was influenced by his activities.

Yamamuro himself, in 1917, launched a crusade in the Japanese communities scattered along the Pacific Coast. Although he was there for only two weeks, his mission also resulted in great success. Attendance at his sermons reached 14,500, and Yamamuro persuaded between seven and eight hundred Japanese immigrants to become Christians.¹²³

Before Yamamuro's mission, Kobayashi, impressed with the activity of the Salvation Army,

¹²¹ Ryo Yoshida, "Sen kyūhyaku jū nendai kalifolonia nihonjin imin kirisuto kyōkai no ekkyōteki rīdāshippu," *Imin kenkyū nenpō* 17 (March 2011): 14–15.

¹²² R. David Rightmire, *Salvationist Samurai: Gunpei Yamamuro and the Rise of the Salvation Army in Japan* (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 1997), 76.

¹²³ Yamamuro, *Zaibei doho no senkaku Kobayashi Masasuke den*. 85.

had asked him by mail to start a reformist “war” in the United States. In reply to this letter, Yamamuro advised Kobayashi instead to become a member of the Salvation Army and start his own mission among Japanese immigrants. Indeed, during the course of his campaign in the United States, Yamamuro convinced Kobayashi to establish a Japanese Salvation Army in America. Kobayashi followed this advice and became a member of the Salvation Army in 1917. After completing his work with the board, Kobayashi returned to Japan and underwent a six-month training program under Yamamuro’s guidance. Then he came back to San Francisco in 1919 and launched his “war” there.

Kobayashi Masasuke’s Theory of Harmony

Although his active membership in the Japanese Salvation Army began in 1919, Kobayashi had already published the book that represented his position on Japanese immigrants in the United States. This book, *A Study of the United States and Racial Discrimination (Beikoku to jinshu sabetsu no kenkyū)*, was written in 1919 during his stay in Japan and showed how Kobayashi situated his activity on the American West Coast within a broader context. In the introduction, Kobayashi explained his purpose in writing this book:

During this mission, what I felt was that *zaibei dōhō* (Japanese in the United States) complained and were disappointed with the racial discrimination in the United States, and most of them did not know how to become accustomed to this place because they regarded themselves as migrant workers. I finally found that this problem inevitably came from the nonintervention and indifference of Japanese officials and their precursors who did not do research on or study immigrants, and did not have definite views. Therefore, as a matter of great urgency, I decided to make clear the truth of the anti-Japanese immigrant movement, disclose the facts existing behind the movement and let *zaibei dōhō* know the fact that they have an important mission in the life of the United States.¹²⁴

¹²⁴ Masasuke Kobayashi, *Beikoku to jinshuteki sabetsu no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Bunsendō shoten, 1919), introduction 2.

Interestingly, Kobayashi's introduction shows that the most important purpose of this book was not to criticize American discrimination against Japanese immigrants but to make Japanese immigrants understand their own "mission." This mission, Kobayashi wrote, was the resolution of the conflict between the East and the West, and he saw this conflict exemplified in the struggles of the Japanese immigrants in California.¹²⁵

His idea of a confrontation between the East and the West in the United States was extracted from the analysis he presented in *A Study of the United States and Racial Discrimination*. Kobayashi started this book by analyzing the ongoing problem of population growth. Referring to the theory of Thomas Robert Malthus, Kobayashi reviewed the manner in which population problems functioned in the previous century in "Western" history. According to him, the population problem was one of the reasons World War I started. However, this was not a problem only for "Western" countries. While these countries expelled much of the populations from their territories into the New Continent, the Eastern countries still kept increasing the numbers of people within their territories. Kobayashi thought that this unbalanced situation would not maintain itself for long and the increased movement of the population from Eastern countries was inevitable. In that sense, the solution to the population problem is a universal topic and he regarded the United States as the first and best place in which to solve this problem. According to Kobayashi, this logic gives Japanese immigrants in the United States a special significance in world history.

Kobayashi's analysis in the second chapter repeated the importance of the phenomenon that was occurring in the United States. Kobayashi particularly analyzed the problem of *minzoku* (ethnos, nation). For him, the topic of *minzoku* was still a prominent problem in Europe, but he predicted that it would become a universal problem soon. It

¹²⁵ Ibid., 139.

appeared inevitable to Kobayashi that the confrontation of Eastern *shominzoku* (ethnos, nations) and Western *shominzoku* would be persistent. Importantly, since there were both Eastern and Western *shominzoku* in the United States, America symbolized to Kobayashi an important point of convergence. Here he would have the opportunity to apply his reform principles in a crucible of transnational integration. With this understanding, he believed that the Japanese immigrant problem in the United States was related to the destiny of the world.

Kobayashi's view of Japanese immigrants as important agents in the world presupposed that the United States was the place where many contradictions between the East and the West would meet. He thought that a flow of populations into the United States from various Western and Eastern countries and the involvement of various races made the American case exceptional. Tracing the history of the immigrants' inflow in the United States, Kobayashi emphasized the importance of the Japanese immigrants' position:

The Chinese started to enter from around the 1850s. . . . Next, the Japanese came in. They also met with discriminatory treatment. Looking at this course of events, the problem of our one hundred thousand fellows did not happen by accident. This is the first face-to-face match of two currents of races that were separated into the East and the West, and this match is the type of situation that naturally has to happen among people in the world. Each of these people has a one-thousand-year tradition and a particular (life civilization (*seikatsu bunmei*). Therefore, the solution to this would truly solve a great problem concerning the destiny of the world.¹²⁶

In Kobayashi's opinion, therefore, the hardship of Japanese immigrants stemmed from the history of the world, and they were expected to overcome it.

This idea of the confrontation between the East and the West may seem like a vague notion today. However, the logic behind Kobayashi's thinking was widespread among Japanese intellectuals. As we briefly saw when considering Shimanuki's perspective in the previous chapter, arguments similar to Kobayashi's were already circulating in Japan at the

¹²⁶ Ibid., 21-22.

turn of the twentieth century. The Japanese intellectual historian Matsumoto Sannosuke calls such arguments *tōzai bunmei chōwa ron* (the theory of the harmony between the East and the West) and categorizes them as one of the expressions of Japan's national vocation.¹²⁷

Chōwa ron became popular following the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905). Many prominent Japanese intellectuals, such as Tokutomi Sohō, Ukita Kazutami, Ōkuma Shigenobu, and Nitobe Inazō started to use this theory then. Japan's victory over Russia had raised its profile in international affairs, shifting the interests of Japanese intellectuals to their country's role in the world. Now they found that they had to construct their arguments based not only on the national interest but also on the influence of Japan on global welfare. By suggesting the goal of harmony, *chōwa ron* could also support a logic with which to counter the racial antipathy that emerged following the Russo-Japanese war, the so-called “yellow peril” that became a watchword in “Western” popular discourse.

This argument that would link the fate of the world with harmony between Japan and the United States also, however, served to justify Japanese imperialism. It is worth remembering that *chōwa ron* emphasized the representative position of Japan in Eastern civilization, which was an expression of Japanese intellectuals' belief that the Japanese were the only civilized nationals among the Eastern countries. Such a belief gave them a platform from which to carry out what they thought was a responsibility to guide other Eastern people. In reality, in spite of their assertions that Japan was the truest representative of Eastern civilization, the Japanese generally lacked a sense of solidarity with other East Asian countries.¹²⁸ As the Japanese historian Sakai Tetsuya notes, this argument on the one hand urged “Western” countries to recognize the cultural equality between themselves and Japan

¹²⁷ Sannosuke Matsumoto, “Kokumin teki shimeikan no rekishiteki hensen,” in *Kindai nihon shisōshi kōza*, 8 (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1961).

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 114.

by emphasizing their affinity with Eastern civilization. On the other hand, it affirmed Japanese imperial practices in Asia by emphasizing this “harmonized” country’s mission to further civilize other Asian countries.¹²⁹

Taking into consideration the dual nature of *chōwa ron*, the theory’s arguments about Japanese immigrants in the United States also reveal the concept’s intrinsic imperial implications. Interestingly, before the publication of Kobayashi’s book, a Christian reformer had already used *chōwa ron* in writings about the Japanese immigrant situation in the United States. One of the earliest examples of this use occurred in 1905 when the leading Christian socialist Abe Isoo explained the mission of Japanese immigrants in his book, *New Japan in North America (Hokubei no shin Nihon)*, by which Abe meant a society created by the Japanese on the Pacific coast. Abe expected that this society would lead to the creation of a place in which Western and Eastern people would live together.¹³⁰ However, when he wrote his book using *chōwa ron*, Abe did not conceal the connection between his argument concerning Japanese immigrants and the affirmation of imperial expansion:

If you want to say that our nations’ expansion into the United States, on one hand, and Korea and China, on the other hand, mark an imperial expansion from a political perspective, you can say that. However, according to the historical tendency, our Japan just tries to advertise Western civilization on the Asian continent and is doing its mission. My country is the broker of civilization. We try to sell the civilization, which we bought in the American market, in the market of Korea and China. So it is natural that our fellow Japanese try to get a base on the West Coast of the American continent.¹³¹

Abe’s statement indicates that in his application of *chōwa ron* to Japanese immigrants Abe was expressing imperial ambitions. Within this logic of “harmony,” then, the flow of immigrants was related to the imperial expansion of their mother country.

¹²⁹ Tetsuya Sakai, “Teikoku chitsujyo to kokusai chitsujyo-shokumin seisakugaku ni okeru baikai no ronri,” in *“Teikoku” hensei no keifu*, ed. Tetsuya Sakai, Iwanami Kōza 1 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2006), 294–7.

¹³⁰ Abe, *Hokubei no shin nihon*.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 123-124.

How does this issue appear in Kobayashi's text? One of the more problematic components of Kobayashi's thinking is his assertion that the Japanese must represent the East because of their ability to assimilate. In fact, Kobayashi had discussed the issue of the "assimilability" of Japanese immigrants for a long time and had explained their superiority by focusing on that quality. In Kobayashi's opinion, both Japan and the United States exhibited strong powers of assimilation (*dōka ryoku*). Therefore representatives of the Japanese and American civilizations were obliged to aim for harmony between the populations and races.¹³² In that sense, Kobayashi's argument tried to balance the existence of two empires across the Pacific.

As the structure of *chōwa ron* implies, Kobayashi's book outlines two directions for *dōka*. One is harmony and fusion with the West and the other is assimilation of Eastern civilizations into a whole. Regarding the issue of Japanese immigrants in the United States, the structure of *chōwa ron* entails that the superiority in the latter case supports the assimilability of the former as an exceptionalized representative of civilization with a worldwide mission. While he explained the function of assimilation in the United States by reference to Israel Zangwil's *Melting Pot*, Kobayashi argued that Japanese history was also a history of assimilation of Eastern thought. Kobayashi suggested that Japanese *minzoku* represented not a simple bloodline but rather a hybrid bloodline. In his opinion, Japan was a kind of "Eastern melting pot" and in this sense Japanese people have inherited the properties of Eastern *minzoku*.¹³³ On the other hand, Kobayashi wrote that Eastern *minzoku* were backward people (*kōshin sha*) and therefore the Japanese must become their model.¹³⁴

¹³² Kobayashi, *Beikoku to jinshu sabetsu no kenkyū*. 100-103.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 42.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 100-103.

It is at this juncture that Kobayashi highlighted the position of the Japanese in the East by emphasizing their powers of assimilation. He did not focus on Japanese imperial practices in Asia or on the ethnic problem (*minzoku mondai*) in the colonies. The Japanese Empire already had established colonies in Asia, and it was important for Kobayashi to justify this in order to affirm the Japanese “mission.” Kobayashi’s opinion concerning this problem was made clear when he wrote about the role of the ethnic spirit (*minzoku seishin*) in World War I:

At this point, we have to recognize that *minzoku seishin* contributed to the rebuilding of Europe and the promotion of the inclination toward democracy. However, the purpose of *minzoku seishin* was not the construction of a state based on *minzoku*. It became clear in this war that a small country could not have a stable existence without being subjected to a big country, and that its destiny would hang by a thread. Therefore, if the *minzoku* had freedom and rights in everyday life, he/she can carry out the mission of *minzoku* itself while remaining as one element of the state that includes it.¹³⁵

In this way, Kobayashi agreed with the logic of imperial domination. Although he carefully criticized the Japanese people’s prejudice against people in other Eastern countries, he appeared unaware of the implications of imperial desire in his argument.¹³⁶

Kobayashi regarded the Japanese as *minzoku* whose world-class abilities should be applied to the world stage. According to him, immigration was only one process by which cultures could expand throughout the world. If Abe Isoo embraced the relationship between imperial practices and the logic of *chōwa ron* in his argument concerning Japanese immigrants, Kobayashi’s argument also implied that immigrants were regarded as agents shouldering a mission of empire. In the next section I discuss the ways in which Kobayashi’s views developed in his later years and the connection between his logic and the ongoing Japanese imperial expansion in East Asia.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 13.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 42.

The Later Years of Kobayashi and His Lecture Tour in the Japanese Colonies

Kobayashi started his work as a member of the Japanese Salvation Army, which was later transformed into the Japanese Division of the American Salvation Army, in San Francisco in August 1919. In addition to its ordinary “mission work,” what characterized the Salvation Army was its focus on the importance of social work. To provide both a symbolic and functional center, the Japanese Division constructed a large house for social work in San Francisco in 1921 with the aid of the American Salvation Army, the International Headquarters, and the Japanese Benevolent Society of California. The building had fifty-one rooms and was able to accommodate seventy-five people. The Japanese Division provided services such as a free clinic, a sanatorium, a shelter for the aged, a women’s home, and a childcare center.¹³⁷ The various facilities at this center enabled the division to fulfill its adopted mission from the points of view of both the Salvation Army and Japanese community leaders.

According to Sakaguchi Mitsuhiro’s comprehensive research on this organization, the division’s activity had two important implications for social work. First, compared with other Japanese immigrant organizations, this division had more organizational strength and had developed broader networks for outreach. It comprised nine small corps in coastal areas of the United States, and each corps was able to collaborate with other local community workers or religious groups. Second, the division played a pioneering role in the Japanese community, such as in the construction of shelters for the aged and unique activities such as visiting prisoners or patients.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ Yamamuro, *Zaibei dohō no senkaku Kobayashi Masasuke den*, 129-131.

¹³⁸ Sakaguchi Mitsuhiro, “Nihonjin imin to shakai jigyou,” *Shibusawa kenkyu* 6 (1993): 17-40.

Although Kobayashi's activities supported the development of the Salvation Army, the situation of Japanese immigrants in the United States was becoming increasingly worse in the 1920s. California had enacted the Second Alien Land Law, a regulation that prohibited even the leasing of land to Japanese immigrants and closed loopholes that had been exploited in the 1913 Alien Land Law. In 1922, the U.S. Supreme Court passed down its historic *Ozawa v. U.S.* decision, making *iseei* (first-generation Japanese immigrants) ineligible for naturalization. Lastly, the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924 totally banned immigration from Japan.

Aware of these pressures, Kobayashi compared the situation of Japanese immigrants to the history of persecuted Christian saints. According to him, persecution enhanced a saint's loyalty to God and love for his or her brethren while also providing an opportunity for self-reflection. Kobayashi said therefore that he welcomed anti-Japanese persecution.¹³⁹ In order to survive persecution, he suggested, Japanese immigrants in American should follow the idea of *chō teikou shugi* (the principle of super resistance). He defined this idea of super resistance in the following way:

There are three methods in which to deal with conflict. First, you respond to the opponents' violent actions with violence. This is called resistance. Second, you just let the opponents act, and this is non-resistance. Third, you neither respond to the opponents' violent actions with violence nor become subject to them. Even if you are temporarily overrun by the opponents, you will eventually let them realize their faults and guide them toward the reform of their actions. We can call this super resistance.¹⁴⁰

So, if resistance or non-resistance cannot work, what should immigrants do in practice?

Kobayashi's answer was to build personality (*jinkaku*) and show that Japanese in the United States were of as "good quality as American citizens" ("*beikoku shimin toshite yūryō naru*

¹³⁹ Masasuke Kobayashi, *Nihon minzoku no sekaiteki bōchō; Kobayashi Masasuke ronbunshū*, ed. Seiko Ibuka (Tokyo: keigansha, 1933), 112–116.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 86.

monodearukoto”).¹⁴¹ He emphasized in particular the importance of discipline among the second generation of immigrants and suggested the founding of a vocational guidance center.¹⁴² Although I examine the meaning of this building of personality in detail later, here I confirm that he supported the integration of Japanese immigrants into US society by promoting a certain type of subjectivity.

When considering this argument, we can see that Kobayashi tried to maintain his reform strategy for Japanese immigrants in spite of the extremely difficult circumstances. Thus, although he was against racism in the United States, instead of attacking the racist regime he tried to manage the situation by inculcating self-discipline among the immigrants themselves. In that sense, his argument shows how deeply he accepted the framework that sustained pressure on immigrant assimilation into US society. Until his death in 1940, just before the beginning of the Pacific War, Kobayashi maintained his commitment to social work as a leader of the Japanese division of the Salvation Army.

Kobayashi's campaign for assimilation cannot, however, be reduced to the experiences of the Japanese on the American West Coast. Rather, we can situate his activity within a much wider frame. In that sense, his accounts of his travels around the territories of the Japanese empire in Asia in the 1930s take on added significance.

In April 1932, Kobayashi temporarily returned to his home country. During that time, he was compelled to rush around raising funds for the reconstruction of the social work center in San Francisco. According to Yamamuro Buho's biography of Kobayashi, during this stay he gave many speeches and met with prominent politicians, military personnel, and businessmen and was successful in collecting many donations. He received 5,000 yen from

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 87.

¹⁴² Ibid., 92.

Baron Morimura and 2,000 yen from Shibusawa Eiichi's family in December 1932. Parliamentary Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs Taki Masao and Count Kabayama also promised support. He also obtained a donation of 15,000 yen from Baron Sakatani in February 1933 and received 5,000 yen in imperial donations in October 1933.¹⁴³

Aside from fundraising, Kobayashi also held private meetings with Prime Minister Saitō Makoto and attended a party held by the Imperial Japanese Navy general staff. Although his specific political role in this elite imperial network has yet to be clarified, the remaining records demonstrate what a broad social network Kobayashi had developed in the Japanese Empire. He maintained a particularly close relationship with the Japanese Imperial Navy, preaching to sailors on the visiting Japanese naval fleet on the American West Coast when he worked at the Evangelistic Board, which also may have contributed to this connection.

What is also interesting about Kobayashi's activity during his return to Japan is the wide range of his travels. The Manchurian Incident had just occurred, and the Johnson-Read Act of 1924 had heightened tensions between Japan and the United States. In this context, Kobayashi's speech about the mission of Japanese *minzoku* and his analysis of Japan-U.S. relations was welcomed among Japanese business circles, the political community, the military, government officials, the Imperial Household Agency, and educational circles. He therefore continued traveling around the territory and giving talks in 1932 and 1933.

According to Yamamuro's biography, Kobayashi started his tour of Manchuria and Korea in October 1932. First, he visited Dairen and saw the childcare center of the Salvation Army. He then gave talks at high schools, churches, the YMCA, and the South Manchuria Railway Company, and visited the cities of Mukden (Shenyang), Hsinking (Changchun),

¹⁴³ See Yamamuro, *Zaibei dohō no senkaku Kobayashi Masasuke den* 196 -210.

Harbin, Fushun, and Antung (Dandong). He moved on to Korea in mid-October. He first gave talks at the Soldiers' Association and at the Hall of Imperial Japanese Veterans' Association in Pyongyang. Kobayashi then moved on to Keijō (Seoul) and met with the leader of the Japanese (mainlander's) division of the Korean Salvation Army, Captain Amamiya Kaname, who had also previously worked in California. In Keijō, Kobayashi visited the headquarters of the Korean Salvation Army and the Government-General of Korea. He addressed an audience of five hundred people at the Government-General of Korea and at the International Friendship Society, and also spoke to eight hundred people at the building for social affairs (*shakai kan*), which had just been built in 1928 as a symbol of social work in Keijō. After that, he went back to Osaka on 21 October by way of Busan.¹⁴⁴

The significance of Kobayashi's Eastern tour has not been examined before and there are few documentary materials, but this activity, I argue, sheds light on the possible link between the imperial efforts of Japanese social reform in Asia and similar efforts across the Pacific.¹⁴⁵

Although there is little indication of the detailed contents of Kobayashi's speeches in the colonies, one article enables us to speculate on their parameters. That article, "The Truth about the Japan-U.S. Problem" ("*Nichibei mondai no shinsō*"), was published in the December 1932 issue of *Social Work in Korea (Chōsen shakai jigyo)* and provides a record of one of his speeches.¹⁴⁶ According to *Seoul Bulletin (Keijō ihō)*, Kobayashi gave a speech at *shakai kan* under the title "On the Problem between Japan and the United States" ("*Nichibei mondai ni tsuite*") on October 18, 1932. Inasmuch as the remaining extant photo

¹⁴⁴ Yamamuro, *Zaibei dohō no senkaku Kobayashi Masasuke den*, 199-201.

¹⁴⁵ After the Manchurian incident, some leaders of the Japanese Salvation Army visited Manchuria and maintained close ties with local authorities. For example, Captain Yabuki visited there for comfort (*imon*) and pacifying activity (*senbu kōsaku*) in February 1932. In that context, Kobayashi's visit to Manchuria possibly had a similar purpose. See Endō Kōichi, "Senjika no kirisuto kyō shakai jigyo - kyūseigun no katsudō o chūshin ni" *Meiji gakuin ronsō shakaigaku shakai fukushigaku kenkyū* 91 (1993):117-121.

¹⁴⁶ Masasuke Kobayashi, "Nichibei mondai no shinsō," *Chōsen shakai jigyo* 10, no.11 (December, 1932): 47-58.

album of Kobayashi's tour shows a similar title for his speech at a division of the Japanese Salvation Army in Fushun, it is highly probable that he gave a talk about the content of that article in Korea.¹⁴⁷

The content of the speech relates to assimilation efforts on the part of Japanese immigrants in the United States. It largely overlaps with what he argued in his books *A Study of the United States and Racial Discrimination* and *The Worldwide Expansion of the Japanese Nation* (*Nihon minzoku no sekai teki bōchō*), which were published in 1933. The earlier part of the article explained the connection between a worldwide population problem and Japanese migration to the United States, which was very similar in content to *A Study of the United States and Racial Discrimination*. The latter part of his speeches focused more on the migrants' ongoing struggles. While he praised the development of the agricultural industry by Japanese immigrants, Kobayashi also emphasized their efforts to establish a spiritual life.

First, he acknowledged that the pioneer of Japanese international expansion is usually the female prostitute (*kyōshigun*). However, he argued that Japanese society was uncomfortable with this and had created a pure/clean society without prostitutes in both mainland Japan and Hawaii. Second, he mentioned that Chinese gambling caused a problem among Japanese immigrants, as they often lost as much as \$1,000 each year (a huge sum to them) gambling. However, according to Kobayashi, this problem was also to be solved by awakening (*kakusei*) of the brethren. Furthermore, he picked up the issue of the second

¹⁴⁷ *Keijō ihō*, no.134 (1932). The photo album is titled “*Kokokuni okeru kōen ryokō*” (“Lecture tour in home country”), which is available at the Collection of the Yamamuro Gunpei Memorial Salvation Army Resource Center in Tokyo. One of the photos shows a similar title for Kobayashi's speech at Fushun Outpost of the Salvation Army. The title is “*Nichibei mondai to zaibei nihonjin*” (“Japan–U.S. problem and the Japanese in the U.S.”). Japanese edition of the Salvation Army's official fortnightly publication, *Toki no koe* (The War Cry), also reported about Kobayashi's tour in Manchuria and Korea in small articles. According to them, Kobayashi lectured on the history of Japanese brethren and race problem during this tour (*Toki no koe*, vol.879, Nov 15, 1932, 7: vol.880, Dec 1, 1932, 7).

generation. Although he deplored the shortage younger-generation Japanese abroad because of the recent lack of immigration to the United States, he explained that those who had gone to America were being educated well. He supported this opinion by citing recent sociological research conducted by Stanford University that verified the excellence of Japanese immigrants and disproved the theory that the quality of any second generation of immigrants would inevitably decline.

His analysis of the efforts to assimilate being made by immigrants finally led him to the reiteration of Japanese immigrants' assimilability. Kobayashi said:

One of the bitterest criticisms against the Japanese brethren in the United States is that "the Japanese are an unassimilable ethnic group." Against this criticism, they insist that assimilation should not be mimetic; in true assimilation, each ethnic group should rather make a contribution due to their own superior quality. Some Americans with hearts understand this argument.¹⁴⁸

This quote shows how Kobayashi interpreted the issue of assimilation of Japanese immigrants. Instead of obsessing on "mimetic" similarities with other Americans, he claimed that the most important thing was to contribute to American society through each ethnic group's specific characteristics. Isn't this argument similar to the idea of contemporary multiculturalism? Based on such a "multicultural" interpretation of assimilation, Kobayashi argued that the American people had started to understand the assimilability of Japanese immigrants. Whether or not his analysis of the contemporary situation was accurate, what is important here is that in this context he emphasized the achievement of self-disciplinary practices in immigrant communities, or self-reform from the social reformer's perspective. He required the "cultivation of personality (*jinkaku no renma*)" on the part of Japanese people and celebrated the idea that they were successfully showing themselves to be respectable members of US society, quite different from the "degenerate" image of

¹⁴⁸ Kobayashi, "Nichibei mondai no shinsō," 56.

prostitutes or gamblers that had been disseminated in popular discourse.¹⁴⁹ However, why is this self-discipline activity so important for achieving a multiethnic community? At this point, we should remember Balibar's analysis of (fictive) universality. As he emphasized in his analysis of the process of individuation, in the formation of a wider community what is required by the total ideology is the *normalized subject*. In order for the members of minority ethnic groups to be integrated into an empire, they have to show that they are respectable individuals. This is why Kobayashi and other immigrant leaders had to promote the cultivation of personality.

Examining Kobayashi's activity from this perspective, it becomes clear that Kobayashi's discourse not only extended the Japanese imperial ideology but also deeply resonated with American multiethnic nation formation. It demonstrates how this mechanism of universality mobilizes minority members at the margins of society. In that sense, Kobayashi's desperate commitment to *chō teikou shugi* shows on the one hand the enormous pressure Japanese immigrants experienced at that time and on the other hand its similarity to the formation of the model minority subject. The significance of Kobayashi's "resistance" in the United States should be examined from this perspective. At the same time, we cannot ignore the implications of Kobayashi's argument in terms of Japanese immigrants' relationship with other minority members.

In Kobayashi's passion for assimilation, we encounter two complicated positions. On the one hand, he promoted assimilation and social reform as a community leader in the United States. That is, he tried to behave as a model minority to achieve his desire to be recognized as a respectable member of US society. On the other hand, he argued for the relative excellence of Japanese immigrants when compared with other ethnic groups. For

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 57.

example, he emphasized that Japanese immigrants had guided Chinese, Koreans, Filipinos, Mexicans, and other South-European immigrants at the workplace.¹⁵⁰ Consistently with his notion of *chōwa ron* in *A Study of the United States and Racial Discrimination*, he ascribed the excellence of Japanese immigrants to the ability of the Japanese *minzoku* to assimilate Eastern *minzoku*. In that sense, Kobayashi also tried to play a missionary role. As many Japanese intellectuals used the logic of *chōwa ron* in the age of Japanese expansion, his argument had the potential to be used as a justification for the assimilation and guidance of minority members within the Japanese empire.

In the following section, I examine the situation surrounding Kobayashi's tour with this potential in mind. Kobayashi ended his article by imploring the brethren in Japan to fight together with him, Kobayashi, across the Pacific for the global mission of the Japanese national expansion, which includes the guidance of Eastern ethnicities, in the United States and the Japanese Empire in Asia. What meaning, then, could his speeches possibly have had in the Japanese colonies at that time?

Social Reformers and the Moral Suasion Network in Korea

In order to understand the circumstances surrounding Kobayashi's activity in the colonies, we must first pay attention to the expansion of the Japanese Salvation Army. As Kobayashi visited its divisions of Dairen, Fushun, and Seoul, his lecture tour also represented the ongoing development of this organization. Harald Fischer-Tinē's transnational study of the British Salvation Army and its civilizing mission shows that this "most successful of global

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 56.

philanthropic movements” had from its origin a close connection with British imperialism.¹⁵¹

The Japanese Salvation Army was no exception. Although Rightmire emphasized the Japanese Salvation Army’s positive relationship with the state, the organization also followed the territorial development of the Japanese empire closely.¹⁵² In the early twentieth century, Yamamuro Gunpei established a Salvation Army’s Women’s Home in Dairen. This facility was built in 1907 to address the problem of female prostitutes there when, as mentioned, Japanese Christian reformers were concerned with the issue of *karayuki san*.¹⁵³

The Japanese Salvation Army also opened divisions in Korea and Taiwan. In Taiwan, where the mission was established in 1928, teaching the national (Japanese) language to poor Taiwanese people was an important activity. Although the organization had placed a Taiwanese officer in charge, its contribution to *kōminka* (imperialization) policy was closely monitored by the Government General of Taiwan.¹⁵⁴

In the case of Korea, the Korean Salvation Army had existed since 1908. It had its own national headquarters, which answered directly to International Headquarters in London. In addition to this, the Japanese Salvation Army had also sent staff to Korea and opened a mainlander’s division in 1913 in order to take care of Japanese settlers and promote social work. In late 1940, the missionary personnel were evacuated and the Korean Salvation Army was placed under the leadership of a Japanese officer. However, even before then, as Albert

¹⁵¹ Harald Fischer-Tinē, “Reclaiming Savages in ‘Darkest England’ and ‘Darkest India’: The Salvation Army as Transnational Agent of the Civilizing Mission,” in *Civilizing Missions in Colonial and Postcolonial South Asia: From Improvement to Development*, ed. Carey Anthony Watt and Michael Mann (London; New York: Anthem Press, 2011), 126-127. For another study of the relationship between the Salvation Army and an empire (Dutch), see, Lorraine V Aragon, *Fields of the Lord: Animism, Christian Minorities, and State Development in Indonesia* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2000).

¹⁵² Rightmire, *Salvationist Samurai*, 107-134.

¹⁵³ Mikiso Hane briefly traces the relationship between the issue of *karayuki san* and the Salvation Army’s reform movement abroad, particularly in Dairen and Singapore. See, Mikiso Hane, *Peasants, Rebels, Women, and Outcasts: The Underside of Modern Japan*, 2nd ed (Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 206–225.

¹⁵⁴ Yuki Takai-Heller, “Nihon tōchika taiwan ni okeru nihonjin purotesutanto kyōkaishi kenkyū:1895-1945” (Ph.D. diss., International Christian University, 2003) 227-246.

E. Baggs argued, compared with other Christian institutions in Korea, this group cultivated a relatively cooperative relationship with the Japanese colonial government.¹⁵⁵ In the official 1935 yearbook of the Salvation Army, the Governor General, Ugaki Kazushige, wrote:

For real, selfless good, attending to material as well as spiritual resurrection, The Salvation Army offers an example to all. The day and night endeavor, in blazing heat and in freezing cold, to redeem beggar boys, orphan girls, unfortunate women, and destitutes from a state of deepest degradation, and to transform them into respected and loyal citizens, has ever had the enthusiastic support of all people in this Peninsula. The Government has always had full trust in its work and gives grants in aid every year as further encouragement.¹⁵⁶

After the war against China started in 1937, the Korean Salvation Army became involved with the Federation of Military Support (*Gunji kōen renmei*) and was deeply integrated into the war regime.

In this way, Kobayashi's tour in the early 1930s reveals the broader background of the activity of Japanese Christian reformers in the Japanese empire. How then does this also link to the practices of assimilation and social reform in the Japanese empire? At this point, what interests us is the ongoing promotion of "moral suasion (*kyōka*)" in colonial Korea since the early 1930s. In her recent book, *Brokers of Empire*, Jun Uchida observes that the emergence of the moral suasion movement in the 1930s refashioned the "colonial body politic." When moral suasion was brought into colonial Korea as a spiritual mobilization initiative under the Ugaki regime between 1931 and 1936, the colonial government poured a lot of energy into "thought guidance, promotion of labor, vocational training, adult education, and poverty relief."¹⁵⁷ Yet, importantly, this work was carried out not by the state alone. Instead, the state conducted the process by enlisting a variety of civilian groups and

¹⁵⁵ Albert Edward Baggs, "Social Evangel as Nationalism a Study of the Salvation Army in Japan, 1895–1940." (Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Buffalo, 1966), 188-194.

¹⁵⁶ *Salvation Army Yearbook*, (London, Salvation Army, 1935), 44.

¹⁵⁷ Jun Uchida, *Brokers of Empire*, 327-328.

individuals, the function of which was what Gi-Wook Shin and Do-Hyun Han called “colonial corporatism.”¹⁵⁸ For example, the Federation of Moral Suasion Groups in Seoul (*Keijō kyōka dantai rengōkai*), the center of the moral suasion movement in Korea, was composed of many religious and civilian groups. According to *Seoul Bulletin* in 1932, this federation included the Korean Salvation Army, the representative of which was noted as Captain Amamiya, the guide for Kobayashi’s Korean tour.¹⁵⁹ So the network of Christian reformers and the moral suasion movement crossed paths in Korea.

In fact, the moral suasion movement and the development of colonial social work were deeply related. In a sense, it does not seem totally coincidental that Kobayashi’s speech was published in *Social Work in Korea* which, as the only monthly magazine of social work in colonial Korea, was an important medium of the moral suasion movement. It ran from May 1922 until January 1944. The issuing organization was the Research Society of Korean Social Work (*Chosen shakai jigyo kenkyukai*), which changed its name to the Association of Korean Social Work (*Chosen shakai jigyo kyōkai*) in 1929. It was established under the guidance of Yajima Sugizō, the chief of the Government-General’s Social Department in 1921. The organization started with seventy-five Japanese members and defined its goal as “the advancement of people’s welfare” through the encouragement of social works such as monthly study meetings and specialists’ lectures.¹⁶⁰ However, as Sin Yong-hong pointed out, the range of the members’ perspectives could not be limited to a simple altruistic

¹⁵⁸ Gi-Wook Shin and Do-Hyun Han, “Colonial Corporatism: The Rural Revitalization Campaign, 1932-1940,” in *Colonial Modernity in Korea*, ed. Gi-Wook Shin and Michael Edson Robinson (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center: Distributed by Harvard University Press, 1999), 70–96.

¹⁵⁹ Based on the fact that Amamiya was listed as a name of the representative of the institution in *Seoul Bulletin*, there is still a possibility that this membership was specifically related to the mainlander division of the Korean Salvation Army. Exploring the power relationship between Japanese (mainlander) officers and other officers, including Korean officers, in the Korean Salvation Army was beyond the scope of this chapter. For a recent English recollection of the history of the Korean Salvation Army, see Peter H. Chang, *The Salvation Army in Korea* (Seoul: The Salvation Army Korea Territory, 2007).

¹⁶⁰ Sōda Aisen, “Honkai no soshiki to enkaku (jyou),” *Chosen shakai jigyo* 6, no.2 (February 1928): 25-26.

enhancement of welfare; rather, there was a keen sense of anxiety about a crisis of security stemming from social antagonism within Korea, as represented by independent movements or socialism. Social reformers in Korea therefore felt the need to guide properly (*zendō*) the colonial population.¹⁶¹

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, new developments in Korean social work emerged. The district commissioner system (*hōmen iin seido*) was introduced in 1927 from the mainland, and moral suasion groups (*kyōka dantai*) appeared in 1930. The Association of Korean Social Work was deeply involved in the construction of this moral suasion network. In fact, the Association of Korean Social Work took the initiative of linking with the Federation of Moral Suasion Groups (*Kyōka dantai rengōkai*) in mainland Japan by establishing the moral suasion department (*kyōka bu*) in 1930.

The *kyōka dantai* organization had been promoted on the mainland since the government first promulgated the Imperial Rescript Regarding the Promotion of Spirit (*Kokumin seishin sakkō ni kansuru shōsho*) in November 1923, two months after the Great Kantō Earthquake and five months after the first major rebellion against the Japanese Communist Party. After this promulgation, the Home Ministry established the Federation of Moral Suasion Groups in 1924 and tried to spread the implementation of the rescript. This federation was operated jointly by the government and the private sector, and early members of the board included the Christian social reformer Tomeoka Kōsuke and the social educator Hasunuma Monzō. This federation began with thirty-six groups in Tokyo, but it quickly spread across Japan and, changing its name to the Central Federation of Moral Suasion Groups (*Chūō kyōka dantai rengōkai*), its network covered more than twenty prefectures in

¹⁶¹ Sin Yong-hong, “Chosen shakai jigyo kenkyukai to chosen syakai jigyo kyōkai no setsuritsu” in *Senzen senchū ajia kenkyū shiryō 4: zasshi chosen shakai jigyo bessatsu* (Tokyo: Kingendai shiryō kankō kai, 2007), 8-10.

1928.¹⁶² Yamamuro, the leader of the Japanese Salvation Army, was also involved in this movement. The federation's 1930 brochure includes his lecture on the close relationship between moral suasion and Christianity.

The Christian reform–moral suasion network reached Korea when the Central Federation of Moral Suasion Groups asked the Government-General to establish similar moral suasion groups there. The Governor General, Saitō Makoto, responded that, although it did not use the word *kyōka*, the Association of Korean Social Work had played a similar role in Korea. Saitō suggested that the Association of Korean Social Work should establish a department dedicated specifically to moral suasion. As a result, its moral suasion department became a member of the Central Federation of Moral Suasion Groups in 1930.¹⁶³ Two weeks after this, the first meeting to promote moral suasion in Korea was held, with almost three hundred people, including some Korean reformers, participating by invitation. At this meeting the federation confirmed that, following the purport of the Imperial Rescript, they would promote and strengthen the organization of moral suasion groups to enlighten the nation's young people.¹⁶⁴ In November 1932, the Government-General called for “promotion of spirit and self-reform (*seishin sakkō jiriki kōsei*),” and, in order to promote the moral suasion initiative, Keijō also established the Federation of Moral Suasion Groups in the following month.

Statements made at the August 1932 conference of the Central Federation of Moral Suasion Groups in Korea, just two months before Kobayashi's visit, reveal the views of

¹⁶² For details in the development of Japanese welfare policies in the early twentieth century, see Garon, *Molding Japanese Minds*, Introduction and Ch. 1.

¹⁶³ Yamakawa Kenjirō “Chūō kyōka dantai rengōkai kaichō Yamakawa Kenjirō aisatsu,” *Chosen shakai jigyō* 8, no. 12 (December, 1930): 5.

¹⁶⁴ Sin Yong-hong, *Kindai chosen shakai jigyōshi kenkyū – keijo ni okeru houmenin seido no rekishiteki kousatsu* (Tokyo: Ryokuin shobō, 1984), 166-171.

members of the Association of Korean Social Work regarding moral suasion in Korea. To represent the Korean moral suasion groups, the Association of Korean Social Work sent Harima Genshirō and Okuyama Senzō to this conference, at which Harima gave a talk about moral suasion in Korea. He first pointed out that the “emergency situation” caused by the recent economic depression and dramatic increase in unemployment was a problem not only for the mainland but also for Korea. In order to resolve this problem, Harima agreed to follow the guidelines of the Boshin Year Rescript (*Boshin shōsho*) and the Imperial Rescript Regarding the Promotion of Spirit. That is, while production increases would certainly be advanced by the promotion of a strong work ethic, industrial development and agricultural reform as well as “life improvement (*seikatsu kaizen*)” should also be promoted. Harima included these objectives under the rubric of self-reform (*jiriki kōsei*) and argued that both represented possible solutions to the contemporary crisis.

Harima explained the importance of the “Korean problem (*chōsenjin mondai*).” Admitting that outsiders might regard the Korean problem as a distant problem in a remote location, he emphasized that “Koreans were actually looming presences” over the problems of villages, unemployment, and ideology on the mainland. He pointed out the rapid population flow from Korea to the Japanese mainland at the time and predicted that the “problem of the mainland and Korea (*naisen mondai*)” would become more complicated in the absence of moral suasion. The colonial problem was already a serious issue for the mainland:

Non-interference does not improve the Koreans. If we let the Koreans, who gradually run away centrifugally, go without any moral direction, Korea might become a kind of Ireland in Britain. If that happens, it will be not only unhappy for the Koreans, but the empire itself will be burdened with incessant trouble. We should immediately guide, cultivate, and discipline Koreans. Furthermore, we have to make them gradually centripetal and thus make Korea a kind of Scotland in Britain. This is the

so-called *naisen mondai*. In the future, it should lead to assimilation. It is only then that we will realize the purpose of the annexation, enjoy the coexistence and co-prosperity of the mainland and Korea, promote the welfare of Koreans, and smoothly manage the development of empire.¹⁶⁵

Harima feared that internal antagonism would cause the Japanese empire to collapse and argued that mutually prosperous development was essential. Even while suggesting co-prosperity, however, Harima stated that on the other hand Korean immigrants suffered from “lack of education, lack of ability, low dignity, and lack of the idea of hygiene” and that Japanese mainlanders were expected to play the role of guides:

As our brethren in the mainland have guided 1.5 million of the backward outcast people, they have to raise the ability and dignity of 350 thousand of the new brethren in the mainland to the level of the mainlanders through kind and earnest guidance, moral suasion, and enlightenment. Through this, mainlanders have to assimilate the new brethren, make them loyal subjects of the empire, and abolish the idea of discrimination subjectively and objectively. If those things are done, then the Korean problem will disappear naturally.¹⁶⁶

Harima’s speech reveals the intended effect of moral suasion on social workers in Korea. Its purpose was to contribute to the maintenance of social order in the empire; Harima defined the solution to achieving assimilation as so-called “co-prosperity,” a piece of rhetoric clearly designed to assuage Koreans’ antipathy toward Japanese colonialism.

However, in Harima’s articulation, we can still easily find the tension between the two terms, “assimilation” and “co-prosperity.” If this assimilation framework guarantees the positions of the colonizer as a subject of action and the colonized as an object of that action so clearly, is it possible to justify moral suasion as a project of co-prosperity? Does it not rather too easily characterize its nature as subjection through coercion? In that sense, Harima’s unapologetic binary of Japanese guide and Korean backwardness still did not go far enough in explaining the significance of the idea of *jiriki kōsei*.

¹⁶⁵ Harima Tōgaku (Genshirō), “Hijōji kyōka taisaku,” *Chosen shakai jigyō* 10, no.9 (September, 1932): 4-5.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 6.

Rather, another article in *Social Work in Korea* by Takeuchi Seiichi, the social reformer at the Government-General office, clarifies the core role of moral suasion in a much better way. Starting with the dictum of the famous prison director Ogawa Shigejirō, Takeuchi explains:

“Social work should also be the work of *kyōka kuniku* (moral cultivation).” This means that social work itself should be a sort of moral cultivation. It is because the underlying principle of social work is maintaining and respecting the personality. It does not deal with “a patient as patient, the weak as the weak, a villain as villain, an orphan as orphan, the poor as the poor,” and “not only a savior (*kyūsaisha*) is not self-aware of saving but also the saved does not notice being saved.” On that condition, it arouses the spirit of self-reliance, self-respect, and self-confidence. Then, it makes one gain the great power (*idainaru chikara*) to pioneer, reform, and upgrade his/her own condition. That is the main purpose of social work.¹⁶⁷

What Takeuchi explains as “the great power” to reform one’s own condition is the aspect of modern subjectivity, which perpetually attempts to transform itself with its projection for the future. Takeuchi clarifies that the purpose of the project of moral suasion is exactly the production of such active subjectivity. At this point, we have to take account of the fact that Takeuchi emphasizes the cultivation of “the spirit of self-reliance, self-respect, and self-confidence.” This means that individuality is the important aspect of this subject formation. As we have seen in the theoreticization of fictive universality by Etienne Balibar, individuation is necessary for the integration of minority ethnic group members into the wider community. Furthermore, as we have seen, the counterpart of this universality is the structure of normalization. Through its promotion of disciplinary practices, the moral suasion movement attempted to produce normal subjects.

At the same time, however, it is worth noting that there is a strong presupposition that this reforming subject should act towards subject formation by its own will. In other words,

¹⁶⁷ Seiichi Takeuchi, “Chosen shakai jigyo ni taisuru yōbō,” *Chosen shakai jigyo* 11, no. 1 (January 1933): 52.

spontaneity matters. This process of normalization should not be achieved through coercion. Balibar carefully points out that the internalization of the norm is an important process for individual subject formation:

For normality is not the simple fact of adopting customs and obeying rules or laws: it means internalizing representations of the ‘human subject’ (not exactly an essence, but a norm and standard way of behaving) in order to be recognized as a person in one’s own right—to become *presentable* (fit to be seen) in order to be represented. To become *responsible* (fit to be answered) in order to be respected.¹⁶⁸

This is why the logic of the production of the reforming subject takes the form of “making them gain” it. Behind this formula, we cannot ignore the colonizers’ dream that the colonized population would spontaneously, not by coercion, make an effort toward self-reform and take the path toward assimilation. In other words, this logic fit the fantasy in which colonial power relationships or violence had become disconnected from the colonized people’s self-reform practices. At the same time, we can also find that these practices would contribute to the mobilization of the colonized population for active participation in the imperial regime. As we have seen in the case of Kobayashi’s effort to assimilate Japanese immigrants in the United States, this is exactly the mechanism for the production of model minority subjects. As Balibar explained, the counterpart of fictive universality is the *free individual* with *normality*. In that sense, this moral suasion project is precisely a form of the process of integrating various members under the universality of the Japanese empire.

It is now clear that Kobayashi’s speech at *shakai kan* was made against the backdrop of such moral suasion networks and the imperial expansion efforts of social reformers. Even as he spoke about Japanese immigrants’ efforts to assimilate in the United States, his colleagues and other reformers in the colony, some of whom were likely present, were

¹⁶⁸ Balibar, *Politics and the Other Scene*, 162–3.

committing themselves to another project of assimilation: that is, the integration of their own colonized populations. At this point, we can see clearly how two projects involved in imperial nation-building across the Pacific overlapped. Kobayashi's call to carry on the fight for national expansion across the Pacific showed how a migrant struggle for assimilation could coexist with another campaign of integration in his home country by sharing its ideal of self-discipline through social work.

Conclusion

On the path to creating twentieth-century multi-ethnic/racial empires, both Japan and the United States sought to integrate a large number of minorities in their territories. In this process, social reform practices played a key role in the formation of normalized subjects from minority group members. In the Japanese empire, Japanese Christian social reformers had been among the most important actors who promoted the development of the disciplinary regime as non-governmental actors. However, as this chapter has shown, their social reform activity was also deeply involved with issues of minority integration in the Japanese colonies and immigrant communities in the United States.

Kobayashi Masasuke was among the Christian social reformers who worked at the very crossroads of such broad networks of Japanese social reform practices. What distinguished Kobayashi's activity is that, as a leader of Japanese immigrants in the United States in the first half of the twentieth century, he had to face the imperial expansions of both Japan and the United States, and managed to invent a logical rationale to justify his mode of existence between two empires.

As this chapter has demonstrated, Kobayashi's activity revealed that issues associated with social reform on the American West Coast played an important role in responding to the multi-ethnic ideal of the American nation. Based on Balibar's theory, his social reform practice is interpreted as the production of normalized subjects in the process of integration into a multi-ethnic empire. At the same time, I analyzed Kobayashi's logic of *chowa ron* and revealed that it also reflected the ongoing assimilation of minorities in the Japanese empire. This means that, at the crossroads of the two expanding empires, Kobayashi tactfully managed his dual status as imperial subject of the Japanese empire and assimilable American citizen in the United States. In that sense, although Kobayashi was critical of racial discriminations in the United States, what his argument and practice actually stood for was less a criticism of the mechanism of the American empire than an endorsement of the co-existence of two empires on either side of the Pacific Ocean.

Importantly, the transnational network of Japanese social reformers to which Kobayashi belonged showed that assimilation and reform in the Japanese colonies were not independent phenomena. As this chapter has demonstrated, his fellow reformers in colonial Korea also engaged in social reform practices that were deeply related to the integration of Koreans into the Japanese empire as normalized imperial subjects. Accordingly, assimilation practices and experiences of discrimination in both countries overlapped. Kobayashi's transpacific mobility and discourse showed us how social work and self-reform practices were channeled into the productions of imperial subjects in both countries.

In this way, this chapter has clarified how Japanese migrations across the Pacific also bridged imperial subject formations in both countries. In the next chapter, I turn my attention to the American side. In the first two chapters, we have seen how the Japanese transpacific

migrations were deeply related to nation formation in the Japanese empire. What then was the relationship of American leaders and intellectuals with the Japanese migrations to the United States? Did the migrations also influence their understanding of the formation of empire and the corresponding nation? How did they think about the integration of those minority members into American society?

Chapter 3

Japanese Immigrants/Americans and American Theory of Racial Contacts:

Missionary, Social Scientists, and Question of Loyalty

In the previous two chapters, I have demonstrated how Japanese (Christian) leaders were involved in transpacific migrations of the Japanese and how this movement affected and interconnected Japanese imperialism. However, those immigrants also drew the attention of liberal American leaders and intellectuals. These Americans observed and examined this new *other* for US society. Importantly, they were not simply the target of discrimination, they were also regarded as important agents who could confer new characteristics on the American empire. Between these statuses, the Japanese immigrants and their offspring had to become the objects of the suspicious gaze of American observers during World War II.

The archival remnants of empire may leave traces of unsettled feelings. In her recent analysis of colonial archives, Ann Laura Stoler turns her attention to the “feel of documents.” As she argues, the colonial administration’s “grids of intelligibility” were lined with epistemic uncertainties such as disquiet and anxiety.¹⁶⁹ This chapter turns to such imperial epistemic uncertainties taking as its example the United States and analyzes modes of American knowledge production pertaining to minority group members, particularly Japanese immigrants/Americans in the middle of the twentieth century.

In order to examine this theme, I examine discourses of the two groups that represent the modern history of early American encounters with Asian immigrants: Christian missionaries and social scientists. These groups were interested in race relations with the

¹⁶⁹ Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2009), 1.

Japanese in the United States, particularly on the West Coast and in Hawaii, and expressed concern about their loyalty. Such interest and anxiety toward Japanese immigrants/Americans culminated during World War II when they were suspected as potential allies of the enemy state. In this historical context, this chapter demonstrates how American intellectual discourses and knowledge production had situated Japanese immigrants/Americans within a certain narrative of American nation formation. Therefore a focal point of this chapter addresses intellectual discourses on Japanese immigrants/Americans during World War II, particularly those in Hawaii; the chapter also traces the historical development of these discourses.

Regarding American Christian missionaries, I focus on one American missionary in particular, Sidney Lewis Gulick (1860–1945). Gulick, who had stayed in Japan as a Christian missionary in the late Meiji period, is well-known for his support of Japanese immigrants when there were few intellectuals who defended Japanese immigrants against nativists' exclusionary sentiments in the early twentieth century. Therefore, he has been regarded as an “advocate of understanding” between Japan and the United States and his works on Japanese immigrants have been positively mentioned as expressing the American conscience.¹⁷⁰ However, if we closely examine his criticism of exclusion against Japanese immigration, we find that Gulick's promotion of inclusion converged with the emerging American imperial discourse. Furthermore, his work also emblemizes interactions between the two competing empires at the time, Japan and the United States. In this chapter, focusing mainly on some important texts by Gulick, I first show how his works on immigrants can be read in terms of incorporative imperial discourse.

¹⁷⁰ Sandra C Taylor, *Advocate of Understanding: Sidney Gulick and the Search for Peace with Japan* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1984).

I first briefly examine his works on Japanese immigrants in the 1910s. In particular, I focus on his book *The American Japanese Problem*, which was published in 1914 and can be regarded among his early works on Japanese immigrants.¹⁷¹ In this book, Gulick revealed his basic stance toward the Japanese immigrant problem, so it would be helpful to understand his philosophy.

I then move on to his later work, *Mixing the Races in Hawaii*, which was published in 1937.¹⁷² This book has not received much attention, but I argue that it hints at how American racial discourse supported the formation of the nation out of diverse racial/ethnic groups. Furthermore, the book also indicates the relationship between racial discourses in the United States and the ideology of the Japanese empire. At that time, many Japanese immigrants were living in Hawaii, and the racial integration of Japanese immigrants in Hawaii was a more urgent topic than the fate of those on the U.S. mainland. Under such circumstances, Gulick's book can be read as an attempt to solve that problem and clarify the role of intellectuals within an empire.

After this examination, I turn to the other intellectual agents of the collection of knowledge about Japanese immigrants, that is, sociologists. Japanese immigrants in the United States had been the subjects of sociological research since the 1920s. The most well-known academic agents in this respect were the Chicago sociologists. Known for their contribution to the institutionalization of "American Orientalism," their research on Asian immigrants first started on the American West Coast and later extended to Hawaii, which

¹⁷¹ Sidney Lewis Gulick, *The American Japanese Problem; a Study of the Racial Relations of the East and the West*. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1914).

¹⁷² Sidney Lewis Gulick, *Mixing the Races in Hawaii: A Study of the Coming Neo-Hawaiian American Race* (New York: AMS Press, 1978).

drew the special attention of social scientists for its potential as a “racial laboratory.”¹⁷³

During the war, the activities of these sociologists played an important role in recognizing their potential enemy.

Tracing the development of this pioneering sociological research, this chapter examines how the logic of inclusion of Japanese immigrants/Americans and the process of multi-racialization of the American nation had been constructed by the leader of Chicago sociology, Robert Ezra Park (1864–1944), and his student, Andrew Lind (1901–1988), who initiated wartime sociological research in Hawaii. In addition to the racial theory in Chicago sociology and Hawaii’s significance for their research, this study focuses on their use of specific rhetorical tools such as masks and confession. These analyses reveal the sociologists’ strong curiosity about and their potential anxiety over the inner spirit of Japanese Americans. They also show how loyal Japanese American subjects were fabricated through their scholarly discourse.

In this examination, I first explain the importance of Chicago sociology in the study of race in the United States, with particular emphasis on Park’s theory, and examine the meaning of Hawaii as an important locus for their scholarly perspective.¹⁷⁴ Then, I analyze Lind’s prewar work on immigrants in Hawaii and his wartime activity at the War Research Laboratory. Finally, I analyze the works that resulted from his wartime research in order to examine how he interpreted the wartime experience of Japanese immigrants. My inquiry will involve particularly close readings of his texts, including some wartime research materials collected by the War Research laboratory. By analyzing the descriptions of Japanese

¹⁷³ Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 80–85.

¹⁷⁴ Lori Pierce also focuses on Chicago sociologists’ study in Hawaii, but she does not discuss the WLR or the function of imperial nationalism. See Lori Pierce, “Creating a Racial Paradise: Citizenship and Sociology in Hawaii,” in *Race and Nation: Ethnic Systems in the Modern World*, ed. Paul R Spickard (New York: Routledge, 2005).

immigrants contained in those materials, I will show on the one hand how their discourse contributed to the formation of a loyal American subject while, on the other hand, revealing how their constructed discourse simultaneously evidences signs of rupture, which it contains within its harmonizing logic.

The Japanese Problem in California

Sidney Gulick was an American missionary in the early twentieth century, especially famous for his work on Japan. He was born into a missionary family, many members of which worked in the Pacific Islands. Like his family, he also joined the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) and started his missionary career. The ABCFM was founded in 1806 in Massachusetts during the era of religious revivals known as the Second Great Awakening, and its aim was to convert the entire world to Christianity. This institution was particularly interested in Asia and the Pacific and spread its missionary work to India, Ceylon, and China. Since 1869 the ABCFM had dispatched its missionaries to Japan. By the time Gulick arrived in Japan in 1888, it already had ninety-four missionaries, with stations in eight locations where it established schools.¹⁷⁵

In Japan, Gulick not only performed missionary activities but also published books about Japanese culture and taught at Doshisha University. As is well known, Gulick was interested in evolutionary theory around this time, which as he interpreted it was compatible with Christian theology. This view finds in the process of evolution “proof of comprehensive purpose of the Divine Creator,” allowing him to interpret the converts’ “progress to a higher level of civilization” with Christian theology.¹⁷⁶ In 1903, Gulick published *The Evolution of*

¹⁷⁵ Taylor, *Advocate of Understanding*, 19.

¹⁷⁶ Taylor, *Advocate of Understanding*, 42–43.

the Japanese, in which he analyzed the recent modernization of Japan. He finds the true explanation of Japan's rise in its ability to react to the new environment and work along "the line of true evolution."¹⁷⁷ In other words, Gulick presupposed a certain line of social development as an authentic way, which Japan followed. This book, based on the perspective of modernization theory, received international attention and went to five editions. In this way, when he was in Japan, Gulick's activity was not limited to missionary work. After working more than twenty years in Japan, he returned to his home country in 1913.

When Gulick came back to the United States, antipathy against Japanese immigrants had become intense on the West Coast. In the United States, the exclusion movement against Asians had existed since the nineteenth century. A representative policy was the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, but Japanese migration to the US mainland had not yet reached its highest level. However, after the Japanese victory over Russia in 1905, the "yellow peril" invoked stronger antipathy against and fear of Japanese immigrants. As we saw in the previous chapter, this exclusion movement led to the enactment of a series of California Alien Land laws, finally culminating in the Exclusion Act of 1924. Meanwhile, the Japanese immigrant community had tried to counteract this trend by organizing moral reform movements. As Kobayashi's social reform practices demonstrated, immigrant leaders such as the members of the Japanese Association of America and the Interdenominational Japanese Evangelistic Board tried to improve the situation. Japanese (immigrant) leaders were not, however, the only groups who attempted to improve the Japanese immigrants' situation. Some liberal American leaders also responded to this problem and collaborated with Japanese leaders to fight against the exclusion movement. Gulick was one of the central figures in this American effort.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 45.

When the land problem emerged in the 1910s and the exclusion movement intensified, Gulick played a leading role among American liberals in the battle against the movement. The author of a biography of Kobayashi Masuke described his importance to the Japanese immigrant community:

Since the emergence of the land problem in California, it is a professor at Doshisha University, Dr. Sidney Gulick, who engaged most seriously in most effective activity among American religious activists in order to solve the Japan-US problem. The Evangelical Board encouraged people to read the translation of his book *The American Japanese Problem*.¹⁷⁸

As these remarks clearly show, Gulick was working in the context of Kobayashi's social reform practices, which I examined in the previous chapter. According to the historian Roger Daniels, Gulick was a "mass movement all by himself."¹⁷⁹ He was an executive secretary, an organizer of the National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation, a secretary of the Committee on American-Japanese Relations, and a representative of the Commission on Relations with Japan of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. In January 1915 Gulick even traveled to Japan in order to exchange opinions on the immigrant problem. He also published more than twenty books and pamphlets between 1914 and 1924. Among those books, *The American Japanese Problem* was the one which set forth his basic position.

Gulick started this book by analyzing the confrontation between Americans and Asians. Gulick thought that this problem grew out of the differences between the American and Asian civilizations. He showed a typical oppositional articulation of these two civilizations:

From the American point of view, everything in Asiatic civilization goes by opposites. Their language, logic, science, and medicine are folly to us and ours to them; their

¹⁷⁸ Yamamuro, *Zaibei dōhō no senkaku Kobayashi Masasuke den*, 48–49.

¹⁷⁹ Roger Daniels, *The Politics of Prejudice, the Anti-Japanese Movement in California, and the Struggle for Japanese Exclusion*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962), 79.

morals are often our crimes and their religion our superstitions. Many of their national and family customs, political, scientific, and philosophical conceptions, and moral and religious convictions are dramatically opposed to ours.¹⁸⁰

Referring to the famous Kipling lines “Oh East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,” Gulick associated this topic with problems arising between the East and the West all around the world. However, he hoped that, in this “new era of human history,” mutual relationships would fare well and suggested instead that “the West needs the East as the East needs the West.”¹⁸¹

Gulick also explained that there was a misunderstanding of the situation in the case of California. For example, there were arguments about the undesirability of Japanese immigrants for economic, political, and moral reasons, but he emphasized that those were based on misunderstandings of actual facts or a misinterpretation of immigrants’ practices. He even mentioned the effort by the Japanese side to solve the problem. The promotion of internal discipline by the Japanese Association of America and the International Denominational Evangelistic Board is one example of such an effort.¹⁸² This also reveals the context of Japanese immigrant social reform activity, which we reviewed in the previous chapter.

However, these explanations were not enough because there still remained a problem: the “assimilability” of Japanese immigrants. Gulick characterized this as “the storm-center” of the problem of Japanese immigrants. According to him, those who denied Japanese assimilability emphasized that the Japanese were very different from them.¹⁸³ However, Gulick paid attention to the source of this difference. Here, he tried to separate two types of

¹⁸⁰ Gulick, *The American Japanese Problem*, 4.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 8-9.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, See chapter 6.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 118.

difference. The first one involves the biological or physiological “character,” while the other involves the social character:

So-called race characters, then, fall into two groups, the physiological and the psychological; the former are transmitted by biological and the latter by social heredity, whereas biological heredity takes place automatically and entirely unconsciously, by vital processes, and is probably completed in the case of each individual at the moment of conception, certainly not later than birth; social heredity may possibly begin before birth but reaches its maximum activity during childhood—doubtless before the child reaches its tenth year—but continues on into adult life.¹⁸⁴

The important fact is that Gulick thought that “social heredity” made up the difference between Japanese and Americans.¹⁸⁵ According to him, “social heredity” works through conscious and unconscious imitation and becomes subject to human control. Therefore, he could talk about the assimilability of Japanese immigrants. In this way, Gulick created a logic for justifying the assimilation of Asian populations into US society.

What then is the status of Japan in this “Eastern” civilization? As I mentioned at the beginning of this dissertation, Gulick regarded the confrontation of East and West as a phenomenon of a new era of human history. Behind this he identified the awakening of the “Orient” as in China, India, Persia and Turkey. However, among those countries, he gave Japan the highest marks. He regarded Japan as a leader of this new Orient because this country taught all Asia the “secret of progress and of independence.”¹⁸⁶

Meanwhile he also mentioned the privileged status of the United States. In saying that there was a “new America,” he explained that America was now an international power

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 123.

¹⁸⁵ Interestingly, he deplored interracial marriage at this point. As we will see later, he eventually found new possibilities in this type of contact as well.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 203.

and its national responsibilities were enormous.¹⁸⁷ As a result, in the contemporary situation, both Japan and the United States were supposed to play important roles.

From this perspective, Gulick neglected the histories of colonialism entirely. While he accepted Japan's absorption of Korea, he himself did not criticize US expansions into Hawaii or the Philippines. He affirmed them.¹⁸⁸ He seemed to consider as natural a scenario in which the advanced country guided the supposedly backward one. This is a typical pattern of missionary discourse and is a logic with which he was able to explain the importance of solving the immigrant problem in the United States.

In this way, Gulick signified the encounter between Americans and the Japanese in the context of the world historical situation. As we saw in the previous chapter, such a harmonizing logic was also found in Japanese intellectual discourses of the time. Thus, both Japanese and liberal American intellectuals tried to narrativize the race problem of Japanese immigrants in the United States as a symbolic history of this civilizational encounter. Furthermore, when we put the supportive arguments regarding Japanese immigrants from both sides together, we find a structure that supports the imperial practices of both countries. Much like Gulick's argument, Japanese harmony theory (*Chōwa ron*) also neglected Japanese colonial invasions. It was even used to celebrate the Japanese people's ability to involve many Asian races as members of its empire. Therefore, both discourses could support their respective imperial practices. At this point, we learn how intellectuals in both empires created a complicit relationship in their approach to the problems of Japanese immigrants.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 203.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 269–270.

The Creation of a New American Race

After publishing *The American Japanese Problem*, Gulick continued to support Japanese immigrants. Although the enforcement of the Exclusion Act in 1924 damaged the relationship between Japan and the United States, Gulick still tried to improve the situation.¹⁸⁹ However, as the Japanese empire invaded Asia, the tension between the two empires grew, and it was difficult to maintain the complicity which Gulick's works had supported. Gulick's later work reflected this changing situation. In 1937, he published another book which also treated race problems. However, this time he wrote not about California but about racial mixing in Hawaii. This book is interesting in many ways, but the most important point is his way discussing Japanese immigrants in Hawaii. By analyzing this situation, we can see how the relationship between the two empires influenced the construction of a multi-racial or multi-ethnic empire in the late 1930s.

Gulick summarizes his argument the foreword to his book:

Hawaii is a land of many wonders. But the most striking of them all is its people. Here are some 400,000 men, women and children, of many races, languages, social traditions and varieties of moral and religious ideals, living together in remarkable harmony. Here a poly-racial, poly-chrome, poly-linguistic, poly-religious and thoroughly heterogeneous population is being transformed into a homogeneous people, speaking a common language—English—holding common political, ethical, social and religious ideas and ideals, putting into practice with remarkable success the principles of racial equality, and maintaining a highly effective, democratic form of government.¹⁹⁰

First he indicated that Hawaii was a place where you could find a diverse or, in his words, a “thoroughly heterogeneous population.” Actually, he later mentioned popular descriptions of Hawaii as an “ethnological museum,” “a social laboratory,” and “a storehouse of racial

¹⁸⁹ Regarding Gulick's activity after 1924, see this book, Izumi Hirobe, *Japanese Pride, American Prejudice: Modifying the Exclusion Clause of the 1924 Immigration Act* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2001). However, this book does not explore Gulick's analysis of race relations in Hawaii and its implication.

¹⁹⁰ Gulick, *Mixing the Races in Hawaii*, v.

dynamite.” However, what Gulick wanted to emphasize in this book was the new phenomenon that was happening within that heterogeneous population. That is the transformation of the heterogeneity of that population into a certain degree of homogeneity; what was emerging within this transformation was, according to him, a “new race.”

Based on his argument, this new race of Hawaiians was created by various racial, historical, educational, political, social and religious factors. Therefore, most of this book was devoted to explaining those factors. However, here I focus on how Gulick signified that homogeneous category and, thereafter, the reason he had to do so. In that sense, it is important that he regarded the characteristics of the new race which emerged from a heterogeneous population as distinctly “American.” He said that the physiological characteristics of this new race would be a mixture of Hawaiians, Caucasians, and Asiatics. This means that “American” cannot be defined by biological race or geographic origin. At this point, he referred to the arguments of famous anthropologists which appeared in the *New York Times*:

The eminent anthropologists, Professors Boaz of Columbia and Hooten of Harvard, lecturing recently on the characteristics of an “American,” agree, as summarized in the *New York Times*, that “He is not blond or dark. He is not tall or short. He is not German or Irish, French or Italian, Jewish or British. He is a man who has been woven into the American social fabric, who thinks as his fellow citizens do about accepted institutions, government, morality, honor, and who conducts himself as they do. By his deeds he is to be judged—not by his looks or geographic origin.”¹⁹¹

The title of this *New York Times* article is “What is an American?” and it summarizes the addresses on race delivered by Franz Boas and Earnest Hooton in 1936. The main argument of the article was advanced to oppose eugenic ideas that presuppose racial purity and try to decide which race is superior. As an example of such eugenicists, this article mentions

¹⁹¹ Ibid.,v. The original article comes from the *New York Times*, May 3, 1936.

Lothrop Stoddard and Madison Grant, who suggested the superiority of the “Nordic type.” Contrary to them, the author of this article emphasized that we were all mongrel races and that it was difficult to tell precisely what a race was. He then suggested that we should lay less stress on race and more on “culture.”¹⁹² Therefore, as the quotation above indicates, this article posits “deeds” as an important point of reference by which people can judge whether a person is American or not, deflecting primary importance from physical characters.

Although it is not clear how closely Gulick followed the discussions of anthropologists such as Boas or Hooton, it is helpful for us to pay attention to contemporary anthropological works because some of them addressed similar topics. For instance, in the same year, Boas published an article which addressed the effects of the American environment on immigrants. In this article, the plasticity of the organism or, in other words, the problem of hereditary determination of personality, became a point at issue, and Boas actually admitted that the human organism, while genetically determined, was modified by outer influences. He also referred to the importance of culture in determining how this plastic organism would follow in its physiological, mental and social behavior.¹⁹³

When we examine Boas’s articles of the time, it is important to consider that he was counteracting the scientific racism of Nazi Germany in the 1930s.¹⁹⁴ His criticism of hereditary determination in this article also might be related to combating such racism. Yet, when we consider the theories of race proposed by Boas as well as Gulick’s reference to them, we have to be mindful of the limits of its critical perspective because they could also

¹⁹² *New York Times*, May 3, 1936

¹⁹³ Franz Boas, “The Effects of American Environment on Immigrants and Their Descendants,” *Science*, no. 84 (1936): 522–25.

¹⁹⁴ Regarding his attempt to counter the Nazi German racial propaganda, see, Marshall Hyatt, *Franz Boas, Social Activist: The Dynamics of Ethnicity* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990).

be used to advocate for the assimilation of immigrants based on social plasticity. Actually, the conclusion of the article can be interpreted in that way.

Boas's main concern in the article was immigrants from Europe such as Italians, the Irish, and Germans, but interestingly he also mentioned the case of Japanese immigrants in Hawaii. He referred to the Japanese immigrants' case when he examined environmental influence on bodily proportions. Relying on a report which showed corresponding changes among Japanese born in Hawaii, he admitted that new environments can lead to physical changes. Here Boas edited a report written by an American physical anthropologist, Harry L. Shapiro.¹⁹⁵ Actually, in 1939 Shapiro published his book on the study of the physical characteristics of Japanese immigrants in Hawaii and the effects of the environment.¹⁹⁶ The important thing is that anthropological discourse regarding immigrants' transformation already involved the case of Japanese immigrants in Hawaii. Although Gulick did not mention Shapiro's work, his book was produced with this situation in mind and it was no wonder that he mentioned the anthropologists' argument in the forward of his book.

Compared with contemporary anthropological works, Gulick's explanation of the transformation of immigrants mentioned many more aspects. He tried to show the emergence of a new race not only from a social and political perspective but also from a physiological and psychological perspective. In that sense, he tried to integrate all of aspects of these perspectives into his analysis. According to Gulick, any change in such aspects showed us that a homogeneous new human type, which he called the "Neo-Hawaiian American Race,"

¹⁹⁵ Boas, "The Effects of American Environment on Immigrants and Their Descendants," 522.

¹⁹⁶ Harry L Shapiro and Frederick S Hulse, *Migration and Environment; a Study of the Physical Characteristics of the Japanese Immigrants to Hawaii and the Effects of Environment on Their Descendants*, (London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1939).

was forthcoming.¹⁹⁷ However, what are the implications of calling this new race “American,” and what is the significance of his argument in the context of contemporaneous international politics?

At this point, it is important to understand which racial groups Gulick wanted to examine in his book. When examining the mixing of races in Hawaii, he was concerned with various racial groups such as Hawaiians, Portuguese, Chinese, and Filipinos. However, what he was really concerned with was the existence of Japanese immigrants in Hawaii. It is true that a huge percentage of the population of Hawaii consisted of Japanese immigrants at that time, and, in that sense, it is no wonder that he focused his attention mostly on them. However, there is another concern he showed in this book, which is an anxiety about the possible war between Japan and the United States. At the beginning of this book, he mentions the “alleged menace of Asiatics”:

Viewed from the political angle there are those who see in the large numbers of Asiatics in Hawaii, and especially in the Japanese, a menace to the interests and the welfare of the rest of the population and a threat to the policies and ambitions of the great American Republic. “On the surface,” said a lady, “all looks fair and promising. But once you really get under the surface you will find that the 150,000 Japanese in these islands are cherishing the dream that some time—perhaps not so far distance—Hawaii will be added to Japan’s expanding Empire. These Japanese in our midst are a menace. They are not to be trusted. Provision must be made for dealing with them in our plans for national defense.”¹⁹⁸

Immediately after this paragraph, expressing an opposing point of view, Gulick introduces the opinions shared by “intelligent persons” and “old-time residents.” They argued that a majority of Japanese in Hawaii were quite content with the present situation. By introducing this point of view, he tried to assuage anxiety about the menace of Asiatics. Nevertheless, the very occurrence of this discussion shows us that this topic was of general concern to many

¹⁹⁷ Gulick, *Ibid.*, vi.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.

people. He repeats this concern many times in the book, implying that Gulick himself could not eliminate his own anxiety. He even predicted the possibility of internment in case of war with Japan:

The most serious menace to the wholesome political development of the Neo-Hawaiian-American race lies in the relations of the United States and Japan. Should the strain in those relations develop to a point where war looms ominously and obviously above the horizon, martial law would probably be promptly declared, general civil rights be abrogated and a large section of the population—Hawaiian-born Japanese no less than alien Japanese—might be subjected to humiliating suspicion and, quite likely, to deportation to huge concentration camps on one of the smaller islands.¹⁹⁹

Actually, at this point, the problem of racism and the question of loyalty coalesced into a critical topic, and the figure of two competing empires appeared.

As an “advocate of understanding” between Japan and the United States, Gulick had tried to support Japanese immigrants and prove their assimilability into US society. However, what this book revealed is concern about the possible betrayal of such Japanese immigrants, and he clearly indicated that the reason for this was racism in US society.

In his book, Gulick regards racial prejudice as an obstacle to the development of a homogeneous population from such a heterogeneous population, but racial prejudice was an important problem for Gulick not simply because it prevented minorities from being integrated into society, but also because that minority group was possibly the enemy of American empire.²⁰⁰ If the United States failed to deal with them properly, it would not only produce disloyal members in their territory, but also lose legitimacy as an empire. In the book Gulick was also concerned with how racial prejudice against Japanese immigrants in the United States influenced the competing relationship between two empires:

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 206.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 189.

The expression of race prejudice which has most deeply affected the Japanese is the Asiatic Exclusion Law adopted by Congress in 1924. To an extent that few Americans realize it embittered the entire Japanese race. It has given to Japanese militarists and jingoists in Japan a powerful ground of appeal to the masses. America's wanton, unilateral, ungentlemanly abrogation of the Gentleman's Agreement for the regulation of immigration to the United States, largely shattered Japan's confidence in America's moral idealism. It no doubt had much to do with her re-assertion of her Asiatic Monroe Doctrine, with her unilateral abrogation of various international treaties and with her high-handed procedures in China.²⁰¹

Here, Gulick indicates the relationship between Japanese policy in the 1930s and the exclusionary act of 1924. He then shows how this affected Hawaiian-born Japanese youth:

For a few years Hawaiian-born Japanese youth did not appear to have been particularly affected by these various political events. These youth, however, are beginning to discover that although they are loyal American citizens they are not fully treated or regarded as such, and are more or less under suspicion especially when they go to the mainland. Propaganda from Japan, moreover, is also said to be instilling into their minds the resentments and the national pride that are now so rampant in Japan. America little appreciates the injury to inter-national and inter-racial relations still being done by that utterly needless expression of race prejudice.²⁰²

Now, we can think about the significance of this text in terms of the contemporaneous imperial competition across the Pacific. Gulick starts his book in a very optimistic and positive tone and also concludes with hope for a bright future for "The Paradise of the Pacific" and the emergence of a "new human type."²⁰³ However, as we have seen, what is also present in this text is anxiety over the possible betrayal of the loyalty of Japanese immigrants. As a result, this text evinces tension within its description of immigrants. In fact, by inventing a new homogeneous category, the Neo-Hawaiian-American-race, Gulick created a separation between people of the US empire and those of the Japanese empire. In other words, he drew a line through the "heterogeneous population" in Hawaii. That is why

²⁰¹ Ibid., 191.

²⁰² Ibid., 191.

²⁰³ Ibid., 212.

he often mentioned the loyalty of Japanese immigrants in Hawaii. He even quoted the patriotic resolution adopted by the Ninth Annual Conference of the New Americans held in Honolulu, which expressed “the undivided allegiance and loyalty” of second-generation Japanese.²⁰⁴ In this way, he tried to erase Hawaii’s heterogeneity and create a multi-racial but homogeneous category. Therefore, we can interpret his text as an example of the integrative project of a multi-racial empire.

In this way, Gulick’s discourse and activity shows how a representative American liberal leader anticipated the emergence of a new nation from racial/ethnic contacts, particularly through the situation of Japanese immigrants. Gulick is regarded as an important supporter of Japanese immigrants, but he also had to find a logical justification for the presence of those immigrants within the same nation. He finally found it at the forefront of the American empire as an emerging new race. At the same time, his analysis did not analyze the loyalty of Japanese immigrants there and, even if Gulick already perceived the potential threat of the Japanese imperialist ideology, the question of loyalty had not yet actualized as an urgent security concern. However, following the attack on Pearl Harbor, the loyalty of Japanese immigrants became a crucial issue. This eventuality generated an important theme: what was the relationship between this American incorporative discourse and Japanese American subject formation during the war?

In order to pursue this question, I turn to another group of intellectuals in the United States. I do this because the development of a discourse focused on multi-ethnic nation formation was not initiated by missionaries alone. Academic knowledge productions also contributed to this discourse. In fact, in the case of Japanese immigrants in Hawaii and on the American West Coast, American social scientists had in the 1920s begun playing a more and

²⁰⁴ Ibid., 97.

more important role in the analysis of immigrant behaviors and their *inner spirit*. Scholarly investigation of Japanese immigrants continued (or rather intensified) during the war and in the end contributed to the creation of an incorporative narrative. Furthermore, this academic discourse generated the model of minority subjectivity that was expected during the war and gave additional insight into American imperial subject formations.

Chicago Sociology and the Analysis of the “Oriental” Race

In the United States, the University of Chicago was the first school to introduce sociology as an academic field and it became famous for graduate-level sociological education in the early twentieth century.²⁰⁵ The so-called Chicago school is famous for its urban sociology, but its analysis of race relations, better known as assimilation theory, has also been influential. The main protagonist of the Chicago school was Robert Ezra Park, who is recognized as one of the early founders of Chicago sociology and who trained many students there. He completed many sociological studies, but rose to prominence with the invention of an assimilation theory, called the “interaction cycle” or the “race relations cycle.”

In the 1910s and 1920s, he developed a model of racial or intergroup relations that provided an important schema with which many sociologists analyzed contemporary situations such as immigrant flows and racial discrimination. Using this theory, he focused primarily on the assimilation of immigrants and various races in the United States. According to *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, this cycle is composed of four stages: competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation.²⁰⁶ Over the course of these stages, assimilation is supposed to be gradually achieved and racial discrimination is expected to be

²⁰⁵See, Faris, *Chicago Sociology, 1920–1932*.

²⁰⁶ Robert Ezra Park and E. W Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology, Including the Original Index to Basic Sociological Concepts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), 507.

overcome. In Park's view, this theory seemed to sufficiently explain the assimilation of European immigrants into American society.

However, for a scholar using this interaction circle scheme, the problem was that there were groups of people who could not proceed to the assimilation step of the cycle. "Orientals" were examples of such groups, and Park had been involved in the Survey of Race Relations in the 1920s and maintained his interest in "Orientals" even after the research was completed.

The Survey of Race Relations is known as the beginning of American social scientific interest in "Orientals." Financially supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, this research was conducted by missionaries and American sociologists in order to study the situation of "Orientals" on the U.S. West Coast where anti-Japanese sentiment was running high. Park was chosen as research director and he affirmed the assimilability of the Japanese immigrants.²⁰⁷

After the dissolution of this survey around the mid-1920s, the teamwork of missionaries and sociologists, who joined forces in joint knowledge production, continued in Hawaii. While the missionary members of the research team created the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) in Hawaii, many Chicago sociologists visited Hawaii and researched race relations and the situation of immigrants there.

In the early twentieth century, eugenics and biological racism in the United States were on the rise, but Park focused more on subjective aspects such as consciousness or awareness as a basis for understanding racial conflicts.²⁰⁸ As we saw in the previous section, this transition in the focus of race studies from a biological difference to the role of

²⁰⁷ Yu, *Thinking Orientals.*, Ch.1.

²⁰⁸ Robert Ezra Park, "The Nature of Race Relations," in *Race Relations and the Race Problem, a Definition and an Analysis.*, ed. Edgar T Thompson (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1939), 3.

consciousness was not unique to Park's sociology and parallel movements existed in U.S. academia such as in Franz Boas's anthropology.²⁰⁹ However, diverging from progressive works on racial problems, Park's work connected the problem of racial difference to his sociological analysis of modern social formation. In particular, the mobility and experience of city life were very important to Park's understanding of racial consciousness.

For Park, mobility, like migration and movement, was a characteristic of the modern world, which was caused by technological development. He particularly emphasized the importance of mobility in modern society by referring to Ferdinand J. Toennies's famous book *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (Community and Society).²¹⁰ In that work, Toennies associated the pair *Gemeinschaft / Gesellschaft* with what he termed a sacred/secular society. A sacred society is a small, isolated community in which everyone is bound to one another, and is characterized by immobility. Examples of this include a family, a clan, and a religious sect. By contrast, mobility is a characteristic of a secular society. A good example of such a society is a market in which people get together not because of a primary bond or collective action but because of their differences and their individual interests. Then, cities become the ideal environment for modern life.²¹¹ For Park, cities were sites where people who were moving and migrating from isolated communities got together. On the other hand, his concern for mobility and the experience of the city was closely connected with the problem of race consciousness. In his theory, cities were not only sites where people from diverse backgrounds migrated and mingled, but also places where they became race conscious.

²⁰⁹ Fred H Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977), 160.

²¹⁰ Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community & Society (Gemeinschaft Und Gesellschaft)* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1957).

²¹¹ Robert Ezra Park, "The Problem of Cultural Differences," in *Race and Culture*. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950), 11.

Such theoretical interests were related to the Chicago sociologists' later interest in Hawaii. At this point, it is important to note that when Park analyzed the modern social formation and race consciousness, he approached it from a global perspective. For example, he found that a phenomenon similar to race consciousness among the American "Negros" could be found around the world. In his article of 1914, he argued that there was a similarity between the growing self-consciousness of "Negro(s)" and the European nationalist movement. According to Park, "a nationality, in its narrower sense, may be defined as the racial group which has attained self-consciousness, no matter whether it has at the same time gained political independence or not."²¹²

Moreover, the increase in mobility and the diversification of city life were phenomena that had expanded to a global level. According to Park, the seed of the present civilization could be found in Greece, from where it gradually expanded to the rest of Europe and eventually spread to the United States. What he calls "civilization" comprises the "movement and migration of people, the expansion of trade and commerce," a "vast melting pot of races and cultures," and "the metropolitan cities." This movement loosens local bonds and destroys tribal cultures to be replaced, in Park's view, with the freedom of cities and rational organization.²¹³ This expansionist model explained the emergence of new metropolitan cities that circled the world like a "girdle": "San Francisco, Yokohama, Shanghai, Hong Kong, Colombo, Bombay, Marseilles, London, and New York."²¹⁴ Hawaii was also involved in this global increase in mobility. In the introduction to Andrew Lind's first book, Park also explained Hawaii's place along the global thoroughfare:

²¹² Robert E Park, "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups With Particular Reference to the Negro," *Am J Sociol American Journal of Sociology* 19, no. 5 (1914), 622.

²¹³ Robert E Park, "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *Amerjsoci American Journal of Sociology* 33, no. 6 (1928): 889–90.

²¹⁴ Park, "The Nature of Race Relations," 41.

Honolulu is one of the minor cities on the great encircling highway which connects Europe and the United States with the rest of the world. . . . The result is that in Hawaii, where all the people of the world have come together in an association more intimate than is possible in regions less insular and less isolated by surrounding seas, the processes of assimilation and acculturation, characteristic of port cities and metropolitan communities elsewhere, have been going on at a rate that has made the Islands the most notable instance of a melting-pot of the modern world.²¹⁵

Although he acknowledged the emergence of nationalist movements all over the world and international movements such as Pan-Africanism that were based on racial consciousness, he held a positive view of civilization and the accommodation of the various races.

This expansionist model ran parallel to the worldwide version of the “interaction cycle.” In his 1926 article, Park mentioned the importance of Hawaii from that perspective. According to him, because of the continuous expansion of international commerce, communication and politics, “race relations have ceased to be a domestic problem.” Now racial and national consciousness had emerged all over the world, but they were supposed to lead to a melting pot. For him, the direction of the “interaction cycle” was irreversible and antagonism toward Japanese or Chinese immigrants in the contemporary United States was also supposed to be overcome in the near future. In this context, Hawaii became a symbol of such an idealized melting pot. Park wrote that, “in the Hawaiian Islands, where all the races of the Pacific meet and mingle on more liberal terms than they do elsewhere, the native races are disappearing and new peoples are coming into existence.”²¹⁶ For his analysis of race relations, Hawaii indicated the possible direction in which race relations were moving.

Andrew W. Lind and the War Research Laboratory in Hawaii

²¹⁵ Andrew William Lind, *An Island Community; Ecological Succession in Hawaii* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1938), xiii–xiv.

²¹⁶ Robert E Park, “Our Racial Frontier on the Pacific,” *Survey Graphic*, no. 9 (1926): 196.

In Hawaii, since the Chicago-trained sociologist Romanzo Colfax Adams (1868–1942) became the first professor of sociology at the University of Hawaii in the 1920s, Chicago-trained sociologists played an important role in research on race relations. Among the works produced by students mentored by Park, the series of writings by Andrew W. Lind are of particular importance. These works exemplify how the research of Chicago sociologists on “Orientals” led to support for the integration of minority populations during the war. Lind studied sociology with Park and received a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. He started his research in Hawaii in 1927, and, after Adams retired, he became the chair of the Department of Sociology at the University of Hawaii in 1934. Lind’s dissertation, published in 1937, was entitled *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii*, and the introduction was written by Park. This work is an ecological study of Hawaiian racial succession from Cook’s “discovery” up to the time of the study’s publication. The book traces the shift from the subsistence economy of the native Hawaiians to the capitalist plantation system.

According to Lind, such an economic transformation necessarily requires population movement. For example, while the plantation system recruits laborers from all over the world, movement away from plantations and into vocational work also occurs. In that process, people struggle for economic position and status. For Lind, occupational succession is an integral factor in the intensification of race prejudice, because economic rivalries between races often appear in the process of competition. However, following the theory of race relations cycle, this prejudice should have been overcome. According to Lind, race prejudice emerges as a defense mechanism in competition, and racial barriers are temporarily effective in resolving conflicts. Ultimately, it is supposed to reach the final stage of that cycle:

assimilation and amalgamation.²¹⁷ In addition to this optimistic analysis, Lind also indicated that there was only a “slight manifestation of racial feeling in Hawaii,” because of the “continuing abundance of occupational opportunity.”²¹⁸

For those reasons, Lind arrived at an optimistic conclusion about race relations in Hawaii. Touching upon the emerging racially hybrid population, Lind confirmed that Hawaii was indeed a “racial melting pot of the Pacific.” He particularly referred to Romanzo Adams’s work on intermarriage in Hawaii and introduced his argument that a distinct “new race” had emerged there.²¹⁹ He argued, therefore, that through dramatic changes in Hawaii, such as the “deepening penetration of the Western money economy,” which he called a “capitalistic civilization,” and the import of a diversity of alien people, “an Island commonwealth” had finally come into being.²²⁰

Lind’s narrative shares some important points with Park’s argument. First, both have optimistic views of “capitalistic civilization” or modernization. For them, the expansion of the capitalist economy was irreversible and its violent process was not to be critically examined. For example, they felt the history of U.S. colonization of Hawaii was not a matter that required serious consideration. Second, that expansion process was a one-way street, as exemplified by calling it the “Western” economy. When Park discussed American culture, he contrasted the Occident and the Orient in terms of mobility. According to Park, while “the soul of the East” is repose, “the genius of the West” is action. He especially defines the outstanding characteristic of American life in terms of its extraordinary mobility. To him, this mobility was an important aspect of the modern world that is peculiarly characteristic of

²¹⁷ Lind, *An Island Community; Ecological Succession in Hawaii*, 268.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 269.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 304–5. Here he is talking about Romanzo Colfax Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1937).

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 316.

the Occident, not the Orient. Thus the unchanging characteristic of the East is contrasted with the mobility of the West.²²¹ Based on this contrast, the civilizing process becomes one of expansion of “the West” to other countries. Lind also repeated this form of narrative. Within this framework, when compared with the Occident, the Orient was supposed to play a more passive role.

In this way, using the theoretical tools of Chicago sociology, Lind all too easily established a certain view of Hawaii’s “race relations.” However, it was after the Pacific War began that his study of race relations became tightly intertwined with the destiny of Japanese immigrants/Americans in Hawaii.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941, the territorial governor immediately declared martial law and a military government was formed. In this particular circumstance, Lind developed his research on race relations by collaborating with the military government. Lind first engaged in cooperation with the Moral Section. This unit originally functioned under the Liaison Division, Territorial Office of Civilian Defense, from December 18, 1941 to January 26, 1942 and then was established as the Moral Section of the Office of the Military Governor.²²² The objective of this section was “to sustain community morale and national unity” as a bridge between the military authorities and racial and national groups. Among its many functions, it also claimed that it would strengthen the “spirit of inter-racial harmony that has long been the outstanding characteristic of Hawaii.”²²³

²²¹ Park, “The Problem of Cultural Differences,” 9.

²²²Memorandum of the Moral Section, April 14, 1942, Andrew Lind Papers, Box 17, Morale Committee File, Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory (RASRL) Records, University of Hawai’i at Manoa Library.

²²³ Memorandum of Public Moral Section, Tentative Consideration, Andrew Lind Papers, Box 17, Morale Committee File.

From the beginning, Lind joined this section as a member of the Advisory Committee, in which various issues relating to public morale were discussed.²²⁴ What Lind was really concerned about was the situation of Japanese immigrants/Americans. For example, in the memo to the director of the Moral Section, Charles F. Loomis, on December 19, 1941, Lind described how feelings of dismay and fear dominated among second-generation Japanese and, referring to the opinion of a Nisei leader, he mentioned the immigrants' withdrawal from the community. He also offered possible solutions to the ongoing confusion, ranging from equal distribution of jobs to the establishment of a civilian advisory council.²²⁵ As this document shows, he was in close contact with the wartime government in its early phases, and his sociological analysis of the immigrant population became an important tool for the islands' governance.

As chair of the sociology department, Lind tried to mobilize the resources of the University of Hawaii. Following the beginning of the Pacific war in December 1941, the University of Hawaii, like other institutions in the Territory, had to adjust to the new situation. After it reopened in February 1942, two members of the sociology department, Lind and Bernard L. Hörmann, hoped to reduce the number of academic programs because of the urgency of research needs. Since the objective of the Moral Section appealed to the sociology faculty of the University of Hawaii, they tried to support it as much as possible.²²⁶ However, as research on the ongoing situation continued, it demanded more of their time and resources until they concluded that they needed to be released from full teaching

²²⁴ Progress Report 1, Dec 28, 1941, War Research Laboratory Record, Box 2, RASRL Records, University of Hawai'i at Manoa Library

²²⁵ Memo, Andrew Lind to Mr. Charles F. Loomis, December 19, 1941, Andrew Lind Papers, Box 17, Morale Committee File, RASRL Records, University of Hawai'i at Manoa Library.

²²⁶ Memo, Andrew Lind to President Gregg M. Sinclair, July 8, 1942, Andrew Lind Papers, Box 17, Moral Reports, RASRL Records, University of Hawai'i at Manoa Library.

responsibilities. In a memo from July 1942 to Gregg M. Sinclair, the president of the University of Hawaii, Lind explained the significance of the sociological research at that particular historical moment:

Just as the volcanologist hastens to the scene of an eruption in order to observe and record nature's "experiments," the sociologist feels the urge and the obligation to utilize for science the catastrophic outbreaks in social relations. Certainly there are social changes taking place in Hawaii at the present time of a revolutionary character, which, if not observed and recorded now by competent students, will be forever lost to science. No other agency in the community is assuming the responsibility of providing this record, and it would seem that no institution outside of the University is so appropriately fitted to perform the task.²²⁷

In what he called a "revolutionary" moment, Lind saw a precious opportunity to observe momentous sociological "experiments." His sociological interest in the wartime impact on race relations was also shared by Lind's mentor, Robert Park. In terms of collective behavior, Park thought the war would have the "most tremendous effects on" society and men. In his article on the function of war, he hypothesizes that war against "other-groups" was correlative with peace in the "we-group." He even argued that war was the greatest "enterprise in which a nation can emerge."²²⁸ Therefore, in his letter to Lind of August 1942, Park told him that he was concerned with how this war would change the "racial ideology in the United States."²²⁹ This "revolutionary" moment could not be ignored by the race relations scholars.

Lind and his colleague Hörmann were partially relieved from their academic duties in the fall of 1942 in order to conduct part-time research on "civilian morale and race relations." For clerical and research assistance, a sum of \$2,000 was made available by the

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ Robert Ezra Park, "The Social Function of War," in *On Social Control and Collective Behavior. Selected Papers*, ed. Ralph H Turner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 157–63.

²²⁹ Letter, Robert E. Park to Andrew Lind, August 18, 1942, Andrew Lind Papers, Box 13, A W. Lind Correspondence 1940–46, RASRL Records, University of Hawai'i at Manoa Library.

Board of Regents in November 1942. This program continued without interruption throughout the war and was later granted official status as the War Research Laboratory in 1943.²³⁰ The War Research Laboratory, however, was not a pure consequence of the war, nor did the department begin by focusing only on the topic of race relations from this time onwards. Rather, in the 1930s, before the war began, this institution had already been known informally as the Sociology Laboratory. This laboratory emerged from the research conducted by Adams.²³¹ Since then, he had “accumulated and developed a sizable body of data, varied techniques, and numerous studies.”²³² Therefore, there was considerable continuity between wartime research and the Chicago sociologists’ research since the 1920s.

During the spring of 1942, Lind started fieldwork with a small group of volunteer assistants who were students at the University of Hawaii. This research project was gradually expanded, and finally a considerable number of reports and personal documents were made available to the War Research Laboratory. While an annual budget of \$2,500 was allotted for part-time and student assistants in August 1943, it is the existence of the various types of volunteer collaborators which played the most important role in the collection of information. According to Lind, “some eighty former University students and others qualified by interest and position in various professions and racial groups” were scattered over the various islands as informal reporters, and many of them were in the middle and upper strata of society.²³³ For example, he exchanged letters with schoolteachers in Kauai in 1943 and asked them to

²³⁰ Andrew William Lind, “Sociological Studies in Wartime Hawaii,” *Social Process in Hawaii*, no. 9–10 (July 1945): 5–10; Bernhard L. Hörmann, “A Report on the War Research Laboratory in Hawaii,” *American Sociological Review*, no. 10 (February 1945):1–6.

²³¹ Bernhard L Hörmann, “Sociological Research at the University of Hawaii,” *Social Process in Hawaii* 19 (January 1955): 5–12. This institution was renamed Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory in 1955.

²³² Hörmann, “A Report on the War Research Laboratory in Hawaii,” 1.

²³³ Andrew William Lind, *Hawaii’s Japanese, an Experiment in Democracy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1946), 7–8.

report on situations in the community that related particularly to race relations.²³⁴ They also collected many letters from soldiers of Americans of Japanese Ancestry (AJA) to their friends or families, and Lind himself also directly exchanged letters with AJA soldiers in mainland camps or on the European battlefield.²³⁵ Although it was still difficult to get the documents of *Issei* (first-generation Japanese) because of illiteracy and their hesitancy to come forward, the War Research Laboratory quickly accumulated a number of materials which were useful in creating a picture of the mind-set of Japanese Americans.

From Anxiety over the Possible Threat to a Form of Confession

In 1943, in the middle of his wartime research at the laboratory, Lind published a 40-page document, *The Japanese in Hawaii under War Conditions*.²³⁶ This report was submitted by the American Council as a document of the Eighth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations held in Mont Tremblant, Quebec, in 1942.²³⁷ In this report, Lind described the situation of Japanese Americans in Hawaii since Pearl Harbor. When the war began, there were about 160,000 people of Japanese descent in the Territory of Hawaii, accounting for

²³⁴ Letter, Andrew Lind to Yuriko Matsukawa, March 17, 1943 Andrew Lind Papers, Confidential Files, Box 12, RASRL Records, University of Hawai'i at Manoa Library; Letter, Andrew Lind to Kazuichi Hirano, March 17, 1943, Andrew Lind Papers, Confidential Files, Box 12.

²³⁵ See for example Letter, Japanese draftee at Camp McCoy to Chinese girl classmate, July 5, 1942, Andrew Lind Papers, Confidential Files, Box 1, RASRL Records, University of Hawai'i at Manoa Library; Letter, Norito Kawakami at Camp Savage to Andrew Lind, Dec 12, 1943, Andrew Lind Papers, Confidential Files, Box 1.

²³⁶ Andrew William Lind, *The Japanese in Hawaii under War Conditions*, (Honolulu; New York: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943).

²³⁷ The Mont Tremblant conference is famous for its discussion of colonialism among the Allies. That topic was a sore point. In relation to the implications of the Atlantic Charter for Asia and the Pacific, which originally respected the self-determination of colonized people, the British and American groups fiercely confronted each other. In contrast to the American position, which supported decolonization, Churchill refused to apply self-determination in the Atlantic Charter to British colonies. In the same year, Gandhi and Nehru were arrested because of their intensified independence movement in India. Against the criticism of the American group, the British side countered by referring to racial discrimination and concentration camps for the Japanese in North America. According to Tomoko Akami, "It is possible that discussions at the IPR conference may have had some impact on policy-makers." For example, in the next year, the United States promised to relinquish its extraterritoriality in China and abolished discrimination against Chinese immigrants. Tomoko Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific: The United States, Japan, and the Institute of Pacific Relations in War and Peace, 1919-45* (London; New York: Routledge, 2003), 267-70.

almost 35% of the total population. As an American military outpost in the Pacific, Hawaii had prime significance and their “possible threat” to the military effectiveness of the Islands became a big concern.²³⁸

This report starts with the explanation of the prewar situation. Here, while Lind admits that racial feelings had existed among “oriental races” and against the dominant white race, he emphasizes that “local sentiment, expressive in part of the American tradition of toleration and freedom, has consistently frowned upon discrimination on purely racial lines.” He regards this as an “Island ritual of racial equality,” which is confused with “the local Aloha-spirit,” and he claims it had allegedly worked at least prior to the outbreak of the war.²³⁹

After this, Lind analyzes the reactions of Japanese Americans after Pearl Harbor. From the prewar situation to the atmosphere among the immigrants during the war, he closely scrutinizes many variables. Behind the desire to thoroughly understand Japanese Americans, there was anxiety about not entirely grasping what was going on in their minds. For example, Lind mentions one crucial question about the “Japanese in Hawaii”: “are the Japanese loyal?” It was difficult for him to answer this question because “loyalty is a matter of the inner spirit and devotion of men for which there are no wholly infallible or convincing proofs. Even death may be ‘a way out’ or evidence of ‘the last full measure of devotion.’”²⁴⁰ There was a tension between the suspicion of their loyalty and the optimistic affirmation of what he called the “Island ritual of racial equality.” Actually, this topic had been a longstanding concern. Lind writes that “the difficult situation faced by Japanese in Hawaii in the event of a war had been anticipated long before the actual catastrophe occurred. For years,

²³⁸ Lind, *The Japanese in Hawaii under War Conditions*, 1.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 28.

the Nisei in particular had been told that they were ‘on the spot.’”²⁴¹ Even after the war began, “dramatic acts of disloyalty, such as the Niihau incident,” affected the population’s view of Japanese Americans.²⁴²

Despite such a social climate, this report recommended respect for “racial justice and equality.” According to the report, the situation in Hawaii could be described as an “unstable equilibrium,” and one of the contributing factors to the equilibrium was “the Hawaiian tradition of race relations,” which judged people by individuality rather than race.²⁴³

Although this frame of analysis needs more careful consideration, it should not be ignored that this report was made when the “race war” became an important matter between the two countries.

On the one hand, during an anti-Nazi war, racial ideology which praises white men’s superiority should have been critically examined in the United States, but the role of race relations was also crucial in the Asian-Pacific war because the Japanese empire tried to ideologically justify their imperial expansion using the logic of a “race war” between the white race and the non-white race. Therefore, in order to win this war, imperial powers had to seriously face the problem of racism and colonialism. For example, one year after he wrote about his concern for the destiny of American racial ideology in his letter to Lind, Robert Park wrote about the characteristics of this war. According to him, the war between the Axis and the Allies was being redefined. He states: “The war, which began as a struggle for living space between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have-nots,’ has become a struggle between the master-races and the rest of the world. . . . In short, the issues which were economic and

²⁴¹ Ibid., 29.

²⁴² Ibid., 37. The Niihau Incident occurred on December 7, 1941 when a Japanese Zero pilot crash-landed on the Hawaiian island of Niihau. A citizen and an alien of Japanese ancestry gave assistance to the grounded pilot.

²⁴³ Ibid., 37.

political have become racial and cultural.”²⁴⁴ In this article, while mentioning the situation of the “Negro” in the United States, Park expressed strong regret that “the war has changed the nature of the race problem, but it has not changed fundamentally the mind of the American people.”²⁴⁵ Importantly, people thought that the internal problems of race and the international situation were closely connected in this worldwide war. An example of this thinking involved African Americans and the Japanese. As George Lipsitz observed, during World War II there were many signs of African Americans finding “transnational interracial identifications and alliances” with the Japanese people.²⁴⁶

Racial discrimination against Japanese immigrants/Americans was another serious concern. As we have already seen, Sidney Gulick had already expressed his anxiety about the influence of war propaganda from Japan in 1937. After the war began, the ongoing concern with the role of Japanese immigrants/Americans in international racial politics is evidenced by the famous memorandum of a future representative scholar in the field of Area Studies, Edwin O. Reischauer.²⁴⁷ In this memorandum, Reischauer suggested constructing a new racial policy in order to win the ideological war in Asia. Specifically, he recommended the inclusion of large numbers of Japanese Americans in combat units. Here was a struggle for the legitimacy of empire. While the Japanese empire tried to justify its expansion using the logic of a racial war between the white race and non-white races, Reischauer tried to counteract this propaganda by using another one. Reischauer’s memorandum is a good example of the interaction between two empires. In this way, Japanese

²⁴⁴ Robert Ezra Park, “Race Ideologies,” in *American Society in Wartime*, ed. William F Ogburn (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1943), 312.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 315.

²⁴⁶ George Lipsitz, “Frantic to Join...the Japanese Army”: Beyond the Black-White Binary,” in *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998), 185–211.

²⁴⁷ Edwin O. Reischauer, “Memorandum on Policy Towards Japan,” September 14, 1942, See <http://www.iwanami.co.jp/sekai/2000/03/146.html> (accessed June 10,2014)

immigrants/Americans were situated inside the complex racial politics during the war, and the tension within Lind's report can be understood better in this context.

Based on his wartime report, Lind published *Hawaii's Japanese* in 1946. Compared with the shorter wartime report, this book was greatly extended to 250 pages, to reflect the collection of a considerable volume of documents about Japanese immigrants/Americans. According to Lind, the War Research Laboratory collected many private documents, including letters, journals, diaries, and confidential reports. Because of those documents, he thought it was possible to examine "uncensored 'pictures' of the Japanese."²⁴⁸

The basic line of argument in this text did not change. According to Lind, the people's concern with Hawaii during World War II recurred in connection with a longstanding question: "What of the Japanese?" Answers to that question could be broadly divided into two opposing points of view. On the one hand, there was a group that saw in the "Japanese in Hawaii" a "yellow peril." On the other hand, another group of people saw in Hawaii an instance of racial harmony because of the traditional history of treatment of racial minorities.²⁴⁹ Although Lind admits that impressions varied somewhat between those two extreme views, he maintains his belief in traditional racial equality in Hawaii. In particular, in contrast to the discrimination expressed and felt in private, he emphasized the public sentiment of interracial amity, which is what he called the "tradition" of Hawaii. This Hawaiian "tradition" was also associated with American democracy and, thus, Lind concludes that immigrants' "devotion of spirit to American values and ideals" became dominant among "Hawaii's Japanese."²⁵⁰

²⁴⁸ Lind, *Hawaii's Japanese*, 6.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 1-2.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 258.

However, the composition of this text is important for analyzing the possible effect of his textual practice. In this book, the collection of new documents conditioned the characteristics of the text. It is important to note that, in contrast to typical sociological texts, Lind directly inserted many voices of Japanese immigrants/Americans from various sources into his explanation of the wartime situation. The testimonies and quotations from primary sources are sometimes many pages in length. Particularly, the latter half of this book is composed of such collected voices. Regarding this textual transition, we cannot avoid the recurring question of the “inner spirit” of Japanese immigrants/Americans which heavily concerned Lind in his wartime report.

Those voices exhibit a variety of immigrant testimonies, displaying complicated emotional transitions. For example, Lind introduced the voices of *Nisei* who worked for Hawaii’s Territorial Guard and were later rendered inactive in response to the distrust of the community:

To me it seems that all our hopes and aspirations of showing our loyalty so that our posterity could be proud of us were dashed to pieces when we were deprived of any reasonable chance of verifying our verbal declaration. Never in all my life did I feel so bitter, so disappointed and so hopeless as when the discharge papers were handed to us. How can one feel otherwise when he expatriates from the country of his ancestors to which he was a subject by legal formality and tries to become 100% American and further voluntarily enlists in the Army in time of war to sacrifice himself and then is told ‘You are not wanted.’ What country can I now call ‘Mea patria’? I am no longer a subject of Japan. I am an American citizen, but am treated as a despicable outcast.²⁵¹

In this way, Lind portrays Japanese immigrants/Americans as talking about their inner conflict in their own voices. As Lind mentioned in this text, it is difficult for him to answer questions about the loyalty of Japanese immigrants/Americans because that is a matter of “inner spirit.” Now, although he admits that they responded diversely, he claims that he

²⁵¹ Ibid., 147–48.

found positive proof of their “integration” and suggested that, if they were “properly nurtured,” loyal spirits would become dominant.²⁵²

It is interesting, however, that Lind called the verbal statements of Japanese immigrants/Americans during the war, which his research targeted, a form of “religious confession.”²⁵³ As Michael Foucault once argued, confession serves as a “main ritual” for the “production of truth” through the disclosure of its secret interiority and it also produces “men’s subjection.”²⁵⁴ In that sense, *Hawaii’s Japanese* is regarded as a textual practice of confession, the disclosure of the immigrants’ “inner” voice which is supposed to be the hidden “truth.”

Importantly, such strong concern for the immigrant’s interiority had already been found in Lind’s mentor, Park. In his 1926’s text “Behind Our Masks,” Park explained the purpose of the Race Relations Survey by using a rhetorical tool, the “mask.” According to him, our “conventional mask,” often representing a racial type, concealed “the individual man” and created social distance. It is through close personal relationships that we become aware of the “sentiments and passions” of others, that strangers become friends and racial barriers are broken down. Therefore, the purpose of The Survey is also to go beyond the Oriental “masquerade.”²⁵⁵

Park’s strong interest in discovering what was behind the Oriental mask was reflected in his suggestion for the method of The Survey. When Park explained how recording life histories of immigrants provided the most important material for a survey, he suggested it “should be anecdotal, a record of first-hand experience, and like the Padre’s description of a

²⁵² Ibid., 258.

²⁵³ Ibid., 9.

²⁵⁴ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), 58–60.

²⁵⁵ Robert Ezra Park, “Behind Our Masks,” *Survey Graphic*, no. 56 (1926): 135–39.

confession, it should be ‘sudden, bitter, and complete.’”²⁵⁶ To listen to an immigrant’s “confession” as a mode of history is one of the ideal approaches for his study. In such a story, even “bitter” experiences are non-negligible components. Therefore, he reminds researchers not to miss any minute movements of the body and emotional shifts displayed by interviewees:

Interviews should be recorded as far as possible in the language and reflect the accents and emphasis of the person interviewed. . . . Formal language is an imperfect instrument of expression of attitudes, which are only adequately revealed in actual behavior. What one does is always the commentary on what one says. For this reason a record of personal experience, in which action and sentiments are recorded as integral parts of the whole transaction, are the best indices as to what the attitudes actually are.²⁵⁷

In this way, a kind of “closeness” with the subject, which enables the researcher to record “accents” or “sentiments,” plays an important role in Park’s methodology. This point was also considered by Lind. When he explained the methodological approach of *Hawaii’s Japanese*, he admitted that the best resource could be obtained from observers’ having close relationships with Japanese immigrants/Americans. According to Lind, such “extended experience provides the opportunity to penetrate that mask of propriety and convention which all people tend to wear in contact with strangers.” Although Lind simultaneously emphasized the careful and “dispassionate” examination of those materials, he thought this “closeness” made it possible for him to penetrate the “mask.”²⁵⁸ However, this importance of “closeness” does not lead to the dislocation of each social position such as that of the

²⁵⁶ Robert Ezra Park, “Suggestions for a Study of the Oriental Population of the Pacific Coast,” *Journal of Applied Sociology*, no. 8 (1924): 202–3.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 203.

²⁵⁸ Lind, *Hawaii’s Japanese*, 4–5.

researcher and that of his/her subject. The form of confession rather enforces the separation between the two.

Both Park and Lind associated their research with attempts to rip off the mask by way of confession. This symbolic description of their practice is useful for understanding the consequence of the textual practice of Lind's *Hawaii's Japanese*. As I have already explained, Lind tried to approach the inner spirit of Japanese Americans based on several primary sources to capture their voices. It is true that he was not satisfied with judging their loyalty simply on the basis of yes/no answers and paid attention instead to the conflicting situation in which those statements were produced.²⁵⁹ However, there is a relation of power involved in the form of confession itself. The point is how this form of confession is conditioned. Confession is not a general clarification of hidden truth; instead, it has a specific addressee and there is a hierarchical relationship between the addresser and the addressee. Through this ritualistic practice, subjection is established. This specific relationship between the addresser and the addressee is what conditioned Lind's text. In other words, when confession is working, it is important to examine how the presupposition about the right to become the addressee is supposed to be given to certain people, in front of whom the addresser is eager to reveal his/her interiority. This unsymmetrical relationship is, in a concrete sense, described by one of the letters in Lind's collection, which describes the presence of police officers when a Japanese woman was asked to write down her attitude.²⁶⁰ This indicates that her confession was produced in the context of a certain power relationship. However, more symbolic descriptions of the position of Japanese Americans can be found in the letter of a Nisei soldier to Lind. This letter displays a description offered by a colonel:

²⁵⁹ Ibid., 4.

²⁶⁰ Letter, Mrs Take Ogawa, Andrew Lind Papers, Confidential Files, Box 12, RASRL Records, University of Hawai'i at Manoa Library.

He said that we were on trial. That when we came to the mainland we could expect to be treated with discrimination by some people, but that the majority of people would wait to see how we acted before making up their minds about us and that if we restrained ourselves in the beginning, and conducted ourselves as gentlemen, and good citizens that soon the majority would take care of the few Jap haters and would come to accept us as Americans, as contrasted with the Japanese enemy.²⁶¹

Japanese Americans were “on trial.” In this circumstance they were pressured to internalize the majority’s gaze (“wait to see”) and constantly probed about their own inner spirit in order to check whether they were behaving as true Americans. Furthermore, they were expected to externalize their inner spirit to show the sincerity of their loyalty. This is the mechanism of confession as subjection which Foucault analyzed when he concluded that the production of truth is “thoroughly imbued with relations of power.”²⁶²

Given how this discussion has run throughout this dissertation, we cannot ignore the structure of *normalization* that is inherent to this power relationship. When I examined the social reform practices of minority ethnic members in the previous chapter, I demonstrated that those practices contributed to the integration of minority people as a formation of normal subjects. The important mechanism of this structure of normalization or production of the normal subject is that this normality should be internalized. In other words, it is not enough for minorities to obey the rules. They have to embrace them in their *inner selves*. However, in order to prove their loyalty they have to keep demonstrating it as often as asked.²⁶³ The issue of loyalty also requires a similar structure. The confession of loyalty should not be a forced statement. Rather it should be the true manifestation of the *inner voice*. As we have

²⁶¹ Letter, Norito Kawakami to Lind, Dec 12, 1943, Andrew Lind Papers, Confidential Files, Box 1, RASRL Records, University of Hawai’i at Manoa Library.

²⁶² Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 60.

²⁶³ Of course, theoretically this order is totally inverted. The independent *inner self* is produced exactly in this demonstration.

seen, it is at this moment that the model minority subject is formed in the process of imperial nation formation.

Lind tried in his text to describe the emergence of a loyal subject that corresponds with its subjection to the state. With this approach, as already mentioned, Lind confidently predicted the gradual “Americanization of the Japanese” based on a tradition of “inter-racial harmony” in Hawaii.

What then has been left out of the construction of loyal subjects throughout those turbulent years? Lastly, I want to address two additional types of observations from Lind’s text, which open up uncertainties in the middle of an integrative discourse. In *Hawaii’s Japanese*, he cites an anonymous observation on the attitude of *Issei* who were put in a drastically changing situation by World War II. According to this source, they started considering potential informants as collaborators with the F.B.I or the local police and stopped speaking: “They were afraid that whatever they said might be interpreted as something amiss and so they said nothing.”²⁶⁴ Although Lind seemed to imply that *Issei* were hiding their disloyal spirit from censorship, this silence rather turns our attention to the extreme situation in which people could not find their position in the existing discourse. This example shows how certain people were defamiliarized by the prevailing discourse and withdrew into silence.

On the other hand, another observation concerns the “cocky” and “belligerent” Japanese Americans. In *Hawaii’s Japanese*, Lind repeatedly depicts the figure of a belligerent *Nisei* in the army or on the island. For example, he introduced the following comment from a “haole leader”:

²⁶⁴ Lind, *Hawaii’s Japanese*, 103.

The fact remains that the atrocious public manners of A.J.A boys now constitute a serious and increasing source of irritation and criticism. This irritation and criticism are pointed at the A.J.A group alone. It is identified in the public mind as a new ‘cockiness,’ reflecting the attitude of the Japanese components toward the rest of population. . . . They simply cannot say, ‘Our boys are no worse than any other boys—we are being persecuted.’ The answer is to find some way to teach the brats good manners and see to it that they behave.²⁶⁵

Lind also introduced observations on the pugnacious attitude of Hawaiian Nisei soldiers such as those “carrying a chip on their shoulder” in the army.²⁶⁶ These figures show that a degree of tension existed in the island community. Interestingly, Lind opined that such resentment emerged when their “devotion” to the “American ideal” was questioned.²⁶⁷ In fact, *Hawaii’s Japanese* compiled complaints of Nisei who lamented that their expectations of being treated as Americans had been betrayed or that their loyalty was repeatedly questioned. Thus their frustrations did not come simply from the discriminative treatment itself, but rather from the shock that their earlier expectations had been betrayed. In regard to this point, Ghassan Hage’s analysis of difference in the function of interpellation between the first and the second generation of migrants is useful. According to Hage, unlike the negative interpellation (not being recognized or being recognized negatively) which first-generation immigrants often face, the second generation suffers “mis-interpellation.” When the nation hails the citizen, he/she recognizes that it is him/her that is being hailed, but finds out that he/she is not. It is a “shock of the rejection where the very ideological grid that is inviting you in the nation expels you” and it sometimes causes a more traumatic experience than simple exclusion.²⁶⁸ In this article, Hage deals with contemporary racism in Australia, but I

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 178–79.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., 164.

²⁶⁷ Ibid., 181.

²⁶⁸ Ghassan Hage, “Multiculturalism and the Ungovernable Muslim,” in *Essays on Muslims and Multiculturalism*, ed. Raimond Gaita (Melbourne: Text Publishing, 2011), 155–86.

would argue that this analytical framework is useful for examining the process of imperial nation formation as well. I am inclined to interpret this “mis-interpellation” not simply as the experience of deception but as the effect of supplementary characteristic of racism in relation to nationalism.

In other words, the universalistic aspect of nationalism has the potential to constantly extend its interpellation beyond the existing membership. In that sense, this analytical framework is applicable not only to the experiences of successive generations of immigrants but also to the experiences of racial/ethnic minority groups in the process of imperial expansion. The complaints of discharged Hawaii Territorial Guards or belligerent Nisei soldiers confronting fellow GIs or civilians show the effect of very similar types of traumatic experiences. In that sense, their pugnacious reaction expressed their sense of instability inherent to the organization of imperial nation formation itself. In these “irritating” figures Lind found the Japanese immigrants’ “weakness,” which was coming from an insecure environment and finally affirmed that the “official strategy of building loyalty by expecting loyalty” was vindicated.²⁶⁹ However, these disquieting figures instead indicated the unstable basis of this wartime process of minority inclusion and the traces of their betrayed momentary hope.

Conclusion

For American liberal intellectuals, the Japanese immigrant problem of the early twentieth century was not only a manifestation of American nativist thought but also an indication of a possible future American nation. In other words, they also found in this racial conflict and encounter the sign of the formation of a multi-racial community.

²⁶⁹ Lind, *Hawaii's Japanese*, 233.

Gulick's discourse showed how the issue of Japanese immigration stimulated American intellectual discourse on race and nation during the first half of the twentieth century. In particular, my analysis has demonstrated that such liberal discourse on Japanese immigration nonetheless reflected the ideology of the expanding American empire and also implied the potential threat of another empire across the Pacific. However, in general, my analysis of Gulick's texts reveals the logic of a complicit pre-war relationship between the two Pacific empires.

Meanwhile, in my analysis of the Chicago sociologists' discourses, in addition to their formation of an incorporative discourse of the American empire, I also reveal their wartime activity in Hawaii and clarify how they contributed to produce model minority Japanese American subjects through their research. From its early development, Chicago sociology had been interested in immigration across the Pacific and the social transformation it entails. In their theoretical inquiry, Park and Lind identified Hawaii as an ideal place for the future of global racial interactions by setting aside the violent effects of the development of capitalism and U.S. imperial expansion across the Pacific. The wartime confusion in the island community gave them an opportunity to observe a "social experiment" and the wartime sociological research aimed at vindicating the emergence of a harmonious multi-racial community.

In the context of race war and the presence of uncertain attitudes toward a potential enemy, these sociologists focused on the loyalty of Japanese immigrants/Americans. While Gulick expected their incorporation, Lind concluded with optimism for assimilation through the confessional disclosure of inner thoughts. This methodological approach can be traced

back to Park and it is a technique for the subjection of marginal members of a community through differential inclusion.

While the textual practice of *Hawaii's Japanese* showed how the narrative of sociology contributed to the formation of the imperial subject, the sociological discourse was haunted by uncertainties expressed through symptoms such as silence or belligerent attitudes. These traces show us the tension harbored by the American intellectuals in their attempt to build a multi-racial nation.

As this chapter has shown, the Japanese transpacific migration deeply affected American social scientific knowledge and this academic knowledge played an important role in producing model minority subjects in the empire. What then happened to Japanese knowledge production around this time? Did this migration also stimulate similar discussions among Japanese scholars? In the next chapter, I turn again to discourses circulating in the Japanese empire. My question regards how Japanese social scientists addressed issues related to migration and engaged in knowledge production in the context of the formation of multi-racial/ethnic empires on opposite sides of the Pacific Ocean.

Chapter 4:

Transpacific Migrations and the Creation of *Minzoku*:

Japanese Sociological Discourse on Racial/Ethnic Contacts

In his insightful reflections on the history of racism, Étienne Balibar examines the benign anti-racist attitude that is based on a humanist point of view of the indivisibility of the species. His reading reveals the complicity of such an anti-racist critique with the recent development of differential racism that is often practiced within discourse on cultural differences. This new racism reflects, according to Balibar, a post–World War II ‘Copernican revolution’ of the studies of race that have become the basis for our current discussion of racism. Through its manifestation in the scientific critique of biological racism exemplified by the 1950 and 1951 UNESCO declarations about the notion of race, Balibar writes, this revolution moved the discussion ‘from an objectivist to a subjectivist standpoint with respect to the concept of race.’²⁷⁰

However, this does not necessarily mean that this critique of biological racism suddenly emerged during the post–World War II era. As we already saw in the previous chapter, it is well known that prominent social scientists in the United States, such as Franz Boas and Robert Park, had already espoused critical approaches regarding the biological understanding of race by the early twentieth century.²⁷¹ What I have already demonstrated is that their discourses played an important role in developing the idea of a multi-racial/ethnic nation and contributed to producing imperial subjects during the war. However, intellectuals

²⁷⁰ E. Balibar, “Racism Revisited: Sources, Relevance, and Aporias of a Modern Concept,” *PMLA* 123, no. 5 (2008): 1630–39.

²⁷¹ The following book also emphasizes this point. See Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 64–5.

in the Japanese empire had their own ideas. During the imperial expansion into Asia and the Pacific during the 1930s and 1940s, some Japanese intellectuals criticized biological racism and started to employ the more nuanced concept of ‘*minzoku*’ (usually translated as “race,” “ethnos,” or “nation”).²⁷² What is important to notice here is that these new approaches toward the matter of race were often accompanied by ongoing questions about how to incorporate heterogeneous populations into each country’s territory and manage increased contacts with them in the context of capitalist development and imperial expansion. In this sense, we cannot ignore the potential complicity between the subjectivist understanding of race and the social conditions underlying such discourse—that is, the promotion of national integration in the empire.

It is at this point that transpacific Japanese migration and Japanese imperial nation formation crisscrossed in Japanese intellectual discourses. Racial discrimination against Japanese migrants in the United States had annoyed and offended many Japanese intellectuals. In particular, the enactment of the 1924 Exclusion Act disappointed many Japanese liberals. At the same time, in the context of increased Japanese emigration in the 1930s, this issue of racial conflict could be intellectually discussed within a much broader framework by comparing it with racial/ethnic conflicts in Japanese colonies in Manchuria. Therefore, when the subjectivist understanding of race started to emerge among Japanese intellectuals, the issue of discrimination against the Japanese migrants in the United States was ready to be discussed in the much wider context of Japanese imperial formation.

²⁷² For recent comprehensive research on this intellectual transition in Japanese social science, see Seok-Won Lee, “Rationalizing Empire: Nation, Space, and Community in Japanese Social Sciences, 1931–1945,” (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, New York, 2011). In order to avoid erasing the ‘equivocality’ of the word ‘*minzoku* (民族),’ this chapter uses the original Japanese pronunciation. For the ‘equivocality’ of this word, see Sakai, “Imperial Nationalism and the Comparative Perspective.”

Based on such contexts, this chapter examines, through the narrow lens of a specific case study, the abovementioned transition in Japanese race theory and its potentially transpacific scope. Japanese sociologist Koyama Eizō (1899-1983), whose works on race studies and media studies became very popular, developed his theories precisely in this era of imperial expansion and war. His prewar writing has recently come to the attention of scholars who examine the connection between knowledge production and Japanese imperialism. His prewar writing has recently come to the attention of scholars who examine the connection between knowledge production and Japanese imperialism.²⁷³ Yet unlike some previous studies that deal with Koyama's scholarship as a product of "exclusionary" racism, this paper brings into sharper focus his use of the notion of *minzoku* in the 1930s and 1940s to show the more complicated nature of his work and its relationship to imperial nation formation.²⁷⁴ In regard to this point, what distinguishes Koyama's studies of race and *minzoku* from other Japanese intellectual works is his longtime focus on population movements inside and outside of the Japanese empire and the resulting racial/ethnic contacts. I argue that this concern with mobility and contacts is an important basis of Koyama's works. Overall, this chapter examines both the social conditions underlying the dynamic racial/ethnic contacts from which Koyama's theory and the racism of the Japanese empire evolved, and the contribution of his theory to imperial nation formation in the Japanese

²⁷³ Tessa Morris-Suzuki, "Ethnic Engineering: Scientific Racism and Public Opinion Surveys in Midcentury Japan," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 8, no. 2 (2000): 499–529; Shunya Yoshimi, "Media o kataru gensetsu: ryō taisenkanki ni okeru shinbungaku no tanjō," in *Naihasuru chi :shintai, kotoba, kenryoku o aminaosu*, ed. Akira Kurihara et al. (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 2000), 177–237.

²⁷⁴ Sakano's and Fukuma's studies also examine Koyama's use of *minzoku* from the perspective of anthropology and sociology, respectively, but neither explores its relationship to subject formation. See Sakano, *Teikoku nihon to jinrui gakusha*; Tōru Sakano, "Jinshu, minzoku, nihonjin:senzen nihon no jinruigaku to jinshu gainen," in *Jinshu gainen no fuhensei o tou: seiyō teki paradaimu o koete*, ed. Yasuko Takezawa (Kyoto: Jinbun shoin, 2005), 229–54; Yoshiaki Fukuma, *Henkyō ni utsuru nihon: nashonariti no yūkai to saikōchiku*, (Tokyo: Kashiwa shobō, 2003).

empire. My study thus reveals the mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion within the empire through Koyama's works that developed along with the fluidization of society.

Furthermore, my study of Koyama's discourse on mobility also offers valuable clues as to how best to approach a transpacific comparison of racism by positioning the study of knowledge production in an empire in a transpacific context. More specifically, I argue that Koyama's discourse on race and *minzoku* reveals unexamined foundational information in contemporaneous American race studies. As we have already seen, recent comparative studies have underscored a comparable transition from racism based on exclusion, what Takashi Fujitani called "vulgar racism," to "polite racism," a variety of discrimination that works through the universal inclusion of hierarchized people.²⁷⁵ While this chapter is built on such recent comparative works on racism, it focuses more closely on how these contemporaneous discourses on race in the two countries were actually entangled through academic discourses on transpacific mobility, a subject that has not been discussed yet in the relevant specialized literature.

Koyama's Studies of Media, Race, and *Minzoku*

The prewar academic career of Koyama Eizō, who graduated from the Department of Sociology at Tokyo Imperial University in 1925, has been broadly categorized into two types of work. Koyama worked at the newly founded Newspaper Research Center (Shinbun Kenkyūjo) at Tokyo Imperial University beginning in 1929, and he has been regarded as a pioneer of media studies and an important figure of the postwar period.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁵ Fujitani, *Race for Empire*.

²⁷⁶ Masaharu Satō, "Senjika nihon no senden kenkyū: Koyama Eizō no sendenron o megutte," *Mediashi kenkyū*, no. 5 (1997): 98.

Before he became a professor in the Department of Economics at Rikkyo University in 1939, Koyama did research at the Newspaper Research Center on the social function of mass media, such as newspapers, radio, and film. His first published work in media studies was the massive *The Study of Newspapers (Shinbungaku)* in 1935.²⁷⁷ As one of the earliest Japanese scholars to attempt to establish the discipline of media studies, Koyama conducted comprehensive research on newspapers. *The Study of Newspapers* covers a broad range of topics, including not only the history of newspapers and their contemporary development all over the world, but also the conditions of their existence and their social functions. As Japanese sociologist Yoshimi Shunya underscores, a gradual transformation in the discourse about media occurred during interwar Japan. For example, unlike the early studies of newspapers, which consisted mainly of practical advice for news reporters, discussions in the 1920s started to objectify newspapers as media and explored their functions in historical and social contexts. There is an emerging intellectual concern with the amorphous desires of the ‘mass’ (*taishū*) or the ‘crowd’ (*gunshū*) and with mass media as their mediator.²⁷⁸ It is obvious that Koyama’s interest in the conditions and functions of media was pursued parallel to this concern. In *The Study of Newspapers*, he defined one of the functions of newspapers as the synthesis of heterogeneous ideas that develop through what Ferdinand Tönnies termed *Gesellschaft* (society). Once Koyama recognized this synthetic function of newspapers, he was only one step away from emphasizing their indoctrinating role in society.

²⁷⁷ Eizō Koyama, *Shinbungaku* (Tokyo: sanseido, 1935).

²⁷⁸ Yoshimi, “Media o kataru gensetsu: ryō taisenkanki ni okeru shinbungaku no tanjō.” In addition to Koyama’s studies, Yoshimi also deals with other representative intellectual discourses during this period. Importantly, in contrast to the discourses of Koyama or another pioneering scholar of newspapers, Ono Hideo, Yoshimi chooses approaches that respect the media, to some degree, as ‘the place of polyphonic narration’ in the discourses of Hasegawa Nyozeikan, Tosaka Jun, and Shimizu Ikutarō. For a comprehensive study of prewar Japanese media studies, see Fabian Schäfer, *Public Opinion, Propaganda, Ideology: Theories on the Press and Its Social Function in Interwar Japan, 1918–1937* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012).

Koyama's 1937 *Theory of Propaganda Technique (Senden gijyutsu ron)*, for example, focuses on the media's ability to mobilize people following the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War.²⁷⁹ This book led to his wartime propaganda studies, such as *Theory of Wartime Propaganda (Senji senden ron)* in 1942.²⁸⁰ Although Koyama quickly became a supporter of democratic society under the U.S. occupation after World War II and became a noted expert in public opinion research (*yoron chōsa*), as recent scholarship has clarified, he maintained his view of media as a synthesizing mediator.²⁸¹ Koyama's career as a scholar of media studies highlights interesting interrelations between the issues of media, mass society, and imperialism. However, what surprises us about his prewar career is that he had also been a prolific writer on the topics of race and ethnic studies, which almost completely disappeared from his postwar writings.²⁸² This chapter deals with this other side of Koyama's study in its historical context of the transformation of Japanese society.

Koyama's first published book was *General Theory of Racial Science (Jinshugaku sōron)* in 1929.²⁸³ This general survey of race issues was followed by his serial works on race and *minzoku*, including the first volume of *Particular Theory of Racial Science (Jinshugaku kakuron zenpen)* (1931), *Outline of a Theory of Racial Science (Jinshugaku gairon)* (1939), *A Theory of Minzoku and Population (Minzoku to jinkō no riron)* (1941), and *Problems on Minzoku and Culture (Minzoku to bunka no shomondai)* (1942).²⁸⁴

²⁷⁹ Eizō Koyama, *Senden gijyutsu ron* (Tokyo: Kōyō shoin, 1937).

²⁸⁰ Eizō Koyama, *Senji senden ron* (Tokyo: Sansaidō, 1942).

²⁸¹ Morris-Suzuki, "Ethnic Engineering."

²⁸² Eizō Koyama, "Shokumin shakaigaku to konketsu gensho," in *Shakaigaku no shomondai: Takata sensei koki shukuga ronbunshū*, ed. Kentarō Komatsu (Tokyo: Yūhikaku, 1954), 409–32.

²⁸³ Eizō Koyama, *Jinshugaku sōron* (Tokyo: Oka shoin, 1929).

²⁸⁴ Eizō Koyama, *Jinshugaku kakuron zenpen* (Tokyo: Oka shoin, 1931); Eizō Koyama, *Jinshugaku gairon* (Tokyo: Nikkō Shoin, 1939); Eizō Koyama, *Minzoku to jinkō no riron* (Tokyo: Hata shoten, 1941); Eizō Koyama, *Minzoku to bunka no shomondai* (Tokyo: Hata shoten, 1942).

Koyama's *General Theory of Race Studies* was first intended to be written with Matsumura Akira, a famous scholar in Japanese physical anthropology at Tokyo Imperial University. As this fact implies, this book reflects his interest in anthropology, since he categorizes race studies (*Jinshugaku*) as a subfield of physical anthropology. As Koyama explained in the preface about how he would describe the whole picture of race studies, he covers a variety of European and American anthropological works and even touches on Japanese eugenics in this 500-page book. According to Matsumura's preface to the book, *General Theory of Race Studies* was what people had "craved" in a situation in which knowledge about race should be utilized in many different fields. Covering different races of people all over the world, Matsumura wrote, the book became an "unprecedented" dictionary on race.²⁸⁵

This book features Koyama's biometrical gaze on human bodies. Koyama defines a race as a group the members of which share many characteristic marks (*chōhyō*) that, based on their definite combinations, can be used to distinguish between morphological groups. Koyama argues these racial characteristic marks are constitutional phenomena (*taishitsuteki genshō*), and he focuses on various dissected aspects of the human body such as hair, skin, eyes, skulls, and fingerprints.²⁸⁶ With his analysis of these body parts in this text, he also introduced the anthropometric techniques of body measurement and various examples of the taxonomy of races.

How then is Koyama's early work on race situated in the history of Japanese studies of race? In Japan, the discussion of race emerged from the confluence of several disciplines including genetics, medical science, eugenics, and social sciences in the late nineteenth and

²⁸⁵ Koyama, *Jinshugaku sōron*, 1–2.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 7–14.

the early twentieth centuries and the role of anthropology is particularly well known.²⁸⁷ After E. S. Morse introduced anthropological ideas in the 1870s and 1880s, Tsuboi Shōgorō opened the first formal university course on anthropology in 1892 and trained many important Japanese anthropologists such as Torii Ryuzō and Matsumura. As one of the main concerns for those anthropologists was the origin of the Japanese people, studies of race in modern Japan have from their beginning developed in accordance with scholarly concerns with Japanese identity. This development of anthropological discourse is also parallel to the expansion of the Japanese empire and the anthropological gaze kept registering various “tribes” in the territory through its classificatory framework.

What is important in this anthropological research on and inquiry into Japanese identity is that their discourses contributed to forming a certain mode of identification in the Japanese empire. The study of race in Japanese anthropology not only classified the observed tribes and subjects. It also put such classified subjects into a single temporal continuum in which the degree of advancement and delay is a key for those subjects’ identity, in which the “modern” Japanese character is reconfigured with the “savage” Ainu people. In this temporal continuum, what Johannes Fabian called “coevalness,” the moment of encounter of the observer and the observed, disappears and classified subjects are captured in a relative relationship.²⁸⁸ In other words, the observed tribes are not living at the same time period as the observers. Meanwhile, based on this condition, the subjects experience anxiety that possibly disrupts this order. That is why the advent of racial hybrids was regarded as the “crisis” of the order.²⁸⁹ In this context, discussions of human reform (*jinshu kairyō/kaizō ron*), early eugenic-like discourses, such as Takahashi Yoshio’s *Nihon jinshu kairyōron* (1884) and

²⁸⁷ Tessa Morris-Suzuki, “Debating Racial Science in Wartime Japan,” *OSIRIS Osiris* 13, no. 1 (1998): 359–60.

²⁸⁸ Fabian, *Time and the Other*.

²⁸⁹ Sakano, *Teikoku nihon to jinrui gakusha*, 179–225.

Unno Kōtoku's *Nihon jinshu kaizōron* (1910), resonated with anthropology, particularly in the sense that they accelerated the examination of the degree of advancement and delay of the Japanese race with a focus on the “transformability” of quality.²⁹⁰

Koyama's race study has been built on this tradition of Japanese imperial expansion and identity formation. Furthermore, as Tessa Morris-Suzuki and Sakano Tōru emphasized, when Koyama's work first emerged, biometry in anthropology and eugenics played an important role with increasing interest in genetic phenomena in studies of race. Koyama's race study also reflected such concern in contemporary academia and he was also influenced by German race studies (*Rassenkunde*).²⁹¹

However, Koyama's later works in the 1930s and 40s evidenced increased attention to another important concept of his work, *minzoku*. At first, Koyama methodologically distinguished between constitution (*taishitsu*) and culture, between race and *minzoku*, and between corresponding frameworks of natural science and cultural science. His early studies of race focus on the former aspects; the concept of *minzoku* was not a prime object of his research. However, in *Outline of a Theory of Race Studies* the concept of *minzoku* was already supplementing his study of race. When Koyama explained the basic concepts of racial science at the beginning of this book, he mostly repeated the idea of race expounded in his *General Theory of Race Studies*. The big difference from the early work is that in the later work he added a long explanation of the idea of *minzoku*.

“The basic idea of *minzoku* study,” Koyama wrote, “is to realistically see *minzoku* as natural and historical sedimentations.” For example, he referred to the following four elements as constituting *minzoku*: race (*shuzoku*), language (*genko*), custom (*fūzoku*), and

²⁹⁰ Ichirō Tomiyama, *Bōryoku no yokan: iha fuyū ni okeru kiki no mondai* (Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten, 2002), 92–115.

²⁹¹ Morris-Suzuki, “Debating Racial Science in Wartime Japan,” 363–7; Sakano, “Jinshu, minzoku, nihonjin:senzen nihon no jinruigaku to jinshu gainen.”

settlement (*kyojyū*). He also emphasized lifestyle (*seikatsu yōshiki*) as an expression of the characteristics of *minzoku*.²⁹²

In addition to this, what is interesting about Koyama's definition of *minzoku* is that he also included a projection into the future as one of its constituting elements. He wrote:

As long as the particular *minzoku* culture includes creative will as its content, it includes something the *minzoku* is going to achieve in the future. That is not only a product of the past, but also the task for the future. Life of *minzoku* aims to go for the infinite distance and does not disappear at the present as a limit. Therefore, *minzoku* is a premise, but also a conclusion, a reality as well as an ideal. The present *minzoku* activity is a historical constitution, but also the vanguard bearing the mission for development. Thus *minzoku* is a community of character (*seikaku kyōdōtai*) that has both a historically determined aspect (heteronomy) and a historically determining aspect (autonomy).²⁹³

Koyama believed that *minzoku* is not only composed of “historical sedimentations,” but is also related to the “creative will” for “development” or the “ideal.” Here, the dynamic character of *minzoku* came to the fore in his race studies.

On the other hand, the distinction between race and *minzoku* became more and more ambiguous in his writing. While he confirmed the close relationship between *minzoku* and race, the matter of race was now regarded as an object of cultural science instead of natural science.²⁹⁴ Furthermore, Koyama had found only a contingent relationship between physical constitution and culture and had denied any functional relationship (*kansū kankei*) between the two, but he also argued that there was at least a parallel relationship (*heikō kankei*) between them, if not a functional one.²⁹⁵ As his race study extends its focus to the analysis of culture, a so-called “grey zone” between race and *minzoku* emerges, which shows that

²⁹² Koyama, *Jinshugaku gairon*, 54.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, 55.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 18, 25–6.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 25.

Koyama had to constantly modify his framework in the development of his research.²⁹⁶ As a reflection of this transition, most of his writings in the 1940s on the subject of race contained the word “*minzoku*” in their titles.

What is behind this development of the idea of *minzoku*? First, it reflects the development of the academic discipline, which is demonstrated by his involvement in ethnology (*minzoku gaku*).²⁹⁷ At the same time, it is difficult to ignore the close relationship between Koyama’s evolving views and the ongoing imperial expansion of the Japanese empire.

In fact, his intellectual interest in race issues can be traced back a bit earlier than his first book. His graduation thesis was a sociological study of islands in the South Pacific, newly gained territory for the Japanese empire after World War I.²⁹⁸ Before he graduated from the university, he joined an inspection trip organized by the Navy Ministry of Japan and observed the life and culture of people in Micronesia. Thus, Koyama’s early interest in race was already evolving in parallel to the colonial expansion of the Japanese empire. In *Outline of a Theory of Race Studies*, Koyama boldly announced the significance of his study for the Japanese imperial mission. After critically reflecting on “the failures of the Japanese continental policies in the past,” specifically, their indifference to people living in colonized territories, Koyama welcomed recent colonial expansions:

The reflection of new experiences from the Manchurian Incident to the Second Sino-Japanese War makes it inevitable to reexamine the existing attitude toward the Japanese continental policy. Furthermore, the establishment of a new state, the

²⁹⁶ For a discussion of this “grey zone” in Koyama, see Junichirō Abe, “Nijusseiki zenhan nihon no jinshu/minzoku kenkyū ni okeru ‘ishukonkō’ genshō eno ōtō: shizen/bunka kagaku no kyōkaisen o meguru ronsō,” *nagoyadaigaku shakaigaku ronshū* 29, no. 2 (2009): 21–46.

²⁹⁷ For a detailed discussion of this shift in Japanese social science, see Doak Kevin M, “Building National Identity through Ethnicity: Ethnology in Wartime Japan and After.,” *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 27, no. 1 (2001): 1–39.

²⁹⁸ For the history of Japanese colonization of the South Pacific, Mark R Peattie, *Nan ‘yō: The Rise and Fall of the Japanese in Micronesia, 1885-1945* (Honolulu: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies, University of Hawaii : University of Hawaii Press, 1988).

national virtue of which is *minzoku* harmony (*minzoku kyōwa*), denies the necessity of *minzoku* conflicts (*minzoku tōsō*) and realizes the most progressive and creative state principle as pursuing the ideal of human beings by organic integration of various *minzoku* and mutual cooperation. Thus the scientific knowledge related to race and *minzoku* starts to play an initiative role in actively engaging in the solution of the problems that emerge in the pursuit of the ideal.²⁹⁹

Koyama was quite convinced that studies of race and *minzoku* could now become a guiding principle of Japanese continental policy. In fact, Koyama attended the governmental Board of the Minzoku Problem (Minzokumondai Iinkai) in 1940 and discussed *minzoku* policies in East and Southeast Asia. Koyama became a researcher for the Population Problem Research Center (Jinkō Mondai Kenkyūjo) in 1939, and he continued working in government agencies during the war. When the Ministry of Education established the Minzoku Research Center (Minzoku Kenkyūjo) in 1943, Koyama became one of its researchers and did fieldwork in Manchuria in order to research *minzoku* problems.³⁰⁰ Although the degree of Koyama's influence on these institutions or on policymaking is still debatable, it is clear that his studies ran parallel to Japanese imperial concerns about managing heterogeneous populations in the territories.

What we now have to examine here is the content of this “problem” and the discursive conditions under which Koyama encountered the “problem.” Koyama's interest in “conflicts” between social groups did not materialize suddenly after the beginning of the Second Sino-Japanese War. Rather, in his studies of race and *minzoku*, Koyama had shown strong interest in racial and ethnic “contacts” (*sesshoku*), including the phenomenon of racially mixed blood. His wartime concern with *minzoku* conflicts went along with his longtime interest in such issues; additionally, it shows us how Koyama's studies were linked

²⁹⁹ Koyama, *Jinshugaku Gairon*, 1–2.

³⁰⁰ For the activity of the Minzoku Research Center, see Katsumi Nakao, “Minzoku kenkyūjo no soshiki to katsudō: sensōchū no nihon minzokugaku,” *Minzokugaku kenkyū* 52, no. 1 (1997): 47–65.

to and resonated with another contemporary imperial project, one that existed beyond the Japanese empire.

Racial/ethnic Contacts and Overlapping Empires

The “contact” between social groups that occurred as a result of Japanese imperial expansion is the important issue running through Koyama’s work on race and *minzoku*. As Koyama argues, such contact should be preceded by the movement of the social group. In regard to this point, Abe Junichirō shrewdly indicates that Koyama’s works were produced during what Abe termed the ‘era of migration.’ During the 1920s and 1930s, 800,000 mainland Japanese people moved to the South Pacific Mandate or Manchuria, and more than one million more migrated to Korea, Taiwan, or South Sakhalin.³⁰¹ Facing problems of unemployment, rural poverty, and overpopulation, Japanese intellectuals and bureaucrats seriously discussed the significance of this mass migration. Additionally, although Japanese immigration into the U.S. was banned in 1924, the Japanese government promoted migration into areas of Latin American during this period. Thus the fluidization of the society was unfolding.³⁰²

In this era of increased mobility, Koyama focused on “contacts” between different racial or ethnic groups. Whereas Koyama thought racial and ethnic mobility and contacts themselves were something inherent to human history, he insisted they were related to

³⁰¹ Junichirō Abe, “Fīludowāku to shiteno kankō, media to shiteno minzoku: Koyama Eizō no minzoku sesshoku ron to 1930-40 nendai ni okeru teikoku nihon no imin kankō seisaku,” *Nenpō shakaigaku ronshū*, no. 22 (2009): 80–91. The population flow from the colonies into the Japanese mainland was also huge this time. For example, it is said that almost 120,000 people migrated from Korea to the mainland between 1917 and 1929. See, Hōmukyoku shutsunyūkoku kanrisitsu, *Shutsunyūkoku kanri to sono jittai* (Ōkurashō shuppanyoku, 1964), 10.

³⁰² Tessa Morris-Suzuki, “Shokuminchi shisō to imin: toyohara no tenbō kara,” in *Kakudaisuru modaniti: 1920--30-Nendai*. 2, ed. Shunya Yoshimi, Iwanami Kōza 6 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2002), 185–90.

colonization in the case of the modern period.³⁰³ He thought territorial expansion of the empire and people's movement necessarily caused certain reactions between racial or ethnic groups.

At this point, I would like to focus on Koyama's interest in the experience of Japanese migrations across the Pacific. This is not only one of the sources of his concern with racial/ethnic contacts but also indicates the point at which knowledge production in the Japanese empire and the American one overlap. In *General Theory of Race Studies*, Koyama had already mentioned the exclusion of Japanese immigrants from entrance into the United States (*hainichi*) as a symbolic example of the racial problem caused by different groups' contacts with one another in the modern era.³⁰⁴ The 1924 Immigration Act in the United States had a variety of impacts on Japanese intellectual discourse on race and *minzoku*. In addition to strong criticism of American racial discrimination voiced by Nitobe Inazō, this incident also allowed some Japanese to reflect on their own ethnic policies in the empire and stimulate Japanese eugenicists' analysis of the quality of Japanese migrant populations.³⁰⁵

For Koyama, the Japanese immigrant problem was not simply an object of criticism, it was also an object of scholarly inquiry. In *Outline of a Theory of Race Studies*, Koyama defined the problem of Japanese immigrants' exclusion from the United States and other areas, along with multi-ethnic racial cooperation issues in Manchuria and exclusion of the Jewish people by the Nazis, as issues strongly requiring an analysis from the perspective of race and ethnic studies.³⁰⁶ In this scholarly work, Koyama was interested in American scholars' discussions and analysis of racial contacts and mixing. In his article on racial/ethnic

³⁰³ Eizō Koyama, "Minzoku no gainen to minzoku sesshoku no taiyō," *Nihon shakaigaku nenpō*, 1934, 295; Koyama, *Jinshugaku sōron*, 385–6.

³⁰⁴ Koyama, *Jinshugaku sōron*, 3.

³⁰⁵ Oguma, "*Nihonjin*" *no kyōkai*, 215–239; Morris-Suzuki, "Debating Racial Science in Wartime Japan," 361.

³⁰⁶ Koyama, *Jinshugaku gairon*, 52.

contacts in the early 1930s, he mentioned a speech by Roderick Duncan McKenzie (1885-1940), professor of sociology at the University of Washington. In this speech, McKenzie argued that the ongoing racial mixing on the American West Coast and in the Hawaiian Islands was collapsing the marital division, which white supremacists wanted to maintain. While criticizing those who wished to prevent racial mixing for fear of degeneration, McKenzie argued that the problems of hybridization were cultural matters and thus problems of “society.” In discussions of racial mixing in the United States during the 1930s, Japanese immigrants were, as I will explain later, important research objects, and Koyama commented on them, stating that the problem of the Japanese immigrants to the United States should be examined as a “social problem” (*shakai mondai*).³⁰⁷ Koyama cited McKenzie’s speech again in *A Theory of Minzoku and Population* and also introduced Robert Park, who argued that a “new culture emerges from the contacts of different cultures, and a new race emerges from the contacts of different races.”³⁰⁸

The preferred site for Koyama to pursue his interest in racial/ethnic contacts in the United States was the Hawaiian Islands. Koyama called Hawaii “the blast furnace of the world” (*sekai no yōkōro*) and a “racial laboratory” (*jinshu kenkyūjo*), and argued that the islands offered interesting data on racial mixing.³⁰⁹ At this point, he relied again on the analysis of American sociologists. Romanzo Adams, a sociologist at the University of Hawaii, was one of the main sources of Koyama’s knowledge about Hawaii. As we saw before, Adams was a scholar known for his pioneering sociological study of interracial marriages in Hawaii. Koyama introduced his observation that Japanese immigrants in Hawaii

³⁰⁷ Koyama, “Minzoku no gainen to minzoku sesshoku no taiyō,” 275.

³⁰⁸ Koyama, *Minzoku to jinkō no riron*, 28.

³⁰⁹ Koyama, *Jinshugaku gairon*, 169; Eizō Koyama, *Nanpō kensetsu to minzoku jinkō seisaku* (Tokyo: Dainihon shuppan kabushikigaisha, 1944), 527.

were the least aggressive group in terms of cross-national marriage because of their cultural habits. However, Koyama indicated, since the reason was merely cultural, it could not prevent the gradual increase of cross-national marriages along with generational change.

Therefore, he presented the future of the islands in the following way:

The sense of home (*kyōdo kanjō*) toward their place of residence unites the racial groups and their common interest, history, and sense of solidarity let each *minzoku* in Hawaii form one *minzoku*. Cultural and racial heterogeneities will be filtered through the mutually conditional process of cultural assimilation and racial amalgamation.³¹⁰

Until the end of World War II, Koyama maintained his interest in race relations in Hawaii.

This clearly shows that Koyama's studies of dynamic racial and ethnic contacts and his perspectives on the formation of new communities went beyond the Japanese domestic sphere.³¹¹

What, then, are the political implications of those American sociologists' research on racial contacts across the Pacific? Robert Park, Roderick McKenzie, and Romanzo Adams, to whom Koyama referred in his works, shared similar interests. They were all sociologists trained or teaching at the University of Chicago. As we saw in the previous chapter, Chicago sociologists had been well known for their studies of and theories about race relations in the United State.

As David Palumbo-Liu has argued, although we observe the consolidation of anti-Asian sentiment in US history from the late nineteenth-century Chinese Exclusion Act to the 1924 National Origins Act and the 1934 Tydings-McDuffie Act, the "modern introjection of Asia into American imaginary" only became apparent in the 1930s. The Chicago

³¹⁰ Koyama, *Jinshugaku gairon*, 172.

³¹¹ Koyama assumed that in the future Hawaiian culture would not simply reflect American civilization, but rather the harmony of Eastern and Western cultures. Though I cannot explore this issue in depth here, it may be possible to find a discussion on the views of the future cultural status of the Hawaiian Islands by intellectuals from both empires. See Koyama, *Nanpō kensetsu to minzoku jinkō seisaku*, 568–9.

sociologists' framework of assimilation contributed to a re-articulation of Asian presence in the United States.³¹² The Chicago sociologists' knowledge production on Asian immigrants can be traced back to the Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Coast in the U.S. between 1924 and 1926. Through this research, Park tested the validity of his interaction cycle theory and argued for the assimilability of these immigrants.

The key to this theory of racial assimilation is its focus on the subjective experience of racial difference. Instead of arguing on only a biological basis for social difference, Park and McKenzie focused on consciousness or awareness of physical difference as a basis of racial difference. In that sense, they introduced the subjective point of view into their analysis of race relations. This racial difference was supposed to be overcome in time by shared memories, experiences, and histories, and move toward assimilation in a unidirectional way. From this point of view, the discourse of race studies by Chicago sociologists was deeply implicated in the imperial expansion and multiracial national mobilization.

In this way, Koyama's concern with the Chicago sociologists' work shows how the interests of intellectuals from empires across the Pacific crisscrossed through the issue of racial/ethnic contacts. Of course, this does not mean that Koyama's approach is the same as that of the Chicago sociologists. Now the question is: with what problematic consciousness did Koyama encounter the issue of migrations and racial/ethnic contacts?

In regard to this point, Koyama's speech of 1937 gives us an important clue. Titled "Population problem of natural *minzoku*: On children of mixed race," Koyama touched on the research in Hawaii and called for a similar practice in the Japanese empire:

³¹² Palumbo-Liu, *Asian/American Historical Crossings of a Racial Frontier*, 17–18.

Although for now based on the idea of racial purity and white supremacy the white races are excluding the colored races, sexual drive cannot be repressed completely by idealism and children of mixed race appeared everywhere. In particular, though the white races put restrictions on marriage in various ways, in reality this attempt to purify the race is overthrown along the Pacific coast. In particular, Hawaii is called the blast furnace of the world's races and offers us most interesting materials of racial mixing. Hawaii is the place where a variety of people are living. In order to research such Hawaiians, the U.S. spent a lot of money and organized an anthropological survey of immigrants in Hawaii. This survey not only targets those immigrants but also checks the life of their parents in the home country. Seeing such an American practice, I think we Japanese should also take a more fundamental survey of migrants. It goes without saying that racial problems will increase hereafter and this topic will get more and more important.³¹³

In this speech, Koyama addressed Adams's research and the issues of the second generation Japanese immigrants in Hawaii. But to whom was his speech addressed? Koyama made this speech at the first meeting of the National Council of the Population Problem, which was organized by the Society for Population Problem Studies (Jinkō Mondai Kenkyūkai), the semi-private group established in 1932. As Koyama's later affiliation with the Population Problem Research Center is well known, it is not surprising that Koyama attended this meeting. The important point is the variety of issues discussed at the council and its interdisciplinary scale. Including university professors, bureaucrats, and a journalist, participants made presentations on population problems in relation to various issues. Some spoke on migrations to Manchuria or the South Pacific Sea and migrants from Korea, but others also discussed national health, mental illness, and criminals.

We can see here that knowledge productions in the empire were aggregated with an eye on population. As the proposal for a national research institution for population problems made in this council indicates, policies aimed at this problem were regarded as fundamentally important for the empire. The issues they concerned included decreased

³¹³ Jinkō mondai kenkyūkai, *The Report of the First Meeting of the National Council of the Population Problem* (Tokyo: Jinkō mondai kenkyūkai, 1938), 73–81.

physical vigor, the supply-demand relationship of labor power, social hygiene, unbalanced birth rate depending on class, and overseas expansion of the Japanese nation.³¹⁴ In other words, what was expected here was the empire as the regulator and manager of the interconnected spheres of life, labor, and migration. Koyama's concern for racial/ethnic contacts was articulated from this perspective.

Why then do contacts (or arrangements of contacts) matter? Although it is well known that Koyama was later opposed to interracial marriage in the 1940s, he had been concerned with the racial/ethnic contacts and interracial marriage as an important site of possible "development" or "degeneration" of the nation since the 1930s. In his work, the expectation of national expansion and anxiety over its collapse were always intermingled. As Koyama emphasized in his explanation of the role of population theory, the production of "a high-grade nation" (*yūshūnaru kokumin*) was the important purpose here.³¹⁵ However, considering the interdisciplinary concerns over the quality of the nation in the discussion of population problems, can Koyama's concern with contacts and "degeneration" not be opened up to the broader anxiety inherent to the mechanism of the Japanese empire?

At this point, recent work of Tomiyama Ichirō is helpful. Analyzing *An Investigation of Global Policy with the Yamato Ethnos as Nucleus* (*Yamatominzoku o chūkaku to suru sekaiseisaku no kentō*), the representative text of the Japanese wartime racism written by researchers at the Ministry of Welfare in 1943 and of which Koyama has been regarded as one of the main writers, Tomiyama finds the formation of what Balibar called a "racist complex" in the Japanese imperial regime.³¹⁶ Situating the increasing displaced "slave" labor in an ongoing formation of a block economy, he indicates that the expressed fear against

³¹⁴ Ibid., 53–54.

³¹⁵ Koyama, *Minzoku to jinkō no riron*, 1.

³¹⁶ Balibar and Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class*, 204–216.

ethnic mobility and contacts in this text also overlaps with the fear of “delinquents” and “criminals.” That is, fear of the broader threat of “degeneration” is the motor of imperial racism and what matters here is the “security” of the empire.³¹⁷

Koyama’s concern with racial/ethnic contacts can be understood in this broader context of imperial security. As we have seen, the population problem already linked him with criminality and mental illness in the 1930s. Furthermore, during the total war regime in the 1940s, Koyama’s discussion of population problems includes the arrangement of migration in terms of the appropriate disposition and cultivation of labor powers in the territory and again the migrants’ lives becomes the important focal point for securing a constant supply of labor.

In this way, Koyama’s work on contacts reveals on the one hand a figure of empire which carefully manages and regulates the life of the population and prevents its degeneration. On the other hand, this empire kept mobilizing the minority populations in the territory and Koyama never gave up on the creation of an ideal entity of broader nation. Within the context of increased fluidization and racial/ethnic contacts, he had to think about the new entity of the empire. How did he try to project it? The next section examines this last question by refocusing on his use of the concept of *minzoku*.

Greater East Asian *Minzoku* and its Philosophy

The extended examination of Koyama’s interest in migrations and contacts allows us to identify the underlining anxiety informing the newly emerging governing mechanism of the Japanese empire. In this section, I refocus on the key concept in his work, *minzoku*, and

³¹⁷ Ichirō Tomiyama, *Ryūchaku no shisō : “Okinawa mondai” no keifugaku* (Tokyo: Inpakuto shuppankai, 2013), 175–244.

reveal how, despite such fear of degeneration, he kept projecting the integrity of the empire in its expansion. This examination presents an alternative view of Koyama's discourse as simple biological and exclusionary racism. In some ways, Koyama's wartime discourse was similar to a certain type of inclusive narrative among contemporary intellectuals in the Japanese empire, and this similarity is understandable when we do not misunderstand Koyama's use of the term "*minzoku*."

In her pioneering analysis of the continuity between Koyama's prewar race studies and other, postwar media studies, Tessa Morris-Suzuki emphasizes Koyama's "anti-assimilationist vision of the empire."³¹⁸ Whereas Morris-Suzuki admits the "elusive" character of the term "*minzoku*," she emphasizes the connection of this term to a physical substratum, such as the body.³¹⁹ Thus, by indicating the similarity of Koyama's approach to scientific racism, Morris-Suzuki clearly differentiates Koyama from contemporary "progressive" social scientists such as Kada Tetsuji or Shinmei Masamichi.³²⁰ On this understanding, *minzoku* is just a cultural replacement of the idea of race, and I do not disagree with this view of race and *minzoku* as overlapping.

Nevertheless, Koyama's use of the word "*minzoku*" often diverges from implicating the immutable national character and includes the role of subjectivity. Thus, depending on the reading of *minzoku*, Koyama's works could be read in a different way, that is, in the

³¹⁸ Morris-Suzuki's interpretation of Koyama's work as "anti-assimilationist vision" itself is understandable because he adopted a negative attitude against the assimilationism (*dōka shugi*) of the 1940s. However, what I would like to examine here is the fact that, when he did so, he kept thinking about how to transform people in the Co-Prosperity Sphere into subjects willing to sacrifice their lives for the empire, instead of keeping them as outside observers. His use of the word *minzoku* is deeply related to this concern. See Koyama, *Nanpō kensetsu to minzoku jinkō seisaku*; In other words, whether or not the person takes a pro or con position against the assimilation issue does not necessarily erase the question of imperial nation formation. For a survey of this discussion on assimilationism, Oguma, *A Genealogy of "Japanese" Self-Images*, 203-36.

³¹⁹ Morris-Suzuki, "Ethnic Engineering," 505, 512.

³²⁰ For her study of wartime Japanese racial science, see Morris-Suzuki, "Debating Racial Science in Wartime Japan."

context of inclusionary discourses within the Japanese empire. In fact, what still strikes us is that his wartime discourse celebrated the emergence of a broader community as the new *minzoku*. In that sense, Koyama's discourse cannot be simply reduced to what Takashi Fujitani has called "vulgar racism." Rather, I argue that we can read Koyama's texts as an engagement with the production of imperial subjects, which resonated with some wartime Japanese intellectuals' activities.

As I have already discussed, Koyama's use of the word "*minzoku*" in the 1930s already indicated the dynamic nature of the term. In the 1940s, this tendency was intensified and Koyama clearly articulated a concept of the broader nation. In the introduction to *Building of the South and Minzoku Population Policy* in 1944, Koyama directly quoted another author's text on *minzoku* and celebrated the emergence of new community:

Now we have learned the bases and subtleties of ethnic policy through our own experience. We are aggregating Asian *minzoku* that had stood helpless and are engaging in a higher-level *minzoku* formation called the new Greater East Asian Minzoku (*daitōa minzoku*). "What is the mission assigned to a *minzoku* in the historical world? *Minzoku* determines the direction of world history. Moreover, it is such a world historical *minzoku* which is always coming into existence anew, from world history. While *minzoku* creates the world, the *minzoku* is created by the world. *Minzoku* is the subject (*shutai*) of world history, but at the same time it is the product of world history. This is the reason why *minzoku* is a historical concept. *Minzoku* is now being created" (Kōsaka Masaaki, *The Philosophy of Minzoku*). Thus *minzoku* is historically prescribed, but simultaneously it prescribes history.³²¹

Here Koyama referred to the work of Japanese philosopher Kōsaka Masaaki (1900–1969) in order to include the discussion of subjectivity in his argument. His references to this text by Kōsaka around this time indicate Koyama's familiarity with ongoing discussions among Japanese intellectuals on the expanding empire and *minzoku* as a historical subject. It does not seem to be contingent on Koyama's incorporating Kōsaka's theory here because Koyama

³²¹ Koyama, *Nanpō kensetsu to minzoku jinkō seisaku*, 3–4.

had shared with them the concern for the ethnic antagonism inside the territory and the creation of the new integrity. What intellectual discussions were going on in the empire at this time?

In the 1930s and 40s, some progressive Japanese social scientists and philosophers attempted to invent a theory of community that would reflect the multi-ethnic/racial reality of the empire. For example, sociologist Takata Yasuma (1883–1972), whose sociological works Koyama had admired since he was young, elaborated the idea of *minzoku* in the 1930s along with other social scientists such as Kada Tetsuji, Komatsu Kentarō, and Shinmei Masamichi. Takata, also referred to as “the father of theoretical sociology in Japan,” is one of the earliest Japanese sociologists who studied *minzoku*. Takata’s style of thought is known as Formal Sociology, which is based on the arguments of George Simmel. Although Takata spent much of his life systematizing this theory, he began to construct the theory of *minzoku* sociology (*minzoku shakaigaku*) in the 1930s. For example, he published *The Problem of Minzoku* (*Minzoku no mondai*) in 1935. This is the first book in which he examined *minzoku* as the main theme. In 1939, he published *Theory of East Asian Minzoku* (*Tōa minzoku ron*) and then *Theory of Minzoku* (*Minzoku ron*) in 1942. Finally, in 1943, Takata became the head of *the Minzoku* Research Center, where Koyama was also a member of the research team.

Takata began exploring the topic of *minzoku* mainly for political reasons. After the Manchurian Incident in 1931, the relationship between the Japanese and East Asian people became strained. In particular, after the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War in 1937, such ideas as *Tōa minzoku* and *Tōa kyōdōtai* (East Asian community) circulated and it became necessary to examine the concept of *minzoku*. As a reflection of this dynamic transition in the contemporaneous situation, while *The Problem of Minzoku* in 1935 did not

address East Asian relations, *Theory of East Asian Minzoku* in 1939 had to directly address the contemporaneous East Asian situation.

For Takata, *minzoku* is not a static category; it rather always negates and recreates itself. Takata demonstrated his basic understanding of *minzoku* in *The Problem of Minzoku*. In this text, he adopts the word “modern *minzoku* (*kindai minzoku*)” as a translation of *nation*, whereas the simple word *minzoku* was used for *volk*. When Takata explained *minzoku*, he referred to kinship and shared cultures through language, religion, and destiny. However, those elements are not sufficient to define modern *minzoku*. According to Takata, in order to become modern *minzoku* there should be not only an objective element but also a subjective element. He argues that *minzoku* becomes modern when its subjective and active aspects override the limits of tradition and begin to dictate future goals. Takata argues that, therefore, “*minzoku* is constituted by us.”³²² Based on this definition, he created the concept of a “broader nation (*kō-minzoku*),” which encompasses a variety of people in the territory during the 1940s.³²³

Another important theory is “The Logic of Species (*Shu no ronri*)” discussed by Tanabe Hajime (1885–1962), one of the founders of the so-called Kyoto School of Philosophy in the 1930s. In this theory, tripartite concepts of the individual (*ko*), species (*shu*), and genus (*rui*) played an important role. As Naoki Sakai has brilliantly articulated, one of the core mechanisms of this logic is the relationship between the individual and the species. In Tanabe’s logic, the species is a sort of substratum from which the individual subject originates. However, this articulation is possible only insofar as there is a breakup that deconstructs the immediate symbiosis of the species and the individual. Without this

³²² Yasuma takata, *Minzoku no mondai* (Tokyo: Nihon hyōronsha, 1935), 253.

³²³ Fukuma, *Henkyō ni utsuru nihon*, 260–78.

negative movement, the question of belonging to the species first of all does not arise. Therefore, there was a Hegelian moment of *mediation* or the subject's *self-othering with itself* such as *self-awareness (jikaku)*.³²⁴ Meanwhile the genus signifies the higher ruler or imperative which allows the subject's negation of a positive reality. As we can see from these explanations, Tanabe's logic shared much with what Balibar tried to explain with the concept of fictive universality. In fact, Sakai argued that, based on the logic that an individual belongs to a species insofar as there is a self-conscious negation of the species through the mediation of the genus (state/empire), Tanabe offered a philosophical foundation for the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.³²⁵ As I show later, Kōsaka was Tanabe's student and his argument has much in common with this *Logic of Species* by developing the theory of negation.

It is important to note that those scholars started articulating their theory before the Japanese government's inauguration of the Co-Prosperity Sphere and the relationship between their theory and ongoing politics is over-determined. However, it is very difficult to deny that the contemporaneous social conditions of the Japanese invasion of China, the huge population flow within the empire, and the rise of ethnic nationalism in the imperial territories affected those intellectual activities.

Koyama himself developed his theory of *minzoku* in response to the ongoing Japanese policy. In *A Theory of Minzoku and Population* (1941), Koyama referred to Prime Minister Konoe Fumimaro's cabinet's basic principles governing national policies and the establishment of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere and their importance for resolving ethnic problems. Koyama saw worldwide cultural conflicts arise between

³²⁴ Sakai, "Subject and Sunstratum," 462–530.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*, 512–7.

ethnicities after World War I and he expected that the study of ethnology should provide theoretical foundations for political action. Explaining Chiang Kai-shek's "Three Principles of the People (*sanminshugi*)" and Japanese intellectuals' "Theory of East Asian Community (*tōa kyōdōtai ron*)" as political theories of *minzoku*, Koyama searched for a way to overcome cultural conflicts through the *minzoku* studies. Therefore, he criticized previous ethnology studies as a "deification of the Japanese spirit" that had totally departed from reality and further clarified the object of his study: "What we problematize now is not the past Japan or imagined *minzoku*, but rather the present and future Japan including the territory of Manchuria, China, and the South Pacific, and *minzoku* living there."³²⁶

Given Koyama's political concerns, how does Kōsaka's argument regarding *minzoku* fit? Koyama's adoption of Kōsaka's logic can help us elucidate the political implications of Koyama's race studies. Kōsaka was a philosopher of the Kyoto School and well known as a scholar of Kant and historical philosophy. He was also famous for his intellectual commitment to the imperial war. *The Philosophy of Minzoku (Minzoku no tetsugaku)*, published in 1942, was one of Kōsaka's wartime texts; he discussed the theory of *minzoku* based on his own philosophy of "world history."³²⁷ The discussion of "world history" by scholars in the Kyoto school is well known as an attempt to criticize the Hegelian monistic understanding of world history as a process of Europeanization and to alternatively posit a pluralistic view of "world history," particularly by emphasizing its spatial aspects.

Kōsaka's attempt to theorize *minzoku* in this text started with a distinction between the concept of *minzoku* and the concept of race (*shuzoku*). He first focused on the point that, whereas the concept of race seemed to be the product of modern natural science, it actually

³²⁶ Koyama, *Minzoku to jinkō no riron*, 1–7.

³²⁷ Masaaki Kōsaka, ed., *Minzoku no tetsugaku* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1942).

acquired its political nuances through a presupposition of racial superiority based on pure blood. As an example of such race theory, Kōsaka used Joseph Arthur de Gobineau's *An Essay on the Inequality of Human Races* (*Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*), in which Gobineau attributed a hierarchical order of innate values among human beings to racial differences. Kōsaka's evaluation of this text was ambivalent. On the one hand, he clearly refuted Gobineau's racial determinism. Gobineau located the very motor of world history in race, or more precisely, in the amount of pure blood in the white race. However, referring to the Kantian explanation of race, Kōsaka asserted that there was no difference between racial groups in terms of type (*Art*) and labeled Gobineau's determinism as prejudice. On the other hand, Kōsaka was interested in the way Gobineau described world history as a bloody conflict among racial groups. According to Kōsaka, Gobineau did not simply compare various racial groups in a typological way. Rather, he examined historically important racial groups that emerged as a result of conflicts, and he examined them in a series. In that sense, he regarded Gobineau's essay as a work on world history from a racial perspective.³²⁸

Instead of Gobineau's racial perspective, what Kōsaka argued for was the establishment of *minzoku* as a subject of world history. For Kōsaka, race (*shuzoku*) was a substratum (*kitai*) and a medium (*baitai*) for the constitution of *minzoku*. As an example of the constitutive conditions of *minzoku*, he presented six important elements: blood ties, territorial bonding, destiny, language, myth, and art. Yet none of them, separately or together, were enough to define *minzoku*. What Kōsaka tried to indicate here were the subjective characteristics of *minzoku*. According to him, *minzoku* "does not have a completely

³²⁸ Ibid., 7–18.

delineated border”; its limits are always indefinite and it shows clear borders only when *minzoku* is limited “subjectively,” that is, negation. Kōsaka also states:

It is true that *minzoku* is not something externally limited and demarcated by some parallel moments. Yet it just tells that *minzoku* is not limited from outside and does not mean that *minzoku* is not internally self-limiting and shouldn't be. The fact that *minzoku* is not limited and demarcated from outside means that *minzoku* is nothing but subjective and practical.³²⁹

In this way, for Kōsaka *minzoku* is the object of transformation by subjective practices.

Importantly, at this moment, Kōsaka introduced the necessity of the state in which *minzoku* limited and represented itself. He called this “state-ethnicity” (*kokkateki minzoku*). The point is that state-ethnicity is the product of subjective acts. Such subjectivity is the counterpart of the state in Kōsaka's philosophy of *minzoku*. At this point, we should notice that his thesis comes very close to positing the mechanism of fictive universality, which I used as an analytical tool in the previous chapter.³³⁰ As we saw, this mechanism of fictive (or Hegelian) universality is particularly useful for analyzing the process involved in integrating diverse populations in empires. When Balibar theoreticizes this process, he highlights the deconstruction of primary community/identity through subjective individuation. However, we cannot ignore that the wider community makes this deconstruction possible as a liberating agency.³³¹ In connection with our discussion, the universality of the state plays the role of this agency. With this understanding, the following explanation by Kōsaka becomes clear:

Minzoku is not simply given by nature. It is not a substratum. It is something which is historically imposed on. It is subjective and self-limiting. While *Minzoku* connects to race (*shuzoku*) in the direction toward the substratum, it connects to the state in the direction toward the subject. It connects to the absolute authority. In the former case,

³²⁹ Ibid., 30.

³³⁰ See in particular chapter 2 of this dissertation.

³³¹ Balibar, *Politics and the Other Scene*, 160.

Minzoku is immanent, but in the latter case, it is transcendent. *Minzoku* is something immanent and transcendent.³³²

Here, we can infer that Kōsaka describes the subjective transition between primary community and the state as a representative of superior ethical and legal values. According to him, since there exist plural states in the world, world history is a competition and coexistence of multiple absolutes, and state-ethnicity is the subject of this world history. This definition of state-ethnicity as a subject of world history is obviously linked to the Kyoto philosophers' notorious claim of worldwide historical significance for the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, as exemplified by the liberation of East Asia from other world powers. In this way, with the articulation of the role of state-ethnicity, Kōsaka's philosophy actually offers the logic of justification for ongoing Japanese imperial development.

Of course, this view of Kōsaka's clearly ran against the racial determinism supported by white supremacists or Western centrists by emphasizing the subjective aspect of community building. Yet the racial discrimination inherent to his own logic leaves much room for discussion. For example, when he argued that "Korean *minzoku* can make use of its true historicity by becoming Japanese *minzoku* in a broad sense," how should we understand the function of his theory in actual imperial policy?³³³ In particular, his theory of *minzoku* does not seem to concern the violence inherent to inclusive nation formation based on subjective will. As we saw in the last chapter, there is a good example of this violent inclusion in the case of Japanese American soldiers in the United States, but the Japanese empire is no exception. In fact, many Korean soldiers were mobilized by the Japanese empire

³³² Kōsaka, *Minzoku no tetsugaku*, 30–31.

³³³ Chikamasa Fujita, ed., *Sekai shiteki tachiba to nihon* (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1943), 339.

during World War II.³³⁴ In this sense, Kōsaka's statement could easily function as an intepellation of a colonized population at this time.

This issue of mobilization of minority subjects of the empire connects Kōsaka's philosophy to Koyama's sociology. It is not surprising that Kōsaka's theory of *minzoku* was referred to by Koyama around this time. Although Koyama developed his theory from a different background, from which theoretical and political articulations of *minzoku* were not yet completely identifiable, those wartime discourses of *minzoku* shared as their goal the linkage of an analysis of the dynamic concept of *minzoku* with the ongoing Japanese imperial nation formation. Therefore Koyama's idea of new Greater East Asian *Minzoku* also faced the problematic of racism functioning in an inclusionary discourse.

One of the aspects that most concerned Koyama during World War II was winning over the East Asian *minzoku* against "Western" imperial powers. He tried to encourage people in the Co-Prosperity Sphere to "fight together with active will."³³⁵ In other words, he tried to gain their subjective commitment to this expanding community. This is exactly what creating model minority subjects in the empire entailed. As I have explained in previous chapters, fictive or Hegelian universality played an effective role in this process. The fact that Kōsaka's philosophy used a similar mechanism of universality shows us why Koyama adopted Kōsaka's idea. By promoting a universalistic appeal within the communities of *minzoku*, Koyama tried to convert them into imperial subjects.

³³⁴ There are many studies that address the mobilization of Koreans as Japanese imperial soldiers. See, for example, Yūichi Higuchi, *Kōgun heishi ni sareta chōsenjin:jūgonen sensōka no sōdōin taisei no kenkyū*, Shohan (Tokyo: Shakai hyōronsha, 1991); Aiko Utsumi, *Chōsenjin "kōgun" heishitachi no sensō*, Shōgen shōwa shi no danmen, no. 186 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1991); Tök-sang Kang, *Chōsenjin gakuto shutsujin : mō hitotsu no wadatsum no koe* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1997).

³³⁵ Koyama, *Senji senden ron*, 290.

However, such inclusionary discourses faced the contradiction of pressuring minority members to spontaneously commit to an occupying country. At this moment, the question of who would take the lead in community formation became an important focal point.

In order to mobilize other *minzoku*, Koyama thought, it was important to understand the mind (*kokoro*) of those *minzoku* and he believed that his ethnology was exactly the right tool for this.³³⁶ As mentioned before, one of Koyama's wartime activities was as a researcher at the Minzoku Research Center, where he examined how the war psychologically influenced the Chinese people. Despite these studies, however, he maintained that there was a civilizational hierarchy between each *minzoku* in the Co-Prosperity Sphere. For example, using the model of kindergarten pupils and college students, Koyama determined the differences among *minzoku* in terms of cultural levels or spiritual structures. In this sense, he never doubted the leading position of the Japanese.³³⁷ That is why his examination of "contact" finally led to the question of how the group in the superior position would lift up the others or prevent their own rapid degradation; he also never tried to understand this "contact" as something that would dislocate his position. In this way, his studies of the usefulness of *minzoku* for creating possible unity were always backed up by racism functioning not necessarily as a biological distinction but as a cultural differentiation.

Conclusion

In light of how complicated it is, both historically and theoretically, to articulate the meaning of *minzoku* and its relationship with the idea of race, I do not think I can give this term a fixed definition. Nevertheless, it is virtually impossible to ignore the fact that, by

³³⁶ Koyama, *Nanpō kensetsu to minzoku jinkō seisaku*, 2.

³³⁷ Koyama, *Senji senden ron*, 291–2.

using the term “*minzoku*,” many Japanese intellectuals had dealt with something other than a strictly biological definition of race since at least the 1920s. From this point of view, Koyama’s study of race and *minzoku* is quite informative in terms of both its temporal development and its geographical scale.

Koyama’s works, on the one hand, are an example of the gradual development of inclusive discourses regarding race and ethnic studies in the Japanese empire and show its contemporaneous contexts, which include important social phenomena such as ongoing territorial expansion, increased mobility or contacts, and the transformation of collective identity. In such contexts, Koyama developed a theory of *minzoku* that was, to a certain extent, comparable to theories advanced in other “progressive” Japanese imperial nationalist discourses. On the other hand, his observation of Japanese migrants led to contemporary American social scientists’ concern over Japanese migrants in the United States. In the previous chapter, I demonstrated how Chicago sociologists contributed to the knowledge production of Japanese immigrants in the United States and how it actually produced model minority subjects during the war. In addition, for these social scientists, the renewed theoretical understanding of racial relations was also crucial when it came to demarcating the expanding borders of the American nation in the face of Asian immigration. Koyama’s reference to the work of the Chicago sociologists showed first that there was contemporaneous academic interest in ethnic/racial contacts through migrations among Japanese intellectuals. In particular, Hawaii was regarded as an important laboratory for the study of race relations. Second, it showed that the interest both countries’ social scientists took in emigrant/immigrant problems was also deeply related to ongoing imperial expansion and the creation of a multi-racial/ethnic community. Although the perspectives of

Koyama and American sociologists are not identical, this connection reveals an important link through which emerging transpacific studies of racism and empires could explore more direct interactions.

Koyama's study also reveals the anxiety of the intellectuals of the empire regarding the "degeneration" of nation, and the concept of *minzoku* was the tool chosen for reestablishing the integrity of the empire. In the end, Koyama's work shows us that the inclusive formation of a nation based on a subjective formation of *minzoku* does not guarantee the end of racism itself but rather serves an important function in discrimination in the development of imperial nation formation. It also works to promote minority members' devotion to the country, as evidenced by many soldiers in the Japanese empire from colonized population during World War II. In fact, I have demonstrated how Koyama's discourse adopted the logic with which he could produce model minority subjects in the Japanese empire.

In this way, I have shown that Japanese intellectual discourse on transpacific migrations also contributed to developing incorporative discourse in the Japanese empire, particularly regarding imperial subject formations. In the final chapter, I will return to the experience of the Japanese immigrants/Americans in the United States. Now what I finally explore is the mobilization of Japanese immigrants/Americans and the intensity of that experience. In such incorporative discourses of empires, to what type of violence were the minorities exposed and what was the radical potentiality of their actions in this process?

Chapter 5:

Between Nightmare and Daydream

Shibutani Tamotsu and Affective Traces of a Participant Observer

The forcible internment during World War II of 120,000 Japanese Americans, many of whom were U.S. citizens, has been the subject of numerous studies. Much of this research has examined the testimonies of survivors, who recount various wartime oppressions, mobilizations, and racial discriminations while also exploring how the memories of such traumatic experiences impacted postwar political struggles.³³⁸ Unsurprisingly, perhaps, previous studies on the topic have revealed the anger and resentment that Japanese Americans felt towards the state and society during this time. Nevertheless, critical analyses of these events tend to end with an evaluation of Japanese Americans' resistance as a patriotic act, sometimes drawing from such acts a straightforward conclusion about their ultimate recovery of recognition and rights by state.³³⁹

As we have seen in previous chapters, World War II was the moment when the inclusion of minority subjects was actively processed in the empires across the Pacific from one another. One of the core mechanisms of this minority inclusion is that it promoted spontaneous commitment to the regime in the name of the ethical/legal universal value of the state. Obviously, what makes this mechanism complicated is the close interconnection

³³⁸ For a rich historical study of memories of internment and the various complicated postwar paths toward the redress movement among survivors, see Alice Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2008).

³³⁹ For an example of such recent scholarship, see Eric L. Muller, *Free to Die for Their Country: The Story of the Japanese American Draft Resisters in World War II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); The narrative of Japanese American resistance itself can be traced back to some revisionist scholars' works of the 1970s. Representative ones are, Gary Y. Okihiro, "Japanese Resistance in America's Concentration Camps: A Re-Evaluation," *Amerasia Journal* 2, no. 1 (October 1, 1973): 20–34; Authur A. Hansen and David A. Hacker, "The Manzanar Riot: An Ethnic Perspective," *Amerasia Journal* 2, no. 2 (October 1, 1974): 112–57.

between resistance against discrimination and integration into empire. In light of this analytical framework, the abovementioned interpretation of Japanese American practices during the war may fit the logic of imperial nation formation.

In contrast to these conclusions, I argue here that the testimony of one atypical Japanese American military unit reveals unresolved memories of racial discrimination and expressions of discontent that cannot be totally subsumed by a narrative of patriotic and subjective resistance or national integration. Rather, they show a form of discontent in the course of integration, which exposes the violent structure of national integration itself and the function of racism within it. In that sense, this chapter develops my analysis of the racism of empire in the previous chapters and theoreticizes the contingent moment in the process of imperial nation formation. This exploration will necessarily demonstrate the alternative interpretation of the so-called “Japanese American” experience during World War II.

This chapter addresses the work of an American sociologist, Shibutani Tamotsu (1920- 2005), who was a so-called *Nisei*, a child of Japanese immigrants to the United States. After the entry of the United States into the World War II, he was interned when he was only twenty years old. However, unlike most of the Japanese Americans who were interned or who served in the military during World War II, Shibutani was recruited as a member of a sociological research group entrusted with studying the internment camps. As a member of the community that was the subject of this research, he played a role of participant observer. Shibutani maintained this observer’s attitude and kept taking field notes later as well, when he was drafted into the army. Shibutani’s postwar academic career was based on the research he carried out during the war. Influenced by the methodology of the Chicago school of sociology led by Robert Park, Shibutani received his M.A. and Ph.D. at the University of

Chicago.³⁴⁰ Based on this sociological training, he wrote several scholarly works about the wartime experiences of Japanese Americans. One of them is *The Derelicts of Company K*, which was published in 1978. This is the sociological study of the Japanese American military unit in which Shibutani had served during the war. Part of the reason for the delay of his publication was, as Shibutani himself indicated, the “difficulty” related to the intensity of the experiences he participated in.³⁴¹ Interestingly, unlike better-known accounts of “heroic” Japanese American combat teams, such as the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, this book deals with the extreme malfunction of a military unit, a subject that had not received much scholarly attention at this time.³⁴² This work vividly records the internal conflicts and racial antagonism existing within the US army. Shibutani analyzed a series of events related to the Japanese American unit as it underwent what he called in sociological terms a process of “demoralization.”

This chapter, by critically examining his interpretation of events, focuses both on the affective experiences of Japanese American soldiers and on the sense of trauma reflected in the writing of participant observer Shibutani himself. These points give us an indication of how to read the discontent of the soldiers beyond the existing patriotic discourse of resistance. The first part of this chapter elaborates on Shibutani’s academic research that focused on the internment of Japanese Americans during the war. In the second part, the chapter offers a detailed exploration of the series of events involving Company K, which

³⁴⁰ On the importance of Chicago sociology in the construction of assimilationist discourse against Asian immigrants, see Yu, *Thinking Orientals*.

³⁴¹ Tamotsu Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K: A Sociological Study of Demoralization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), x.

³⁴² In an article on Japanese American soldiers during the U.S. occupation of Japan, Eiichiro Azuma refers to the description of the soldiers in Shibutani’s last chapter of *The Derelicts of Company K*. However, Eiichiro’s analysis, which mentions the surprising neglect of what he calls an “unusual book,” does not provide a interpretation of the whole document. Eiichiro Azuma, “Brokering Race, Culture, and Citizenship: Japanese Americans in Occupied Japan and Postwar National Inclusion,” *Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 16, no. 3 (2009): 183–211.

Shibutani describes thoroughly in his account. Part three provides a more theoretical analysis and critique of Shibutani's study. Relying on the emergent postcolonial theory on affect, the final part presents an alternative reading of Shibutani's observatory records.³⁴³ It highlights particular stances of several Japanese American soldiers and their potential for unsettling the discourse of integration informing Shibutani's approach.

JERS and Company K

During World War II, three separate groups conducted research on Japanese Americans in the camps. Anthropologists led the community analysts of the War Relocation Authority (WRA). They were charged with providing the WRA with useful information related to camp administration. Alexander H. Leighton directed the sociological research group based at the Poston War Relocation Center in Arizona, which was placed under the auspices of the Office of Indian Affairs. Shibutani worked with the University of California's Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (JERS), directed by Dorothy Swaine Thomas, a sociologist at Berkeley.

Dorothy Thomas, whose husband was the well-known Chicago sociologist, W.I. Thomas, was a central figure in internment camp research. Previously, she had studied social demography and published a book about internal migration. From her academic perspective, the internment offered an important sociological opportunity to study a case of "forced mass

³⁴³ Another recent previous study of Shibutani, see, Karen M. Inouye, "Japanese American Wartime Experience, Tamotsu Shibutani and Methodological Innovation, 1942–1978," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 48, no. 4 (September 1, 2012): 318–38. In this article, Inouye touches on Shibutani's position as a participant observer, which my chapter also focuses on. One of the big differences with her interpretation is that my argument examines more the meaning of the discrepancies between his theoretical framework in that text and affective traces of the experiences.

migration.”³⁴⁴ Thomas recruited the initial staff of JERS from Berkeley. Shibutani was one of the leaders among Nisei students on campus at that time and he had also been trained in the social sciences.³⁴⁵ Those points appealed to Thomas when she started recruiting staff for the project. Most Japanese American members of JERS functioned as participant observers and they were assigned to spend time in the camps.³⁴⁶

Prior to settling in the relocation centers, Japanese Americans spent much of spring and summer of 1942 in assembly centers, and it was at this point that JERS staff members were at first commissioned to work. Shibutani and other Nisei staffers were sent to the Tanforan Assembly Center in San Bruno, California. Others were commissioned to different centers in Puyallup, Tulare, and Santa Anita. At this point, Shibutani started recording his series of observations. Then, as the transfer of evacuees from the assembly centers to the relocation centers progressed, Thomas also transferred the JERS observers to new places. Based on Thomas’s decision to focus JERS research on a few camps, many observers, including Shibutani, were gathered at the Tule Lake War Relocation Center in California.³⁴⁷

Once the WRA decided to allow loyal Nisei to leave the camps in late 1942 and early 1943, their resettlement in the Midwest became another focus of JERS research. Therefore,

³⁴⁴ Dorothy Swaine Thomas and Richard S Nishimoto, *The Spoilage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), v. Thomas began applying for funding in March 1942, immediately after President Franklin Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066. By that time, she already had funding from three major sources, amounting to \$100,000. See, Yuji Ichioka, ed., *Views from within: The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study* ([Los Angeles]: Resource Development and Publications, Asian American Studies Center, University of California at Los Angeles, 1989), 6–8.

³⁴⁵ Ichioka, *Views from Within*, 186-7.

³⁴⁶ For the list of Japanese Americans affiliated with the JERS, see Peter T Suzuki, “The University of California Japanese Evacuation and Resettlement Study: A Prolegomenon,” *Dialect Anthropol Dialectical Anthropology* 10, no. 3–4 (1986): 189–213.

³⁴⁷ For a study of other Japanese American JERS staff researchers, Lane Ryo Hirabayashi deals with Tamie Tsuchiyama, who did fieldwork in the Poston Relocation Center. See, Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, *The Politics of Field Work: Research in an American Concentration Camp* (Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press, 1999). Alice Young Murray also analyzes the roles of JERS field workers such as S. Frank Miyamoto, James Sakoda, Richard S. Nishimoto, and Rosalie Hankey. See Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress*, 140-84.

after serving as an observer at Tule Lake, Shibutani was reassigned to the University of Chicago, where Thomas had opened a new JERS office in the spring of 1943. During his stay there, Shibutai attended graduate seminars in the sociology department at Chicago University and eventually earned his M.A. in 1944. Shibutani was then inducted into the armed forces in 1944 and served in a Japanese American military unit called Company K in 1945.³⁴⁸ This gave him a special opportunity to examine the function of a military organization from inside. Under these new circumstances, Shibutani continued his activity as an observer and continued taking field notes. These notes became the basis of his postwar book, *The Derelicts of Company K*.

After the war, the works of JERS became the most influential in academia among the three research groups that had operated. Unlike the analysts of WRA, most members of JERS published their research immediately after the war, and their analyses provided the basic framework for understanding the experience of Japanese Americans in the camps. First made public in 1946 as *The Spoilage*, one such work was authored by Dorothy Thomas and Richard S. Nishimoto. Based on the research conducted by JERS at Tule Lake, the book focused on the “disloyals” among the internees and interpreted the meaning of the turmoil at the camp. This book was succeeded in 1952 by another study penned by Thomas called *The Salvage*, while her third book in the Berkeley series came out in 1954 under the title *Prejudice, War and the Constitution*.

As might be expected, however, scholarly criticism of wartime research on interned Japanese Americans appeared later. By the 1980s, critical scholarship focused on the ethical

³⁴⁸It was first activated at Fort Snelling, Minnesota, in July 1945, with 258 former students as enlisted men, three cadre NCOs (non-commissioned officers), and one officer. An additional 293 student personnel (58 Hawaiians, 233 mainlanders, and 2 Caucasians) were assigned to this company later. Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K*, 198.

aspects of the connection between academic research and politics.³⁴⁹ In 1987, prominent Asian American Studies scholar Yuji Ichioka organized a conference on the wartime JERS research at Berkeley entitled “VIEWS FROM WITHIN: The Japanese-American Wartime Internment Experience.” Its proceedings were published later as *Views from Within: The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study*.³⁵⁰ In the introduction to the published record of this conference, Ichioka warns against a priori judgments, trying to direct people’s attention to a close examination of the JERS materials. In other words, Ichioka sought to forestall judgments that there can be no redeeming value in this research because of its unethical origins. Ichioka’s words of caution clearly reflect the contemporaneous climate of criticism toward the JERS study. Indeed, even as JERS members were doing their research, they already had to face a problem of legitimacy. There was always the risk of being perceived as “informants” for the WRA or the FBI. Ichioka also noted that “JERS was not a research project in the service of a political cause on behalf of Japanese-Americans.”³⁵¹

Although Shibutani’s works are not immune to this ethical form of criticism regarding the political implications of his research, several of his studies in particular deal with more sensitive and critical issues. Shibutani published his own findings based on the JERS research in the postwar era, but his publications came relatively late compared to similar studies. *Improvised News*, which was based on Shibutani’s master’s thesis and doctoral work, came out in 1966. In this book, he examines how rumors functioned when people were deprived of accurate sources of information.³⁵² He finally published *The Derelicts of Company K* in 1978. Unlike any other JERS study, this book is a study neither of the camps

³⁴⁹ As an example of such a critical view, see Peter T Suzuki, “Anthropologists in the Wartime Camps for Japanese Americans: A Documentary Study,” *Dialect Anthropol Dialectical Anthropology* 6, no. 1 (1981): 23–60.

³⁵⁰ Ichioka, *Views from Within*.

³⁵¹ Ichioka, *Views from Within*, 22-23.

³⁵² Tamotsu Shibutani, *Improvised News; a Sociological Study of Rumor* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966).

nor of resettlement, but rather of life in a military unit. Importantly, Shibutani's description of the unit was far removed from the heroic image of the 100th battalion or the 442nd Regimental Combat team and their combat missions in Europe.³⁵³ In fact, Shibutani's military unit was known as one of the worst groups in the history of the US army.

After working in the camps and in Chicago as a participant observer for JERS for more than two years, Shibutani was inducted into the armed forces in 1944. This gave him a special opportunity to examine the function of a military organization from inside. Under these circumstances, Shibutani continued his activity as an observer and kept taking field notes. These notes became the basis of *The Derelicts of Company K* and has provided precious information about Japanese American soldiers, since they focused on the infighting and internal divisions in the army.

The story of Japanese American military units is a well-known part of the tragedy of Japanese immigrants during World War II. When the war began, almost 2,000 Hawaiian AJAs (Americans of Japanese ancestry, active primarily in Hawaii) were already serving in the US army. However, because of their supposedly unreliable status, the army invented the Hawaiian Provisional Infantry Battalion and reassigned AJA soldiers to it. They were sent to Camp McCoy for training in June 1942 and were later reassigned to the 100th Infantry Battalion.

On the other hand, in January 1943, the Secretary of War announced the formation of a Japanese American special combat team and called for volunteers from Hawaii and the mainland. President Roosevelt's comments regarding this policy have been rightly mentioned as a turning point in the development of a more integrative policy. He declared that "the

³⁵³ For a concise description of Japanese Americans and the military during World War II, see James C McNaughton, "Japanese Americans and the U.S. Army: A Historical Reconsideration," *Army History*, no. 59 (Summer/Fall 2003): 4–15.

principle on which this country was founded and by which it has always been governed is that Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart. Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry.”³⁵⁴ Those volunteers composed the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, which is remembered for its motto “go for broke.” Many of the mainland volunteers came directly from relocation centers. Both the 100th Battalion and the 442nd trained at Camp Shelby in Mississippi, but the 100th Battalion went to Europe first, in August 1943. The 442nd landed in Italy in June 1944.

Since, in June 1942, the Selective Service System had decided based in the advice of the War Department to classify all Nisei as 4-C—“aliens ineligible for military service”—the induction of Nisei was discontinued. Therefore, until the Secretary of War’s call for volunteers, there had been no recruits for frontline duty from the ranks of Japanese Americans except from two institutions. One was the 100th battalion, the other one was the Military Intelligence Service Language School (MISLS).

This situation changed entirely when Nisei were again subjected to the draft in January 1944. Shibutani was drafted in late 1944 and, by then, the 100th battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat team had already started their combat missions in Europe. Shibutani’s unit was far removed from this heroic image, however, and his book analyzes why this unit could not function well. Company K was activated at Fort Snelling, Minnesota, in July 1945 with 258 former students as enlisted men, three cadre NCOs (non-commissioned officers), and one officer. An additional 293 student personnel (58 Hawaiians, 233 mainlanders, and 2 Caucasians) were assigned to this company later.³⁵⁵

³⁵⁴ Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K*, 39.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 198.

In *The Derelicts of Company K*, Shibutani's description and analysis begins with A-9-3(A Company, 9th Battalion, 3rd Regiment), the so-called "fuck-up company," which was formed slightly earlier than Company K at Fort Meade, Maryland. Starting with the analysis of this company, he traces the gradual transformation that occurred among the Japanese American soldiers who were involved.

The Process of "Demoralization"

The description and analysis of *The Derelicts of Company K* has its roots in the complicated process of internment and its influence on Japanese Americans and soldiers in the early stage of the war. It also provides the context for Nisei soldiers' assignment to this military unit.

The main part of the book, however, deals with the gradual increase of internal divisions and infighting within Company K, a process Shibutani traces from the replacement depot at Fort Meade, where the company was known as A-9-3, to the Fort Lawton transshipment point in Washington State. Finally, Shibutani describes what he observed in Japan while Company K was stationed at Zama during the occupation.³⁵⁶

We can read the book, then, as a collection of rich historical materials. On the other hand, the book can be said to contain a certain plot, which also reflects Shibutani's theoretical framework. Though large in scope, Shibutani's narrative crystallizes around his theme of the "morale degradation" of Japanese American soldiers and concludes with their reconciliation with Caucasian soldiers. Shibutani starts the first chapter of the book with a brief description of the precipitating event of the conflict:

The brawl started on a small streetcar—called the "dummy line"—that shuttled for about a mile from the gate to the interior of the fort. It was crowded with soldiers returning from pass, hurrying back to quarters before bed check. In the pushing and

³⁵⁶ Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K*, 102.

scuffling one soldier, whose foot had been trampled, objected loudly and shoved the offender. He found himself confronted by an infuriated man, who cursed him as a “dirty Haole” and muttered to his companion that such creatures should be “fixed.” At the end of the line the three Caucasian soldiers aboard nervously made for their barracks at a brisk pace. They were overtaken at a firebreak and quickly surrounded by the enraged man and his friends. Others stopped to watch. As the protagonists faced one another, the irate man screamed, “You white! You t’eenk you better dan me! Look at me! Yallow! But me, I no scared of you! If you so good, why you no heet me?” The outnumbered men declined to fight, exclaiming repeatedly that no offence had been intended. As they started to run, they were set upon by the gang. One man was beaten to the ground and, as he lay helpless, was kicked repeatedly. As some onlookers began to intervene, the other two succeeded in breaking away. It was not until they approached their company area, however, that one of them realized that he had been stabbed in the back.³⁵⁷

According to Shibutani, this incident occurred on October 17, 1945 at Fort Snelling. Unlike postwar narratives of brave and loyal Japanese American soldiers during World War II, this story presents a different picture of their lives; that is, a picture of aggressive feelings of frustration and anger inside army groups. Why did such an incident occur in a Japanese American unit with a relatively good reputation? What were its consequences? These are the central questions that puzzle the reader at the beginning of this text, and they are the ones that Shibutani tries to answer.

In his description, the use of the terms “demoralization” and “morale degradation” is intended to have a specific sociological purpose. According to him, in this sociological examination, the concept of “morale” refers to the “degree of effectiveness” with which certain groups pursue each recognized goal.³⁵⁸ Consequently, “demoralization” has the opposite effect of morale. In this part, I will follow how Shibutani describes the series of incidents around Company K as the trajectory of what he called “demoralization.”

What Shibutani regards as an “initial break of discipline” emerged during the company’s training at Fort Meade. As the war in Europe reached its end in early 1945, Fort

³⁵⁷ Ibid., 1.

³⁵⁸ Ibid., 3.

Meade functioned as a main replacement depot for Army Ground Forces. Nisei replacements to the 442nd Regimental Combat Team passed through this point. However, since the unit had not been committed to action during that time of year, Nisei replacements were accumulating on this base in large numbers. By V-E day, more than 1,200 Nisei soldiers had been assigned there.

During his long sojourn at the replacement depot, Shibutani found in company A-9-3 symptoms of turbulence. This process of gradual unrest started with the subtle mismanagement of bureaucratic military procedures. The military training of A-9-3 began in early April, but the poor facilities at the base made it difficult for cadres to coordinate their work and to offer effective infantry training. The chaotic manner of the training and the officers' indifference to the soldiers' welfare caused exasperation among the Nisei soldiers and reinforced their growing "sense of uselessness." Shibutani describes the beginning of the breakdown in this way:

At first, recalcitrance took the form of yelling from ranks after being called to attention, or falling into formations sluggishly, and of deliberately marching out of step. In virtually every formation, as they were being counted and grouped, shouts erupted: "Let's go!" "Let's get on the ball!" "What's the holdup?" "One time! On the ball! One time!" "What are we waiting for?" The shouting often continued even when some officer ordered, "At ease!" Whenever they were required to stand in the rain without raincoats, someone would yell: "Anybody but a moron can tell it's raining!"³⁵⁹

The soldiers' frustration was heightened by the differential treatment the Nisei unit received in daily services. Compared with the "Caucasian replacements," Nisei were given longer and stricter work and training assignments. Furthermore, after V-E day, the number of Caucasian

³⁵⁹ Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K*, 112.

replacements at Fort Meade increased, and Shibutani describes the tension between them and Nisei soldiers.³⁶⁰

Shibutani also describes the manifestations of frustration and resentment among Nisei soldiers at Fort Meade in terms of a confrontation between them and the military officers. The book provides many descriptions of Nisei soldiers complaining about their commander and refusing to take his orders seriously, but the most interesting episode seems to have occurred in mid-May when discrimination against the Nisei group reached a boiling point. When Nisei soldiers were assigned extra training while Caucasians were excused, they began to consider an official protest. What Shibutani refers to as the “mutiny” plot was planned to damage the reputation of the commanding officer. The soldiers organized a committee of college students within the unit to draw up a petition accusing him in particular of racial discrimination rather than inefficiency. The reason they emphasized discrimination was because this would violate War Department policy and would be the best way to defame him.³⁶¹ This attempt finally broke down because opposition from some Nisei soldiers developed. However, the conflict remained, and finally the officer was replaced by another officer, a move that many of the Nisei soldiers regarded as a successful outcome of their “vendetta.”³⁶²

This series of conflicts at Fort Meade is only the beginning of the turmoil in Shibutani’s narrative. After the war in Europe was over, Nisei replacements at Fort Meade were deployed in a variety of capacities. Some were sent to Europe and some left for other military camps in the United States. Shibutani follows the fate of the Nisei group that had been sent in June 1945 to Fort Snelling for training in intelligence and civil affairs work.

³⁶⁰ Ibid., 140.

³⁶¹ Ibid., 142-143.

³⁶² Ibid., 154.

There was an MISLS at Fort Snelling, and Nisei soldiers were expected to study Japanese for their future duties. This was where Company K came into being. It was activated on July 25, with 258 student enlisted men, three NCOs, and one officer. Many of its members knew little or no Japanese. The company was later expanded to include 293 enlisted men.³⁶³

Once Company K was founded, a violent chain-reaction emerged. Actual violence began when members of Company K beat up the sergeant of Company F because of his admonishment about the boisterousness of visitors at a beer party. This incident caused tensions within the military. In order to identify the participants in the fight, the company was subjected to a knuckle inspection. This search failed, and it left the problem unresolved. However, one month after that incident, intramural violence began.

Shibutani explains this early stage of violence as something that originated as a conflict between Nisei mainlanders and Hawaiians.³⁶⁴ He particularly focuses on a small circle of drunken young Hawaiians from the 5th Platoon as the main perpetrators of the violence. For example, he refers to the incident at the 6th Platoon barracks on the evening of September 7 as the first gang beating. It started when three Hawaiians grasped one “cocky” mainlander, Yasuda, who had made “a slighting remark,” and proceeded to beat him. Immediately, another mainlander intervened to stop the fight, and he then became the next target of their beating. Two weeks after that incident, another Nisei became the victim of an attack by Hawaiians. Six Hawaiians jumped on him, kicked him after he was down, and broke his nose. Such gang attacks continued, and finally, when the company commander

³⁶³ Ibid., 198. The Table in Shibutani’s book shows that it includes 58 Hawaiians, 233 mainlanders and 2 Caucasians.

³⁶⁴ Ibid., 224, 229. Here Shibutani refers to the widespread belief among the mainlanders that Hawaiians always fought in gangs, while mainlanders preferred individual man-to-man confrontation. He explains that the gang beatings by Hawaiians “reinforced the stereotypes of Hawaiians as barbarians,” which was based on the binary understandings of two inner groups, Nisei mainlanders and Nisei Hawaiians. On the other hand, he does not refer to the view from the opposing side very much.

heard of the beatings, restrictions were imposed on the entire 5th Platoon. Parallel to this intramural violence, there also occurred a beating of one of the company's NCOs (non-commissioned officers). Regarding this event, Shibutani mentions that, although intramural violence was generally condemned by members of Company K, mainlanders and Hawaiians alike, most of them supported violence directed at an unpopular NCO. This NCO was a Nisei, not from coastal areas or Hawaii but Texas, and a Regular Army man. Because of his offensive style, he caused frustration among Nisei soldiers and became a target of their attacks.

According to Shibutani, this chain reaction of violence was then directed toward a Caucasian company and later turned into an interethnic conflict, in September 1945. Company A, the OCS (Officer Candidate School) company, for instance, was housed in the same camp and consisted of 239 enlisted men with no Nisei among them. This company became the target of Nisei hostility. Shibutani points to discriminatory policies in the camp as the cause for hostility. For example, while all Caucasian graduates were given commissions, this was consistently not the case with Nisei graduates. Some were commissioned, but not many. Many facilities around the camp were also available only to Caucasian personnel. These differences conditioned the life of the fort.

In this situation, small matters easily generated hostility and tension. One example is a clash that occurred in the mess hall one day at lunch time. One day, when Company K reached the mess hall to have lunch, the OCS men already formed a long line. Since the OCS men had altered the order of eating by rotation, a delegation of Nisei soldiers complained about it. It soon turned into a quarrel and Nisei soldiers regarded the OCS men's arrogance as something that stemmed from their sense of racial superiority.

What Shibutani regards as the first moment of interethnic violence also stemmed from such an everyday matter. Another clash occurred between a Nisei private and a Caucasian OCS man after a dispute over who should be in front of the line at supper. This skirmish later caused the private to catch the OCS man and beat him mercilessly. Shibutani wrote that most of the Nisei men were delighted with this action.

Nisei aggressions against OCS men continued. Drunken Japanese Americans kept looking for fights during the night. By the middle of October, violence was no longer limited to clashes between Company K and Company A; the same pattern of violence had spread throughout the fort. Although those fights were generally attributed to Company K, members from other companies actually joined in as well. By this time, the OCS men had started to fear Company K, and it was in such an atmosphere of violence and hostility that the stabbing incident occurred.

This stabbing incident stunned the fort administrators. It was immediately reported to the company commander and a careful investigation was carried out. After the guilty man was arrested, administrators kept a close eye on Company K, and armed guards were placed around Company A's area. In order to lessen the frustration and resentment among men in Company K, leaders from both companies had a secret meeting. They agreed to organize a "joint *kaiwa* (conversation) meeting" as an initial step toward resolution of the conflict. On November 1 and November 7, this intercompany meeting was held. According to Shibutani, for this process, the two groups carefully chose the OCS participants. They had to be competent linguists; that is, to have an extensive knowledge of Japanese. They were also required to be persons who were able to be friendly with Nisei. Furthermore, they were expected to change Nisei's assumptions that Caucasian OCS men were snobbish and rank

conscious. Shibutani describes these efforts as succeeding in resolving the “misunderstanding” between the two groups; the series of interethnic conflicts was finally stopped.³⁶⁵

Status of the Observer

In this way, Shibutani describes the long series of violent actions that occurred in A-9-3 and within Company K in *The Derelicts of Company K*. How does he situate these events within his own sociological framework? What sort of ideological consequences result?

In the preface to the book, Shibutani states the two objectives of this work. The first objective is to trace how this group became one of the most disorderly units in United States’ military history. He thus treats this work as a “chronicle.” Meanwhile, there is another sociological objective: the “formulation of sociological generalizations concerning the process of demoralization.”³⁶⁶ In other words, the history of Company K is to be regarded as an example of the inefficiency of sustained group organization. In that sense, the examination of Company K was said to be useful for sociological research on other social groups. I will examine the problem of this methodology shortly, but before I do, I want to clarify what Shibutani emphasized as his most important contribution to the study of “morale”.

At this point, it is important to note that he emphasizes the problems involved in an interpretive community in this study. In the preface, he writes that his research is different from previous studies of soldiers’ morale because he focuses on “the subjective experiences

³⁶⁵ Ibid., 285.

³⁶⁶ Ibid., vii.

of the demoralized men themselves.”³⁶⁷ What he later sociologically paraphrases as “the autonomy of primary groups,” therefore, is the core element of his analysis. Other studies of disorders, Shibutani asserts, do not pay much attention to the standpoint of the participants or victims of that disorder. By this he means that most studies had been conducted from the points of view of outsiders such as officials and observers. According to him, those previous studies do not grasp the participants’ own interpretive framework, or “the manner in which they see their world.”³⁶⁸ Since this interpretive community as primary group is said to operate independently of the larger context, it is important for Shibutani to grasp the dynamism of this primary group and to look at the “demoralization” process from their standpoint. In addition, he thinks that this methodological approach enables him to describe the series of events as a participant observer. According to this logic, not only was he able to collect a lot of primary source material, but he was also able to have a subjective experience of this primary group.

Here, as one implication of this emphasis on the interpretive community, we should not miss Shibutani’s appeal to equality and to democracy. While a lack of careful consideration of the potential antagonisms within a society often causes scholars to regard minorities’ insurrections or revolts as irrational, what he concludes in this work is that high morale cannot be created through authoritarian control, but should be in fact “democratic.”³⁶⁹ In other words, Shibutani is critical of the undemocratic control of the military organization, which he pinpoints as a cause of the “demoralization.” This is why he emphasizes the importance of the subjective experience of the group members. He suggests that the ways in which people in certain groups see the world should be respected in order to manage an

³⁶⁷ Ibid., ix.

³⁶⁸ Ibid., ix.

³⁶⁹ Ibid., 435-6.

organization effectively. This is the key of his theoretical emphasis on the value of an interpretive community.

Meanwhile, his sociological writing hints at the possibility of a more harmonious view. He describes how, immediately after the series of violent actions in Company K led to the stabbing incident, the camp administration carefully organized the intercompany *kaiwa* meeting. In this part, Shibutani picks up on one symbolic moment when the victim of the stabbing came for the session. The victim explained that he was fortunately not in critical condition and that he was “not bitter against all Nisei.”³⁷⁰ According to Shibutani, after a few *kaiwa* sessions, this tension between the two companies had “virtually vanished.” In this process, Shibutani locates the reconciliation that was established by opening up the “communication channels” between two “segregated units.” That is, the soldiers noticed that they were misunderstanding each other and instead recognized what they “had in common.”³⁷¹

As for the type of the narrative that describes the path from conflict to reconciliation, we need to undertake a more careful examination. For example, in an article that analyzes the literature about Japanese Americans’ turmoil during internment, Gary Okihiro criticizes the pressure-release theory as a typology of “resistance.” When he refers to this theory, he primarily means the wartime research by the WRA at the Poston camp, but he also includes Shibutani’s mentor Dorothy Thomas’s JERS research in his examination.³⁷² By the pressure-release theory, Okihiro refers to a framework that divides the life of a camp into an initial period of resistance and a later period of accommodation, in which “the early proliferations

³⁷⁰ Ibid., 283.

³⁷¹ Ibid., 285.

³⁷² Okihiro, “Japanese Resistance in America’s Concentration Camps,” 21.

of ‘incidents’ released pent-up emotions leading to equilibrium and stability.”³⁷³ Although the violent actions in Company K occurred not in internment camps and Shibutani is using a different sociological framework in his analysis, we can see that a similar structure is repeated in Shibutani’s account. One main criticism of the pressure-release theory proposed by Okihiro is that it does not identify what he calls “Japanese resistance” as an ongoing process or place it in a broader historical context.³⁷⁴ However, I will problematize this narrative in a different way. Instead of discussing how Shibutani limits the range of Japanese “resistance,” I want to examine the historiographic stakes of his writing by focusing on the tension in the relationship between observation and participation.

When Shibutani pursued his research on demoralization, it was fundamentally important for him to participate in one of the groups that was the object of observation. However, whereas he emphasizes the importance of the participant’s perspective, he also has to distance himself somewhat from the circumstances in order to be an objective observer. What is at stake here for Shibutani is managing to have the embedded experience of the situation and remain a distanced objective observer at the same time.

As I explained above, Shibutani originally joined JERS as a participant observer and, based on that experience, he pursued his field work in Company K using the same strategy. During that time Shibutani worked in a turbulent and traumatic situation. Nevertheless, paradoxically, it is very difficult to find any subjective, emotional moments in his writing, as if he were trying to remain a neutral observer. The effect is to generate a tension between the emotionally affecting events described in the book and the dispassionate prose in which they are described. However, in the introduction to the book, Shibutani confesses the dilemma he

³⁷³ Ibid., 29.

³⁷⁴ Ibid., 29.

had experienced from the beginning of this research, regarding his status as a participant observer. He writes:

It requires both enough identification with the subjects being studied to comprehend and to feel their definition of the situation and at the same time sufficient detachment to realize that this particular view is but one of several possible interpretations. Remaining reasonably dispassionate, especially in the midst of some of the exasperating circumstances described, was extremely difficult. Indeed it was not until about ten years had passed that much of the resentment began to fade.³⁷⁵

Although, as Henry Yu indicates in his book about the Chicago sociologists, “detachment” is the best word to describe Shibutani’s scholarly works, this quote shows that the process of detachment was not an easy task for him.³⁷⁶ He confesses that he had to constantly struggle with himself, especially with his feeling of “resentment.” In further analysis, we cannot miss the strong feelings behind his seemingly detached observations. We need to dig more deeply into the further effects of the observatory operation that Shibutani tried to pursue despite of its difficulty.

Shibutani faces the observer’s dilemma in the tension between the self-effacing observatory position from which one can grasp the entire situation and the social/practical relationship that actually indicates his inclusion in it. It reveals the distinction inherent in being a subject and shows us that an observer cannot pursue his mission without grounding him/herself in social practice on the level of agency. My point is that, as Naoki Sakai clarifies, there is a slippage between practice and observation, which is articulated as a delay in description. In other words, in the transitional process of description by the observing subject, what is encountered in an observer’s practice must be transformed into the

³⁷⁵ Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K*, 18.

³⁷⁶ With the word “detachment,” Yu emphasizes the explicit analytical distance demonstrated in Shibutani’s works, which was originally required in participant observation, and was one of the common strategies of Chicago sociology. Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 140-148.

phenomenon in which the observer tries to ensure its universal objectivity.³⁷⁷ Therefore, we cannot miss the ways that this slippage always haunts the observer's objective description.

When Shibutani confesses his resentment in his text, he shows the trace of the unsettled feelings that that stemmed from his personal involvement in the situation. Nevertheless, instead of exploring the tension between his observations and his methodological practice, he tries to erase the gap in his scholarly writing as a guarantor of objectivity. As he writes, to be “dis-passionate” is an important element for his research objectives. Then, what is behind Shibutani's adherence to the observatory position in his writing?

Here I want to point out that our practical relationship always goes beyond a sutured and self-defined totality such as a “society” As Ernest Laclau and Chantal Mouffe once articulated, the “irresoluble interiority/exteriority tension” is a condition of our social practice and cannot be reduced to a definable objective relation.³⁷⁸ Therefore, observers cannot stay comfortably outside of the social relationship by positing an objective category of totality. It means that when such predetermined totality is postulated as a basis of an objective relationship, the actual practice of the observer is dismissed. From this theoretical point of view, Shibutani's observation's potential affinity with the integrative narrative through positing a self-defined totality emerges as a matter worth analyzing in more depth.

In *The Derelicts of Company K*, in meticulously tracing the trajectory of the series of violent actions, Shibutani ascribes them to causes such as racism, the bureaucratic military

³⁷⁷ Naoki Sakai, *Translation and Subjectivity: On Japan and Cultural Nationalism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 117–52.

³⁷⁸ Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London: Verso, 1985), 111. See Chapter 3 for the classical articulation of society as a defined totality and social practice.

system, different social backgrounds, and so on. He does not simply describe the incidences of interethnic violence as Japanese resistance. Nevertheless, his writing retains a harmonious conclusion. The reason for this is that his study presupposes certain organizations to be closed entities and focuses on demoralization as a sign of their inefficiency or malfunction. Within this framework, certain elements of equilibrium and stability are introduced from the beginning, and the incidents in Company K are measured as a divergence from the ideal equilibrium. Therefore, the reconciliation is regarded as something like the recovering of harmony. It also implies that the Japanese American soldiers' violent actions are to be regarded as problems to be solved or divergences to be normalized.

As I explained earlier, one of the implications of Shibutani's study is its appeal to equality or democracy. By focusing on the interpretive community, Shibutani tries to show the rationality of Nisei soldiers' attitude in Company K and to indicate the undemocratic malfunction of the military organization. At this point, it is difficult to ignore his intention to criticize US society. Nevertheless, when he sets off to observe the "divergent" actions of Nisei soldiers, his view seems to be determined by the perspective of the ruling class. The more he recounts the explanatory elements for the understanding of the cause and effect of the events, the more this supports a framework that regards the entire situation as an abnormal problem to be solved. In other words, it lacks the perspective that interrogates the regime sustaining the stable/normal order itself.

What we cannot ignore here is this study's possible contribution to national integration. Shibutani's narrative of violent conflict and reconciliation has a particular affinity with the inclusion of resistance posed by minorities. Within this framework, minorities' "resentment" and complaints are carefully examined as something countable, and

ways to remedy minorities' grievances are sought in order to recover equilibrium among members of a national community.

However, isn't something missing from this narrative? If the series of violent actions cannot be remedied by such reconciliation, what does Shibutani's material tell us about these unsettling events? In the next section, I examine these questions.

Nightmare and Daydream

Shibutani's study shows us the wartime history of Company K as one trajectory, in which his observations lay out a course of events leading up to the stabbing incident. However, I want to read his historiography in the reverse direction. That is, instead of examining the established course toward the incident, I want to pay attention to Shibutani's observatory descriptions of Nisei soldiers before the event. Shibutani describes their responses to the stabbing incident as follows: "On Thursday morning everyone learned of the stabbing, and a common reaction to the news was: 'Well it finally happened!' " ³⁷⁹ What I want to examine here is a way to approach the indeterminate domain opened in advance of the word: "finally."

Nisei soldiers in Shibutani's writing, to varying degrees, showed the evidences of having experienced traumatic events, such as humiliation, anger, sluggishness, self-destructiveness, and so on. These various symptoms direct our attention to the reality of people passing through an extreme situation; that is, how people being exposed to this domain perceived their situation and how they bore the traces of this lived experience.

What individuals in such a situation first encounter is expressed by Shibutani as "fear." He vividly describes the scene at the beginning of the Pacific War in Hawaii:

³⁷⁹ Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K*, 276.

The Nisei and the resident Japanese stood accused of disloyalty. They were acutely conscious of their tenuous position. They realized that outsiders knew little about them, and they could well understand their fear and hostility. But there was little they could do to disprove the allegations. They underwent a sudden and drastic change of status; they were cast down to the lowest rung of the multiethnic ladder and suffered in addition the distasteful identification with a dangerous and hated enemy. Their first reaction was fear — fear of internment, fear of mob violence, fear of losing their livelihood. They felt like criminals awaiting execution.³⁸⁰

Although a sense of insecurity must have historically conditioned the everyday life of many Japanese Americans, after this experience of “falling” even further, their omnipresently insecure situation suddenly overwhelmed them; Shibutani does not limit the sources of their fear to a single object. In fact, this fear was actualized in various formations. Shibutani mentions the “campaign of terror” that included “night riders, arson, bombing, vandalism and boycotts” that some Japanese Americans had to face even after returning from internment camps.³⁸¹

His focus on fear as one of the emotional conditions of wartime Japanese Americans needs more examination because it requires a specific type of perception on the part of individuals exposed to this affect. Unlike normal perception, the fear experienced in people’s bodies implies a pre-actualized threat.³⁸² Even from Shibutani’s description of the very beginning of the Pacific war, it is obvious that this sense of threat intensively conditioned the life of many Japanese Americans. Compared to the records of actual incidents and the reactions to them documented in Shibutani’s work, the precise description of the Japanese American soldiers getting involved in this pre-actualized threat in his observation of military

³⁸⁰ Ibid., 34.

³⁸¹ Ibid., 66.

³⁸² For an analysis of the affective quality of fear as indeterminate threat, see Brian Massumi, “Fear (The Spectrum Said),” *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 13, no. 1 (2005): 31–48. In this article, Massumi analyzes the affect of fear as a virtual tool of contemporary power. In contrast, I try to find in this affect regarded as fear an important opportunity for the encounter and dislocation of self.

units is rare. However, we can get a glimpse of such figures in the following short piece of observation by Shibutani of one Nisei soldier at Fort Meade:

Many confessed to feeling insecure, still fearing that Caucasians stood ready to condemn them at the slightest provocation. One man even had a nightmare of being a victim of mob violence. They rarely referred to themselves as “Japanese” or even as “Japanese-Americans” in the presence of outsiders.³⁸³

Feelings of “insecureness” in this nightmare about mob violence provide one example of the effects of pre-actualized threat. As usual, Shibutani does not add any emotional comments to the record of this soldier’s nightmare. However, this record lets us know how deeply the threat informed the life of the man in this situation. Whether this soldier had experienced mob violence before or whether he heard about fellow victims of such menacing circumstances, this threat already haunted him as a potential target and he perceived its actualization in his dream. What Shibutani’s record of one Nisei soldier offers here is this specific mode of exposure to violence in this pre-actualized domain. Meanwhile, other potentially targeted individuals were not simply frightened. Their insecure condition rather instigated in them a certain type of “tension”—or what Shibutani calls “aggressive impulses.”

Among his observations of Company K, Shibutani records at one point the daydream of a Nisei soldier. This dream is in fact a frightening anticipation of aggressive impulses:

A daydream divulged by one of the men reveals how the frustration and resentment were eliciting aggressive impulses:

We get in a big bang fight with the OCS guys. The whole thing starts when one of them calls me a “Jap.” I take a lot of shit from him without saying anything until he calls me that; then I let him have it. All the boys are there, and they back me up. They let me fight this guy alone, and they take on the other Haoles. I beat the shit out of the guy. The next day they find out at the hospital that the guy’s got two broken ribs, a broken nose, and a broken jaw. They got twenty other OCS guys in the hospital. All I

³⁸³ Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K*, 104.

got is a skinned knuckle. I go in to see the CO and tell him all about it, and the CO says I got a right to hit any guy who calls me a “Jap.”³⁸⁴

This is a fantasy of violent action. It is also a story of retaliation with a bit of a narcissistic tone. What I want to draw out from this daydream are the aggressive impulses that propel this story. In anticipation of the “it finally happened” stabbing incident, we can locate here a potential aggressive impulse.

How do we understand the conjunction between the soldier’s fear of violence and this aggressive impulse? In order to analyze further the characteristics of this tension, I want to refer to the discussion by a scholar of postcolonial studies, Tomiyama Ichirō, specifically to what he called the “presentiment of violence (*Bōryoku no yokan*).”³⁸⁵ This concept of the presentiment of violence is developed by Tomiyama in order to examine the specific perception of futurity in this pre-actualized domain. He develops the examination of presentiment along with writings from anticolonial struggles and the experiences of Okinawan intellectuals under the reign of the Japanese Empire. When he describes this presentiment among people in such subordinated positions, whether or not actual violence was practiced or violent insurrection occurred is not a primary concern. Rather he focuses on the sense of “imminency.” Presentiment of violence is one example of this “imminency.” Importantly, when Tomiyama examines the presentiment in this imminency, he describes it as a certain “stance.” Borrowing the words of Frantz Fanon, he describes this “stance” as “on the defensive (*sur la defensive*)” and he finds a potential fighting pose in this stance. By focusing on this “stance,” Tomiyama tries to grasp this subtly undetermined domain in which the threat of violence is already manifest whereas the potential resistance to it is not yet

³⁸⁴ Ibid., 254.

³⁸⁵ Tomiyama, *Bōryoku no yokan*, 1–78.

actualized.³⁸⁶ What the fragments of Shibutani's observation show is a type of domain in which the individuals hold a defensive stance between the nightmare of violence and the daydream of aggressive impulse. This is not a simple subjective resistance but a moment at which the potential for action is maintained, despite the structure of oppression. Accordingly, this domain of potential action opens a rupture in the inclusive and teleological narrative of reconciliation.

This view also sheds a different light on the narrative of the wartime Nisei soldiers' loyalties and on their national subject formation. It is a well-known story that the "heroic" activity of the Nisei soldiers proved their loyalty and improved the status of Japanese immigrants. It is true that when we view the materials about some Nisei soldiers now, we can find demands for recognition as Americans accompanied by criticism of discrimination against them. For example, Shibutani recounts a Nisei soldier's statements as follows: "The bastards! They think they're better than we are because their skin is white. We're just as good as they are. We're just as American as they are."³⁸⁷ However, we should not ignore the complicated relationship between such loyalty statements and the "stance" that I have discussed. In other words, the Nisei soldiers' subject formation was haunted by the shadow of violence, and we can see under what kind of tension the politics for the recognition of their state-regulated rights started to function.

With this view in mind, we cannot see the series of violent events in terms of an all-inclusive narrative of "demoralization" that presupposes an uninterrupted course from conflict to conciliation. This view rather reveals the limits that such narratives have relied on

³⁸⁶This indeterminate relation between threat and resistance is analogous, in my view, to the "potential transformative power" of a search for an alternative future as one of the core concerns for Asian-American Studies. See Kandice Chuh, *Imagine Otherwise: On Asian Americanist Critique* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), ix–xii.

³⁸⁷ Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K*, 250.

and also their rupture, as embodied by some soldiers' stances. In fact, would it not be possible to say that Shibutani's unsettled postwar traumatic feelings about the incidents are evidence that they were not simply resolved through reconciliation? Now there appears the opportunity to examine the series of historical events as an as-yet-unresolved question that kept unsettling the observers. Moreover, it also brings into consideration the relationship between the era in which *Company K* was actually written and the earlier historical past.

In that regard, what strikes us initially is the fact that Shibutani, thirty years after the stabbing incident, relates this study of demoralization to ongoing contemporary events of the 1970s. In the preface to *Company K*, the author touches on the potential applicability of his study of "demoralization" to other phenomena such as "a school system facing student restiveness or a union confronted by a wildcat strike."³⁸⁸ However, what he is most interested in here is the case of the recently ended Vietnam War. By regarding the eruption of violence as a frequent result of "demoralization," he introduces the following war incidents, referring to David Cortright's book:

Towards the end of the Vietnam War several hostile outbursts occurred in the U.S. armed forces. In October 1970 some 400 Negro and Caucasian soldiers in Chu Lai engaged in a shooting spree after a brawl at a service club. On the night of 12 October 1972 a riot erupted on the attack carrier U.S.S. Kitty Hawk, following the questioning of a Negro sailor concerning his involvement in a fight at the enlisted men's club in Subic Bay. Apparently under the impression that their followers were being harassed unfairly, marauding bands of enraged Negroes attacked the others, in some instances pulling sleeping men from their baths and beating them with fists, chains, wrenches, metal pipes, fire extinguisher nozzles, and broom handles. They were heard to shout: "Kill the son of a bitch!" "They're killing our brothers!" "Kill the white trash!" By the time order was restored, 47 men had to be treated for serious injuries; three required medical evacuation to shore hospitals.³⁸⁹

³⁸⁸ Ibid., ix.

³⁸⁹ Shibutani, *The Derelicts of Company K*, 7.

Obviously Shibutani refers to this incident as a means of comparison with the case of Company K. In that sense, his sociological writing of history has political implications in the present. The generalization inherent in his approach can be critically examined, but more important here is the analysis of from which point of view Shibutani is viewing this “hostile outburst.” It is difficult not to ask again if he is identifying with the point of view of the ruler who tries to resolve the “demoralization” as a retrieval of order, although he does not miss the sign of aggressive impulses. In the end, along with the unknown fate of Shibutani’s resentments, this question related to identification remains open.

Conclusion

Shibutani’s text is one of the most precious materials regarding the lives of Japanese American soldiers during World War II. Along with the dispassionate tone of his writing, traces of strong affect nonetheless exist in Shibutani’s textual observations. His later confession reveals the tension within his status of participant observer and also gives insight into the general function of the observer perspective role itself. The status of the observer is a question still to be examined in our scholarship. Instead of conceding, however, to the framework of demoralization ascribed to Shibutani and his writings, this analysis reads Shibutani’s resentment and his descriptions of soldiers as a powerful tool for a reexamination of the violent condition of national integration.

My analysis of Shibutani’s text has demonstrated, on the one hand, how Shibutani’s writings reflect the incorporative logic of the American nation, in which the outbreak of violence between ethnic/racial groups is sublated at the higher level of integration. On the

other hand, his texts also allow us to see the experiences and practices of Japanese American soldiers as the point of malfunction of such integration.

Once we carefully examine the affective traces of Japanese American soldiers in his text, they indicate a certain type of “stance” under oppression. Unlike the general description of Japanese soldiers as heroic and loyal, such a “stance” implies the violent condition of the politics of recognition and defamiliarizes the teleological narrative of integration. Along with the sense of “imminency,” Shibutani’s records convey to us the importance of critically articulating the connection between national integration and violence.

Conclusion

From discourses on Japanese colonialism and migration by Christian leaders in Japan in the early twentieth century to American sociologists' observations of the loyalty of Japanese immigrants during World War II, this dissertation has reviewed and examined the discourses of important actors working at the intersection of Japanese transpacific migration and imperial nation formations in Japan and the United States. Through this exploration of the history of transpacific contacts, my study has demonstrated that discussions of community and subjectivity in both empires across the Pacific from one another in the first half of the twentieth century were tightly interwoven. Furthermore, this study has shown not only the historical links between these discourses in both empires but also their comparable contribution to the imperial nation formations in each country. In other words, this thesis has described the historical process in which two empires across the Pacific from one another developed their incorporative mechanisms as multi-racial/ethnic empires in relation to the issue of Japanese transpacific migrations.

In the first half of the twentieth century, Christian leaders and social scientists in both countries were important historical agents who discussed issues associated with Japanese migration and engaged in promoting the integration of minorities. With my transpacific exploration of their discourses and practices, my research has presented several important findings regarding the history of imperial nation formations in both countries.

First, my dissertation has demonstrated that the Japanese migrant/immigrant problem in the United States invigorated the critique of racial discrimination and the universal ideal of racial equality but this ideal at the same time became a key for broader nation formation in

both empires. The first chapter clarified this point in relation to Japanese imperial expansion by discussing Nagata Shigeshi and his Christian predecessors. As I have shown, as a former immigrant and supporter of Japanese migrations, Nagata was critical of the racial discrimination he experienced in the United States. This antipathy toward discrimination against Japanese immigrants even allowed him to direct his attention toward other contemporaneous racial issues in the United States and so-called non-“Western” countries. He was critical of the withdrawal of the racial equality proposal at the Paris Peace Conference and kept arguing for the importance of the abolishment of racial discrimination until World War II.

What I particularly emphasized in this examination of Nagata’s anti-racist discourse is its close connection with the tradition of Japanese Asianistic thought and Japanese imperial ideology. In fact, Nagata’s critique of racial discrimination was used to explain the greater cause of the expansion of the Japanese empire. It showed how the anti-racist discourse, or universalistic discourse in terms of racial equality, contributes to the justification of the creation of a broader nation. It comes near to stating the obvious that this anti-racism element in Japanese imperial discourse does not guarantee the real absence of racial discrimination in the empire. However, as Nagata’s earlier critique of racial discrimination against Japanese immigrants showed, it does not mean simply that authors of anti-racist discourses lied in the service of imperial ideology. Rather, as Balibar explained in *Race, Nation, Class*, it indicated the close relationship between universalism and racism. In this way, I have clarified the crucial role of universalism for Japanese imperial expansion in the context of its historical development in parallel with transpacific migration issues.

Meanwhile, we can find the critique of racial discrimination against the Japanese immigrants and the development of the idea of diverse nation around the same time in US society as well. The second and third chapters demonstrated this point. In the second chapter, I traced the activity of a Japanese immigrant Christian reformer Kobayashi Masasuke mainly in the 1920s and 1930s and showed that the Japanese immigrant leader tried to discipline the immigrants in the United States in order to counter discrimination by presenting themselves as *respectable* members of the American nation. In this exploration, I showed that Kobayashi justified his practices in the name of the multiculturalistic interpretation of American nation. The third chapter demonstrated similar movement from the side of the Americans. I examined the works of an American missionary, Sidney Gulick, who is well known for advocating for the interests of Japanese immigrants against American exclusionists. By also addressing Gulick's later writings on Hawaii's Japanese immigrants and racial formation in the islands in the 1930s, I clarified that his anti-exclusionary stance in fact contributed to the production of an incorporative narrative of the American nation. Thus my study demonstrated the impact of the Japanese immigrant problem on the development of incorporative discourses based on a universalistic idea in both empires leading up to and during World War II.

Second, in addition to addressing the role of universalism, my dissertation has also focused on the crucial role of subjectivity for my analysis of imperial nation formations in both countries and found comparable attempts to form model minority subjects in the process of integration. I first approached this topic by focusing on transpacific social reform practices in the second chapter, in which I examined Kobayashi's activity on the American West Coast. At the same time, however, I revealed that the network of Japanese social reformers in which

Kobayashi was working, also reached the Japanese colonies and the colonized population engaged in similar social reform practices. With the help of Balibar's theory, I indicated that these social reform practices provided an important tool for the integration of minorities through its production of normal subjects. I focused particularly on the moment of self-discipline in these practices as an internalization of the dominant norm for the formation of the archetype of model minority subjects. Specifically, I demonstrated in this chapter the co-existence of two imperial subject formations that were bridged by Japanese transpacific migrants.

In chapters three and four, I explored the promotion of similar subject formations in the wartime discourse of social scientists in both countries. While migrations and increased racial/ethnic contacts induced those social scientists to rethink the borders of their own nations, their wartime discourses contributed to forming imperial subjects out of minority group members in those empires. In the third chapter, I analyzed the texts of Chicago sociologists, Park and Lind, and examined how their work contributed to the ongoing integration of Japanese immigrants/Americans. Through this analysis, I identified the literary form of confession in their textual practices, through which Japanese Americans became loyal subjects. In the fourth chapter I analyzed the concept of *minzoku* used in Koyama Eizō's works and demonstrated the important role of subjectivity in his theory for the constitution of a new community. Although those two discourses were separately produced on opposite sides of the Pacific, I revealed that for both sides the racial formations triggered by the Japanese transpacific migrations were an important object of their intellectual curiosity. Furthermore, what was common in their attempts is that those incorporative discourses, nevertheless, kept reproducing the differences (or hierarchies) in relation to

minority members. Therefore, their discourses took the form of differential inclusion. The contradiction between the equality of the same nation and the differentiation of racial/ethnic groups always haunts the discourses of intellectuals in both empires. Overall, I showed that both countries' knowledge productions stimulated by Japanese migrations prepared the logic for the formation of imperial subjects from minority group members in each empire.

Finally, my thesis also articulated the unsettling moments in the abovementioned processes of imperial nation formations in the two empires. The integration of minority members or the creation of a broader community had always been subject to danger. As I mentioned in chapter two, there was anxiety over the "degeneration" of Japanese settlers in the colonies. Racial/ethnic contacts are also regarded as a dangerous locus of transformation. The uncertain loyalties of minority populations or different ethnic groups in both empires are also the sources of anxiety of the intellectuals of the two empires, as evidenced by the works of Chicago sociologists and Koyama Eizō. Such uncertainties often conditioned their desire for knowledge of racial/ethnic relations.

In this dissertation, however, I developed the analysis of this rupturing moment of imperial nation formation particularly in the fifth chapter. Analyzing the Japanese American sociologist Shibutani Tamotsu's text on the internal disruption of a Japanese American military unit, I demonstrated the affective traces of this event as an insurmountable remnant of imperial nation formation. Shibutani's description of the internal disruption caused by Company K in the US military is a good example of the violence inherent to the process of the incorporation of minority group members. Those who were involved in this incorporation at the margins of national membership had to be exposed to the fear of violence targeting them. Importantly, Shibutani's testimonial book reminds us of the constant presence of

tension in the formation of model minority subjects. It also points out the contingent moments in the process of imperial nation formation, based on which we can imagine the history of minority integrations *otherwise*.

These findings address the comparable mechanisms of minority mobilization and the formations of the broader nations in both empires as World War II approached. Since the defeat of the Japanese empire, US-Japan relationships have been understood based on a set of principles invoking universalism and particularism. However, my dissertation has revealed that the two empires co-existed with universalistic ideals during the prewar period. This suggests a more contingent relationship between the two countries. In fact, the two empires exhibited sometimes complicit and sometimes competing relationships. This insight should not only liberate us from a simple binary understanding of this relationship but should also turn our attention compellingly to the more complicated functions of universality and minority mobilization in transpacific history.

Furthermore, I argue that the role of transpacific migrations is significant for achieving a better understanding of the history of imperial nation formations across the Pacific during the first half of the twentieth century. While previous comparative studies of these empires examined the mechanism of each imperial nation formation independently, this dissertation focuses on how they were historically interlinked. From the invigoration of anti-racism discourse and migrant reformers' actual transnational activities to the transpacific flow of knowledge of race studies, I have demonstrated the various historical phenomena that mediated the imperial expansion of both countries. This inquiry cannot be pursued if we work only in either Japanese Studies or American Studies. Consequently, my study addresses

the importance of adopting a transnational and interdisciplinary approach to the study of empires across the Pacific from one another.

Bibliography

Manuscript Materials

Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory (RASRL) Records, University of Hawai'i at Manoa Library

The Collection of the Yamamuro Gunpei Memorial Salvation Army Resource Center, Tokyo

Newspapers and Periodicals

Keijō ihō

New York Times,

The Messenger

The Salvation Army Yearbook

Toki no koe

Articles, Books, and Other Sources

Abe, Isoo. 1905. *Hokubei no shin nihon*. Tokyo: Hakubunkan.

Abe, Junichirō. 2009a. "Fīludowāku to shiteno kankō, media to shiteno minzoku: Koyama Eizō no minzoku sesshoku ron to 1930-40 nendai ni okeru teikoku nihon no imin kankō seisaku." *Nenpō shakaigaku ronshū*, no. 22: 80–91.

———. 2009b. "Nijusseiki zenhan Nihon No Jinshu/minzoku kenkyū ni okeru 'ishukonkō' genshō eno ōtō: Shizen/bunka kagaku no kyōkaisen o meguru ronsō." *Nagoyadaigaku shakaigaku ronshū* 29 (2): 21–46.

Adams, Romanzo Colfax. 1937. *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation*. New York: Macmillan Co.

Akami, Tomoko. 2003. *Internationalizing the Pacific: The United States, Japan, and the Institute of Pacific Relations in War and Peace, 1919-45*. London; New York: Routledge.

- Anderson, Emily. 2010. "Christianity in the Japanese Empire: Nationalism, Conscience, and Faith in Meiji and Taisho Japan". University of California Los Angeles.
- Aragon, Lorraine V. 2000. *Fields of the Lord: Animism, Christian Minorities, and State Development in Indonesia*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Azuma, Eiichirō. 2005. *Between Two Empires Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2008. "'Pioneers of Overseas Japanese Development': Japanese American History and the Making of Expansionist Orthodoxy in Imperial Japan." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 67 (4): 1187–1226.
- . 2009. "Brokering Race, Culture, and Citizenship: Japanese Americans in Occupied Japan and Postwar National Inclusion." *Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 16 (3): 183–211.
- Balibar, Etienne. 1994. *Masses, Classes, Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy before and after Marx*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2008. "Racism Revisited: Sources, Relevance, and Aporias of a Modern Concept." *PMLA* 123 (5): 1630–39.
- Balibar, Etienne, and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein. 1991. *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. London; New York: Verso.
- Bamba, Nobuya, and John F Howes, eds. 1978. *Pacifism in Japan: The Christian and Socialist Tradition*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Bellah, Robert N. 2003. *Imagining Japan: The Japanese Tradition and Its Modern Interpretation*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Boas, Franz. 1936. "The Effects of American Environment on Immigrants and Their Descendants." *Science*, no. 84: 522–25.
- Bremen, Jan van, and Akitoshi Shimizu, eds. 1999. *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.
- Bulmer, Martin. 1984. *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ching, Leo T. S. 2001. *Becoming "Japanese": Colonial Taiwan and the Politics of Identity Formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Chuh, Kandice. 2003. *Imagine Otherwise: On Asian Americanist Critique*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Cooper, Frederick, and Ann Laura Stoler, eds. 1997. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Daniels, Roger. 1962. *The Politics of Prejudice, the Anti-Japanese Movement in California, and the Struggle for Japanese Exclusion*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1983. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- “Dendō.” 1895. *Kyūsei* 1: 1–6.
- Doak, Kevin M. 2001. “Building National Identity through Ethnicity: Ethnology in Wartime Japan and After.” *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 27 (1): 1–39.
- Dower, John W. 1986. *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Edward Baggs, Albert. 1966. “Social Evangel as Nationalism a Study of the Salvation Army in Japan, 1895–1940”. State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Edwin O, Reischauer. 1942. “Memorandum on Policy Towards Japan.”
- Endō, Kōichi. 1993. “Senjika no kirisuto kyō shakai jigyo - kyūseigun no katsudō o chūshin ni.” *Meiji gakuin ronsō shakaigaku shakai fukushigaku kenkyū*, no. 91.
- Evan, Dawley. 2013. “Strengthening and Expanding Japan through Social Work in Colonial Taiwan.” In *Tumultuous Decade: Empire, Society, and Diplomacy in 1930s Japan*, edited by Masato Kimura and Toshihiro Minohara. Toronto ; Buffalo ; London: University of Toronto Press.
- Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Faris, Robert E. L. 1967. *Chicago Sociology, 1920-1932*. San Francisco: Chandler Pub. Co.
- Fischer-Tinē, Harald. 2011. “Reclaiming Savages in ‘Darkest England’ and ‘Darkest India’: The Salvation Army as Transnational Agent of the Civilizing Mission.” In *Civilizing Missions in Colonial and Postcolonial South Asia: From Improvement to Development*, edited by Carey Anthony Watt and Michael Mann. London; New York: Anthem Press.

- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fuji, Kazuya. 1991. *Oshikawa Masayoshi: sono nashonarizumu o haikai to shite*. Tokyo: Sanyō shuppansha.
- Fujita, Chikamasa, ed. 1943. *Sekaishiteki tachiba to nihon*. Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha.
- Fujitani, Takashi. 2011. *Race for Empire: Koreans as Japanese and Japanese as Americans during World War II*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fukuma, Yoshiaki. 2003. *Henkyō ni utsuru nihon: nashonariti no yūkai to saikōchiku*. Tokyo: Kashiwa shobō.
- Fukuzawa, Yukichi. 2009. *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gallicchio, Marc S. 2000. *The African American Encounter with Japan and China: Black Internationalism in Asia, 1895-1945*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Garon, Sheldon M. 1997. *Molding Japanese Minds: The State in Everyday Life*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Geiger, Andrea A. E. 2011. *Subverting Exclusion: Transpacific Encounters with Race, Caste, and Borders, 1885-1928*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gibbons, Luke. 2001. "Guests of the nation : Ireland, immigration, and post-colonial solidarity." *Traces: A Multilingual Journal of Cultural Theory and Translation* 2: 79–102.
- Go, Hui-jun. 1895. "Chōsen dendō." *Kyūsei* 2: 16.
- Gulick, Sidney Lewis. 1914. *The American Japanese Problem; a Study of the Racial Relations of the East and the West*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
- . 1978. *Mixing the Races in Hawaii: A Study of the Coming Neo-Hawaiian American Race*. New York: AMS Press.
- H. Chang, Peter. 2007. *The Salvation Army in Korea*. Seoul: The Salvation Army Korea Territory.
- Hage, Ghassan. 2011. "Multiculturalism and the Ungovernable Muslim." In *Essays on Muslims and Multiculturalism*, edited by Raimond Gaita, 155–86. Melbourne: Text Publishing.
- Hane, Mikiso. 2003. *Peasants, Rebels, Women, and Outcastes: The Underside of Modern Japan*. 2nd ed. Lanham (Md.): Rowman & Littlefield.

- Hansen, Authur A., and David A. Hacker. 1974. "The Manzanar Riot: An Ethnic Perspective." *Amerasia Journal* 2 (2): 112–57.
- Harima, Tōgaku (Genshirō). 1932. "Hijōji kyōka taisaku." *Chosen shakai jigyō* 10 (9).
- Hasegawa, Yūichi. 1997. "Hainichi iminhō to manshū, brazilu: Chiba toyoji to Nagata Shigeshi no iminron o chūshin ni." In *Nichibei kiki no kigen to hainichi iminhō*, edited by Kimitada Miwa, 43–87. Tōkyō: Ronsōsha.
- Hayashi, Brian Masaru. 1995. *For the Sake of Our Japanese Brethren: Assimilation, Nationalism, and Protestantism among the Japanese of Los Angeles, 1895-1942*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Higuchi, Yūichi. 1991. *Kōgun heishi ni sareta chōsenjin: jūgonen sensōka no sōdōin taisei no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Shakai hyōronsha.
- Hirabayashi, Lane Ryo. 1999. *The Politics of Field Work: Research in an American Concentration Camp*. Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press.
- Hirobe, Izumi. 2001. *Japanese Pride, American Prejudice: Modifying the Exclusion Clause of the 1924 Immigration Act*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Hōmukyoku shutsunyūkoku kanrisitsu. 1964. *Shutsunyūkoku kanri to sono jittai*. Ōkurashō shuppankyoku.
- Hörmann, Bernhard L. 1945. "A Report on the War Research Laboratory in Hawaii." *American Sociological Review*, no. 10 (February): 1–6.
- . 1955. "Sociological Research at the University of Hawaii." *Social Process in Hawaii* 19 (January): 5–12.
- Hutchison, William R. 1987. *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hyatt, Marshall. 1990. *Franz Boas, Social Activist: The Dynamics of Ethnicity*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Ichioka, Yuji. 1988. *The Issei: The World of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants, 1885-1924*. New York; London: Free Press ; Collier Macmillan Publishers.
- . , ed. 1989. *Views from within: The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study*. [Los Angeles]: Resource Development and Publications, Asian American Studies Center, University of California at Los Angeles.
- . 1990. "Japanese Immigrant Nationalism: The Issei and the Sino-Japanese War,

- 1937-1941.” *Calihist California History* 69 (3): 260–75.
- . 1997. “The Meaning of Loyalty: The Case of Kazumaro Buddy Uno.” *Amerasia Journal*. 23 (3): 45.
- Imai, Teruko. 1984. “Meijiki ni okeru tobei netsu to tobei annaisho oyobi tobei zasshi.” *Journal of Tsuda College*, no. 16 (March): 305–42.
- Inaba, Tsugio. 1986. *Dainihon kaigai kyōikukai no kyū kankoku ni okeru kyōiku katsudō: shōwa rokuju nen tsukuba daigaku gakunai purojekto kenkyū hōkoku sho*. Sakuramura, Ibaraki.
- Inouye, Karen M. 2012. “Japanese American Wartime Experience, Tamotsu Shibutani and Methodological Innovation, 1942–1978.” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 48 (4): 318–38.
- Itagaki, Ryuta, Satoshi Mizutani, and Hideaki Tone. 2012. “Japanese Empire.” In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Modern Imperial Histories*, edited by Philippa Levine and John Marriott. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Jinkō mondai kenkyūkai. 1938. *The Report of the First Meeting of the National Council of the Population Problem*. Tokyo: Jinkō mondai kenkyūkai.
- Kang, Sang-jung. 1995. “Kirisuto kyo, shokuminchi, kenpō.” *Gendai shiso* 23 (10): p. 62–76.
- Kang, Tōk-sang. 1997. *Chōsenjin gakuto shutsujin : mō hitotsu no wadatsum no koe*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Kaplan, Amy, and Donald E Pease, eds. 1993. *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kawai, Michio. 1991. *Bushi no natta kirisutosha Oshikawa Masayoshi kanken*. Tōkyō: Kindai bungeisha.
- Kawashima, Ken C. 2009. *The Proletarian Gamble: Korean Workers in Interwar Japan*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kobayashi, Masasuke. 1919. *Beikoku to jinshuteki sabetsu no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Bunsendō shoten.
- . 1932. “Nichibei Mondai No Shinsō.” *Chōsen shakai jigyō* 10 (11): 47–58.
- . 1933. *Nihon minzoku no sekaiteki bōchō; Kobayashi Masasuke ronbunshū*. Edited by Seiko Ibuka. Tokyo: Keigansha.

- Komagome, Takeshi. 1996. *Shokuminchi teikoku nihon no bunka tōgō*. Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten.
- Kōsaka, Masaaki, ed. 1942. *Minzoku no tetsugaku*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Koschmann, J. Victor, Ryūichi Narita, and Yasushi Yamanouchi, eds. 1998. *Total War and "Modernization"*. Ithaca, N.Y.: East Asia Program, Cornell University.
- Koshiro, Yukiko. 1999. *Trans-Pacific Racisms and the U.S. Occupation of Japan*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Koschmann, J. Victor. 2003. "Modernization and Democratic Values: The 'Japanese Model' in the 1960s." In *Staging Growth : Modernization Development, and the Global Cold War*, edited by David C. Engerman, 225–49. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Koyama, Eizō. 1929. *Jinshugaku sōron*. Tokyo: Oka Shoin.
- . 1931. *Jinshugaku kakuron zenpen*. Tokyo: Oka Shoin.
- . 1934. "Minzoku no gainen to minzoku sesshoku no taiyō." *Nihon shakaigaku nenpō*.
- . 1935. *Shinbungaku*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- . 1937. *Senden gijutsu ron*. Tokyo: Kōyō shoin.
- . 1939. *Jinshugaku gairon*. Tokyo: Nikkō shoin.
- . 1941. *Minzoku to jinkō no riron*. Tokyo: Hata shoten.
- . 1942a. *Minzoku to bunka no shomondai*. Tokyo: Hata shoten.
- . 1942b. *Senji senden ron*. Tokyo: Sanseidō.
- . 1944. *Nanpō kensetsu to minzoku jinkō seisaku*. Tokyo: Dainihon shuppan kabushikigaisha.
- . 1954. "Shokumin shakaigaku to konketsu gensho." In *Shakaigaku no shomondai : Takata sensei koki shukuga ronbunshū*, edited by Kentarō Komatsu, 409–32. Tokyo: Yūhikaku.
- Kurashige, Lon. 2002. *Japanese American Celebration and Conflict: A History of Ethnic Identity and Festival, 1934-1990*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a*

- Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Lee, Robert G. 1999. *Orientalism: Asian Americans in Popular Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lee, Seok-Won. 2011. "Rationalizing Empire: Nation, Space, and Community in Japanese Social Sciences, 1931-1945". New York: Cornell University.
- Lind, Andrew William. 1938. *An Island Community; Ecological Succession in Hawaii*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1943. *The Japanese in Hawaii under War Conditions*,. Honolulu; New York: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations.
- . 1945. "Sociological Studies in Wartime Hawaii." *Social Process in Hawaii*, no. 9-10 (July): 5–10.
- . 1946. *Hawaii's Japanese, an Experiment in Democracy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Lipsitz, George. 1998. "Frantic to Join...the Japanese Army': Beyond the Black-White Binary." In *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*, 185–211. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lowe, Lisa. 1996. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Lublin, Elizabeth Dorn. 2010. *Reforming Japan the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in the Meiji Period*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Massumi, Brian. 2005. "Fear (The Spectrum Said)." *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 13 (1): 31–48.
- Matsumoto, Sannosuke. 1961. "Kokumin teki shimeikan no rekishiteki henshen." In *Kindai nihon shisōshi kōza*. 8. Tokyo: chikuma shobō.
- Matthews, Fred H. 1977. *Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- McNaughton, James C. 2003. "Japanese Americans and the U.S. Army: A Historical Reconsideration." *Army History*, no. 59 (Summer/Fall): 4–15.
- Mizusaki, Don. 1924. "Kokudo no kokujin:būkātē Washinguton." *Rikkō sekai*, no. 237 (September): 32–36.
- Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. 1998. "Debating Racial Science in Wartime Japan." *OSIRIS Osiris*

- 13 (1): 354–75.
- . 2000. “Ethnic Engineering: Scientific Racism and Public Opinion Surveys in Midcentury Japan.” *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 8 (2): 499–529.
- . 2002. “Shokuminchi shisō to imin: toyohara no tenbō kara.” In *Kakudaisuru modaniti: 1920--30-Nendai*. 2, edited by Shunya Yoshimi. Iwanami Kōza 6. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Muller, Eric L. 2001. *Free to Die for Their Country: The Story of the Japanese American Draft Resisters in World War II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Murray, Alice Yang. 2008. *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Nagata, Shigeshi. 1915. “Kaigai tokōsha kyōikuron.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 135 (July): 1.
- . 1919a. “Chōen o tōshimitaru nihon no shokuminteki nōryoku.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 176 (April): 2–3.
- . 1919b. “Chōsen to filipin.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 176 (April): 1.
- . 1919c. “Hidōka ron.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 182 (November): 1.
- . 1924a. “Nichiboku kōshu dōmei.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 229 (January): 1.
- . 1924b. “Nichiboku kōshu dōmei ron.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 234 (June): 2–29.
- . 1929. “Chōsen jin no kaitakusha tachi.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 296 (August): 2–7.
- . 1930. “Zenshi no kokorozashi o okonau nomi.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 306 (June): 4–8.
- . 1931. “Kashū ni manabu.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 313 (January): 2–7.
- . 1932. “Ishokumin no shisōteki shinten.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 336 (December): 2–7.
- . 1935. “Ijyūsha no shidō ni tsuite.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 366 (June): 2–7.
- . 1936. “Hokuman o kashū ni: sabaku o hanazono ni.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 381 (September): 2–8.
- . 1937. “Ijyūsha shidō no ichimokuhyō.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 389 (May): 2–5.
- . 1939. *Mōkyō konshoku to taishi imin*. Tokyo: Fuzanbō.
- . 1940. *Zaibei dōhō to kataru*. Tokyo: Nhon rikkōkai.

- . 1942a. “Tōakyōeiken yōin no rensai.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 448 (July): 2–8.
- . 1942b. “Kokumin rensai no mondai.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 451 (October): 4–10.
- . 1943. “Nanpō shin kenkoku no katei.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 455 (February): 2–6.
- . 1944. “Iminzoku no kyusai ni teishin suru mono.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 470 (May): 3.
- Nakao, Katsumi. 1997. “Minzoku kenkyūjo no soshiki to katsudō: sensōchū no nihon minzokugaku.” *Minzokugaku kenkyū* 52 (1): 47–65.
- Nanmeian shujin. 1924. “Kokujin kaihō no senkaku roido garrison.” *Rikkō sekai*, no. 240 (December): 10–16.
- Nihon rikkōkai sōritsu hyaku shūnen kinen jigyō jikkō iinkai kinenshi hensan senmon iinkai, ed. 1997. *Nihon rikkōkai hyakunen no kōseki : reiniku kyūsai, kaigai hatten undō, kokusai kōken*. Tokyo: Nihon rikkōkai.
- Nirei, Yosuke. 2004. “The Ethics of Empire: Protestant Thought, Moral Culture, and Imperialism in Meiji Japan”. University of California, Berkeley.
- Notehelfer, F. G. 1985. *American Samurai: Captain L.L. Janes and Japan*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Oguma, Eiji. 1998. “*Nihonjin*” no kyōkai: okinawa, ainu, taiwan, chōsen, shokuminchi shihai kara fukki undō made. Shohan. Tōkyō: Shin’yōsha.
- . 2002. *A Genealogy of “Japanese” Self-Images*. Melbourne; Portland, Or.: Trans Pacific Press ; Distributor, International Specialized Book Services.
- Oharazeki, Kazuhiro. 2013. “Anti-Prostitution Campaigns in Japan and the American West, 1890–1920.” *Pacific Historical Review Pacific Historical Review* 82 (2): 175–214.
- Okada, Tetsuzō. 1996. *Honda Yōichi den : denki Honda Yōichi*. Tokyo: Ōzorasha.
- Okihiro, Gary Y. 1973. “Japanese Resistance in America’s Concentration Camps: A Re-Evaluation.” *Amerasia Journal* 2 (1): 20–34.
- . 1994. *Margins and Mainstreams: Asians in American History and Culture*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- . 2001. *The Columbia Guide to Asian American History*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Okumuta, Naohiko. 1991. "Shimanuki Hyōdayū no rikkō kyōiku shisō: sono keisei katei to imin jigyo heno tenkai." In *Hokubei nihonjin kirisutokyō undōshi*, edited by Dōshisha daigaku jinbunkagaku kenkyūjo, 497–549. Tokyo: PMC Shuppan.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.
- Onishi, Yuichiro. 2007. "The New Negro of the Pacific: How African Americans Forged Cross-Racial Solidarity with Japan, 1917-1922." *The Journal of African American History* 92 (2): 191–213.
- Osajima, Keith. 1988. "Asian Americans as the Model Minority : An Analysis of the Popular Press Image in the 1960s and 1980s." In *Reflections on Shattered Windows: Promises and Prospects for Asian American Studies*, edited by Gary Y Okihiro, Shirley Hune, Arthur H Hansen, and John M Liu. Pullman, Wash.: Washington State University Press.
- Ōtsuka, Eizō. 1996. *Seiyū Oshikawa Masayoshi : denki Oshikawa Masayoshi*. Tokyo: Ōzorasha.
- Palumbo-Liu, David. 1999. *Asian/American Historical Crossings of a Racial Frontier*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Park, Robert E. 1914. "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups With Particular Reference to the Negro." *Am J Sociol American Journal of Sociology* 19 (5).
- . 1924. "Suggestions for a Study of the Oriental Population of the Pacific Coast." *Journal of Applied Sociology*, no. 8.
- . 1926. "Behind Our Masks." *Survey Graphic*, no. 56: 135–39.
- . 1926. "Our Racial Frontier on the Pacific." *Survey Graphic*, no. 9.
- . 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *Amerjsoci American Journal of Sociology* 33 (6): 881–93.
- . 1939. "The Nature of Race Relations." In *Race Relations and the Race Problem, a Definition and an Analysis.*, edited by Edgar T Thompson. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- . 1943. "Race Ideologies." In *American Society in Wartime.*, edited by William F Ogburn, 301–15. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1950. "The Problem of Cultural Differences." In *Race and Culture*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

- . 1967. “The Social Function of War.” In *On Social Control and Collective Behavior. Selected Papers*,, edited by Ralph H Turner, 157–63. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Park, Robert Ezra, and E. W Burgess. 1969. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology, Including the Original Index to Basic Sociological Concepts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Peattie, Mark R. 1988. *Nan ‘yō: The Rise and Fall of the Japanese in Micronesia, 1885-1945*. Honolulu: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies, University of Hawaii : University of Hawaii Press.
- Persons, Stow. 1987. *Ethnic Studies at Chicago, 1905-45*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Pierce, Lori. 2005. “Creating a Racial Paradise: Citizenship and Sociology in Hawaii.” In *Race and Nation: Ethnic Systems in the Modern World*, edited by Paul R Spickard. New York: Routledge.
- Pilot, Don. 1924. “Mākasu gābē: kokujin afrika jiyūkoku no kensetsusha.” *Rikkō Sekai*, no. 238 (October): 27–31.
- Rightmire, R. David. 1997. *Salvationist Samurai: Gunpei Yamamuro and the Rise of the Salvation Army in Japan*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press.
- Said, Edward W. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- . 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf : Distributed by Random House.
- Sakaguchi, Mitsuhiro. 1993. “Nihonjin imin to shakai jigyou.” *Shibusawa Kenkyu*, no. 6: 17–40.
- Sakai, Naoki. 1997. *Translation and Subjectivity: On Japan and Cultural Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2000. “Subject and Substratum: On Japanese Imperial Nationalism.” *Cultural Studies* 14 (3-4): 462–530.
- . 2013. “The Microphysics of Comparison: Towards the Dislocation of the West.” *Eicpcp*. <http://eicpcp.net/transversal/0613/sakai1/en>.
- . 2004. “Two Negations: Fear of Being Excluded and the Logic of Self-Esteem.” *Novel; a Forum on Fiction*. 37 (3): 229.
- . 2007. *Kyōkan no kyōdōtai to teikokuteki kokumin shugi: nihon/eizō/beikoku*.

Tōkyō: Seidosha.

- . 2009. “Imperial Nationalism and the Comparative Perspective.” *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 17 (1): 159–205.
- Sakai, Tetsuya. 2006. “Teikoku chitsujyo to kokusai chitsujyo-shokumin seisakugaku ni okeru baikai no ronri.” In *“Teikoku” hensei no keifu*, edited by Tetsuya Sakai. Iwanami Kōza 1. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Sakano, Tōru. 2005a. “Jinshu, minzoku, nihonjin:senzen nihon no jinruigaku to jinshu gainen.” In *Jinshu gainen no fuhensei o tou: seiyō teki paradaimu o koete*, edited by Yasuko Takezawa, 229–54. Kyoto: Jinbun shoin.
- . 2005b. *Teikoku nihon to jinrui gakusha: 1884--1952*. Tōkyō: Keisō shobō.
- Satō, Masaharu. 1997. “Senjika nihon no senden kenkyū: Koyama Eizō no sendenron o megutte.” *Mediashi Kenkyū*, no. 5.
- Sawada, Mitziko. 1996. *Tokyo Life, New York Dreams: Urban Japanese Visions of America, 1890-1924*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schäfer, Fabian. 2012. *Public Opinion, Propaganda, Ideology: Theories on the Press and Its Social Function in Interwar Japan, 1918-1937*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Shapiro, Harry L, and Frederick S Hulse. 1939. *Migration and Environment; a Study of the Physical Characteristics of the Japanese Immigrants to Hawaii and the Effects of Environment on Their Descendants*,. London, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scheiner, Irwin. 1970. *Christian Converts and Social Protest in Meiji Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shibutani, Tamotsu. 1966. *Improvised News; a Sociological Study of Rumor*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- . 1978. *The Derelicts of Company K: A Sociological Study of Demoralization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shimanuki, Hyōdayū. 1984. “Yukite chōsen ni dendō seyo.” In *Nikkan kirisutokyō kankeishi shiryō: 1876-1922*, edited by Keiji Ogawa and Myōng-gwan Chi, Shohan. Tōkyō: Shinkyō shuppansha.
- Shimazu, Naoko. 1998. *Japan, Race, and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Shin, Gi-Wook, and Do-Hyun Han. 1999. “Colonial Corporatism: The Rural

- Revitalization Campaign, 1932-1940.” In *Colonial Modernity in Korea*, edited by Gi-Wook Shin and Michael Edson Robinson. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center : Distributed by Harvard University Press.
- Short, James F. 1971. *The Social Fabric of the Metropolis; Contributions of the Chicago School of Urban Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sōda, Aisen. 1928. “Honkai no soshiki to enkaku (jyou).” *Chosen shakai jigyō* 6 (2).
- Stephan, John J. 1997. “Hijacked by Utopia: American Nikkei in Manchuria.” *Amerasia Journal*. 23 (3): 1.
- Stoler, Ann Laura, ed. 2006. *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 2009. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura, Carole McGranahan, and Peter C Perdue, eds. 2007. *Imperial Formations*. Santa Fe, N.M.; Oxford [U.K.]: School for Advanced Research Press ; James Currey.
- Sugihara, Tōru. 1998. *Ekkyōsuru tami: kindai ōsaka no chōsenjin shi kenkyū*. Tōkyō: Shinkansha.
- Suzuki, Peter T. 1981. “Anthropologists in the Wartime Camps for Japanese Americans: A Documentary Study.” *Dialect Anthropol Dialectical Anthropology* 6 (1): 23–60.
- . 1986. “The University of California Japanese Evacuation and Resettlement Study: A Prolegomenon.” *Dialect Anthropol Dialectical Anthropology* 10 (3-4): 189–213.
- Tachikawa, Kenji. 1986. “Meiji kōhanki no tobeinetsu: america no ryūkō.” *Shirin* 69 (3): 383–417.
- . 1989. “Shimanuki hyōdayū to rikkō kai:shinkō, seikō, america.” *Shirin* 72 (1): 106–33.
- Takai-Heller, Yuki. 2003. “Nihon tōchika taiwan ni okeru nihonjin purotesutanto kyōkaishi kenkyū:1895-1945”. Tokyo: International Christian University.
- Takata, Yasuma. 1935. *Minzoku no mondai*. Tokyo: Nihon hyōronsha.
- Takemura, Tamio. 57. *Haishō undō: kuruwa no josei wa dō kaihō sareta ka*. Chūkō shinsho 663. Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha.

- Takeuchi, Seiichi. 1933. "Chosen shakai jigyo ni taisuru yobō." *Chosen Shakai Jigyō* 11 (1): 52.
- Taylor, Sandra C. 1984. *Advocate of Understanding: Sidney Gulick and the Search for Peace with Japan*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.
- Tessa Morris-Suzuki. 2000. *Henkyō kara nagameru: ainu aa keikensuru kindai*. Translated by Masahiko Ōkawa. Tōkyō: misuzu shobō.
- Thomas, Dorothy Swaine Thomas, and Richard S Nishimoto. 1974. *The Spoilage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tomiya, Ichirō. 1990. *Kindai nihon shakai to "okinawajin": "nihonjin" ni naru to yū koto*. Tōkyō: Nihon keizai hyōronsha.
- . 1994. "Kokumin no tanjō to 'nihon jinshu.'" *Shiso*, November, p37–56.
- . 2002. *Bōryoku no yokan: iha fuyū ni okeru kiki no mondai = Presentiments of Violence: Ifa Fuyu and Okinawa's Crisis*. Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten.
- . 2013. *Ryūchaku no shisō : "okinawa mondai" no keifugaku*. Tokyo: Inpakuto shuppankai.
- Tönnies, Ferdinand. 1957. *Community & Society (Gemeinschaft Und Gesellschaft)*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Tsuneya, Seifuku. 1991. *Kaigai shokuminron*. Nikkei imin shiryōshū, dai 3-kan. Tokyo: Nihon tosho sentā.
- Uchida, Jun. 2011. *Brokers of Empire: Japanese Settler Colonialism in Korea, 1876 -1945*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center : distributed by Harvard University Press.
- Utsumi, Aiko. 1991. *Chōsenjin "kōgun" heishitachi no sensō*. Shōgen shōwa shi no danmen, no. 186. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Watase, Tsuneyoshi. 1913. *Chōsen kyōka no kyūmu*. Tokyo: Keiseisha.
- Yamakawa, Kenjirō. 1930. "Chūō Kyōka dantai rengōkai kaichō yamakawa kenjirō aisatsu." *chosen shakai jigyo* 8 (12).
- Yamamuro, Buho. 1963. *Zaibei dōhō no senkaku Kobayashi Masasuke den: kyūseigun zaibei nihonjinbu no katsudō*. Tokyo: yamamuro gunpei senshū kankōkai.
- Yasutake, Rumi. 2004. *Transnational Women's Activism: The United States, Japan, and*

- Japanese Immigrant Communities in California, 1859-1920*. New York: New York University Press.
- Yong-hong, Sin. 1984. *Kindai chosen shakai jigyooshi kenkyu – keijo ni okeru houmeniin seido no rekishiteki kousatsu*. Tokyo: Ryokuin shobō.
- . 2007. “Chosen shakai jigyo kenkyukai to chosen syakai jigyo kyokai no setsuritsu.” In *Senzen senchū ajia kenkyu shiryō 4: zasshi chosen shakai jigyo bessatsu*. Tokyo: Kingendai shiryō kankō kai.
- Yoshida, Kyūichi. 1994. *Nihon shakai jigyo no rekishi*. revised edition. Tōkyō: Keisō shobō.
- Yoshida, Ryo. 2011. “Sen kyūhyaku jū nendai kalifolunia nihonjin imin kirisuto kyōkai no ekkyōteki rīdāshipu.” *Imin kenkyū nenpō* 17 (March): 3–20.
- Yoshimi, Shunya. 2000. “Media o kataru gensetsu: ryō taisenkanki ni okeru shinbungaku no tanjō.” In *Naihasuru chi :shintai, kotoba, kenryoku o aminaosu*, edited by Akira Kurihara, Yōichi Komori, Manabu Satō, and Shunya Yoshimi, 177–237. Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai.
- Young, Louise. 1998. *Japan’s Total Empire Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Yu, Henry. 2001. *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yun, Koncha. 1982. “Nihon shihonshugi no zenshinkichi to shite no keijō gakudō: nihon no ajia shinshutsu no kiseki o fumaete.” *Kaikyō* 11 (November): 42–66.
- “Zappo.” 1915. *Rikkō Sekai*, no. 135 (July): 4.