

# みんなくりポジトリ

国立民族学博物館学術情報リポジトリ National Museum of Ethnology

## The Masculinist Bonds of Nation and Empire : The Discourse on Korean "Japanese" Soldiers in the Asia Pacific War

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| メタデータ | 言語: eng<br>出版者:<br>公開日: 2009-04-28<br>キーワード (Ja):<br>キーワード (En):<br>作成者: フジタニ, タカシ<br>メールアドレス:<br>所属: |
| URL   | <a href="https://doi.org/10.15021/00002871">https://doi.org/10.15021/00002871</a>                     |

# The Masculinist Bonds of Nation and Empire: The Discourse on Korean “Japanese” Soldiers in the Asia Pacific War

Takashi FUJITANI

*University of California, San Diego*

- |                              |                     |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Introduction              | 4. <i>You and I</i> |
| 2. Volunteer Soldier Iwamoto | 5. Conclusion       |
| 3. New Beginnings            |                     |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Today it is fairly commonly accepted that in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries the scholarly and public discourses on the “common ancestry of the Japanese and the Koreans” (*Nissen dōsoron*), as well as on the “unity of the Mainland and Korea” (*Naisen ittairon*), became powerful discursive means by which to legitimate Japanese domination over and colonial rule in Korea. While there are a few scattered references to such ideas in Tokugawa period (1600–1867) texts, it was primarily in the late nineteenth century and through the prewar and wartime years that scholars working out of the modern human sciences—primarily historians, linguists, and anthropologists—produced a massive archive of knowledge that lent credence to the idea that the inhabitants of the Japanese archipelago and the Korean peninsula were descendants of the same ancestors and that they shared many cultural attributes. Journalists and politicians also joined in the production and circulation of such discourses [DUUS 1995: 413–423; KIM I. 1984: 168–184; OGUMA 1995]. For example, in 1906, soon after the establishment of the Japanese “protectorate” in Korea, the well-known politician Ōkuma Shigenobu (1838–1922) borrowed the language of *Nissen dōsoron* and modern phrenology to argue that the ancestors of the Korean people were no different than those of the Japanese, and that the two peoples were in fact one [OGUMA 1995: 101]. For critics of Japanese colonialism, of course, the most problematic aspect of this line of thinking lay in its claim that since the Korean and Japanese people were in essence no different from each other, it was only natural for Korea to be amalgamated into the Japanese empire.

The political utility of this discourse on Korean and Japanese sameness in legitimizing Japanese colonialism is perhaps clear enough, but how a discourse on

gender supplemented and interbraided with that on ethnic unity is by no means well understood. Not only did this colonial discourse entail a feminization of Korean colonial subjects, it also presented Korean men with the opportunity to restore their masculinity by becoming national subjects. Colonialism and nationalism thus worked to mobilize its subjects not simply through repressive means; it also operated by producing desires and presenting opportunities to fulfill them. Thus significant numbers of Koreans joined those who considered themselves to be unproblematically Mainlanders (Naichijin) in producing such a discourse, and many behaved as if they sincerely believed in official and semi-official pronouncements about Japanese and Korean equality under Japanese rule. This is certainly not to deny that there was great resistance to such thinking, and I shall be writing elsewhere on the topic of resistance to this discourse. However, in this article I argue that much can be learned about the mechanisms of Japanese nationalism and colonialism (and perhaps about modern nationalism and colonialism more generally) by analyzing the writings of those Korean cultural practitioners who willingly participated as Japanese national subjects in the projects of the Japanese empire. The tendency of critical scholars to label such willing colonial subjects "collaborators" or simply to dismiss them as, for example, "running dogs" (*sōku*), is understandable. But such a posture closes off an important and textually rich opportunity to consider why different individuals and groups in positions of disprivilege under Japanese nationalism and colonialism felt that their interests would be furthered by active participation in rather than resistance to the Japanese nation and empire.

There were surely a wide variety of individual circumstances and social reasons why individual Koreans willingly participated in such projects. Certainly, as Carter J. Eckert has made clear, many within the Korean capitalist class who had profited from the development of industrial capitalism under Japanese colonialism believed that they could further their economic interests within the colonial context rather than in opposition to it [ECKERT 1991: esp. 224-252]. And while I cannot hope to untangle all the reasons why some Koreans chose to cooperate in producing discourses on the sameness and equality of Japanese and Koreans, I suggest that for many Korean men part of the allure of joining the Japanese nation lay in its promise that active membership would enable them to recuperate their manhood and become full-fledged adult men. This recognition of a masculinist opportunity should be understood within the context of colonial discourses that infantilized and feminized Korean men. It was commonly said, for example, that Korea had become effeminate because of its valorization of the literary over the military arts.<sup>1)</sup> Thus, although the discourse on the "unity of the Mainland and Korea,"

---

1) One of the Korean subjects of Eckert's study echoed this view when blaming the reluctance of Korean students to volunteer for the Japanese military on "Korea's historical degeneration into 'effeminacy,' the result of the country's traditional pursuit of the literary arts to the neglect of the military" [ECKERT 1991: 246].

*Naisen ittai*, would seem to suggest an undifferentiated and nongendered inclusion, it in fact promised full incorporation for men alone and indeed rested on the exclusion of all women from complete membership in the nation, whether Mainlander or Korean. In modern Japanese history one of the most obvious examples of the supplementary relationship between the inclusion of ethnically marked men, on the one hand, and the exclusion of women, on the other, is the “universal” suffrage law of 1925. At that time Japanese suffrage law extended the vote and the right to hold public office to adult Korean male residents in Japan; but writing Korean men into the new law also meant writing all women out.<sup>2)</sup>

To be sure, Korean women as well as Japanese women had their respectable positions within the nation, but in the dominant discourse such positions were almost always represented as mediated through social relations with men. Ueda Tatsuo—an ardent Korean proponent of the theory of *Naisen ittai* and Korean assimilation to Japan who wrote under this Japanized name—captured this idea in a few very blunt words written shortly after the official announcement that military conscription would be extended to Korean men. In expressing his tremendous optimism about the possibility of realizing the true unity of Korea and Japan, he declared that “the time has come for [Korean] women to work toward the creation of their majestic qualifications as mothers, wives, older sisters, and younger sisters of heroic imperial soldiers” [UEDA 1942: 70]. This understanding of women as Japanese national subjects of a second order opened up possibilities for blatant forms of misogyny and the treatment of women as objects of exchange through which the masculinist bond between Mainlander and colonized men could be solidified. As Suzuki Yūko has shown, the colonial government’s official policy of promoting intermarriage between Japanese and Koreans (*Naisen kekkon*) actually encouraged the exchange of women in both directions [SUZUKI 1992].

One of the most salient sites for articulating such a gendered logic of ethnic and colonial inclusion/exclusion in the Japanese nation and empire was the discourse on Korean soldiers in the Japanese military. In the following I shall focus on several stories, by two Korean men, that describe the process by which Korean youth could become “truly Japanese” by successfully becoming soldiers. These stories were written in the very late years of colonial rule, when the demands of total war encouraged the vigorous promotion of discourses like *Naisen ittai*, which emphasized the equality of all within Japan proper and its colonies. It is all too clear that colonial subjects and other marginalized groups within Japan continued to be despised by most mainstream Japanese and that they continued to suffer extreme brutality and exploitation as, for example, sexual slaves and forced laborers; but the official and semi-official disavowal of discrimination was necessary

---

2) In the postwar years the relationship between former colonial subjects residing in Japan and Japanese women continued to be supplementary. However, they exchanged positions, in that the latter won the right to vote and hold public office while the former were stripped of these rights.

because otherwise the extremely diverse population within the empire could not be mobilized to actively join in the war effort. Actually, it could even be argued that it was precisely the blatant, virulent, and undeniable character of discrimination and violence against these ethnic and colonial subjects that necessitated such a consistent effort to disavow differences, both by the national and colonial states and by Korean advocates of assimilation to Japan. The context for the texts that I shall analyze was a tension-ridden and contradictory one in which practices of brutal discrimination that one might expect to find under colonialism coexisted alongside discourses of equality that sound remarkably like the liberal assimilationist discourses found in the post-New Deal United States.

In this article I shall analyze the effects of this national disavowal of discrimination on a Korean writer, Chō Kakuchū (Chang Hyōk-chu), and on Hinatsu Eitarō, a Korean movie director and scriptwriter. One of the few scholars to have examined Chō's works has argued that he was the first Korean writing in Japanese to be recognized as a legitimate writer in mainstream Japanese literary circles (*bundan*) [IM 1994: 202]. Born in the Korean province of Northern Kyōngsang, Chō immigrated to Japan, where he became a teacher and then a writer. The literary work that brought him to the attention of a wide Japanese readership was a short story published in 1932 titled "Gakidō" (Hell of Hungry Ghosts) [CHŌ 1932]. This was a passionate indictment of Japanese colonialism and its oppressive effects on the Korean peasantry, but the works that I shall examine are those that followed Chō's remarkable conversion to Japanese nationalism in the late 1930s. It may also be useful to note that during the late 1930s and through the war years, Chō was one of the most prolific Korean authors writing in Japanese.<sup>3)</sup>

We owe what we know about Hinatsu to Utsumi Aiko and Murai Yoshinori's very well researched book describing his amazing saga as a filmmaker [UTSUMI and MURAI 1985]. Soon after illegally entering the country, Hō Yōng launched his career in the Japanese movie industry under the Japanized name "Hinatsu Eitarō." Not only did he make the Japanese propaganda film *Kimi to boku* (You and I) in 1941; following the war he took up the Indonesian name "Dr. Huyung" and played an important role in the development of postindependence Indonesian filmmaking. The main text that I shall use to discuss Hinatsu is his script for *Kimi to boku*, which was published in the July 1941 issue of *Eiga hyōron*. In a technical sense Hinatsu was not its sole author. Iijima Tadashi, the pioneering film scholar, is listed as co-author, and an army press officer is known to have rewritten some parts of the text. But according to Utsumi and Murai, Iijima did not make a substantial contribution and Hinatsu was certainly the primary author.<sup>4)</sup>

3) Valuable assessments of Chō's writings include Im [1994: 202-212] and Kawamura [1993].

4) On the making of *Kimi to boku*, see especially Utsumi and Murai [1987: 57-121]. It should also be noted that the film version differed from the script analyzed here. Unfortunately, like Utsumi and Murai, I have been unable to locate and view the actual film.

In any case, it is not my purpose to retell the life stories of Chō and Hinatsu, however interesting those lives must have been. Instead my strategy will be to offer close readings of several texts that they wrote in Japanese about Korean men becoming Japanese through soldiering. From their position as colonial subjects, men such as Chō Kakuchū and Hinatsu Eitarō helped produce and circulate the idea that the Japanese nation rejected discrimination against its colonial subjects and that they were in essence equal to Mainlanders under the emperor's benevolent gaze (*isshi dōjin*). The stories they told suggest a great deal about why those in subaltern positions in relation to Mainlander Japanese might have wished to understand themselves as Japanese national subjects. Put differently, they reveal how the structures of the nation, especially under total war conditions, successfully interpellated a significant number of even those in highly disprivileged positions as national subjects.

Chō Kakuchū's short stories concerning Korean soldiers may be found in a 1944 volume that carried the title of the lead short story, *Iwamoto shiganhei* (Volunteer Soldier Iwamoto). In the preface to this book Chō notes that four out of the five stories in the volume were written in a moment of tremendous euphoria—a euphoria that he asserted extended beyond himself and reached “each and every Korean youth” [NOGUCHI 1944: 2].<sup>5)</sup> The cause for celebration was the extension of military conscription to young Korean men, both those living in Korea and those residing in Japan. On May 8, 1942, the Japanese cabinet formally announced that Koreans would become eligible for conscription into military service beginning in 1944. Since 1938 Koreans had been able to volunteer for the army and this earlier legal change serves as an important historical backdrop to Chō's stories; but Chō and many others understood the 1942 decision as signaling a new step toward the complete elimination of inequalities between Mainlanders and Koreans. As he put it, Korean youth were ecstatic because this meant that they

---

5) While the book's title page gives the author as “Chō Kakuchū,” its copyright page names him as “Noguchi Minoru.” The latter was Chō's adopted Japanese name, which today the National Diet Library privileges in its catalogs. How one names Koreans, especially Koreans who live in or who have lived in Japan, is a very difficult and sensitive issue. Not only did the Japanese colonial government attempt to force all Koreans to adopt “Japanese” names, but the postwar Japanese government has also pressured resident Koreans to do the same. For this article I have chosen to refer to this author by the Japanized pronunciation of his Korean name. My assumption is that this is the way his name would most often have been read in Japan during the time that he wrote these stories, and thus comes closer to capturing the subject position that he was attempting to carve out for himself as a Japanese from Korea. However, when citing the book *Iwamoto shiganhei* I will use the name “Noguchi,” since it is the one given on the copyright page.

I want to thank Prof. Mizuno Naoki (Kyoto University) for helping me to locate this book, Toyama University for reproducing the book from a copy in its Kajii Bunko, and Eiji Yutani (UCSD) for forwarding this copy to me.

could at last have the opportunity “to become completely Japanese” (*kore de kanzen ni Nihonjin ni nariuru*) [NOGUCHI 1944: 2].<sup>6)</sup>

The three most substantial pieces about Korean soldiers in *Iwamoto shiganhei* were undoubtedly read or heard by a very large public within Japan proper and Korea, both by those who imagined themselves to be mainstream Japanese and those who understood themselves as Korean. The title story, originally serialized in the major Japanese national daily newspaper, *Mainichi shinbun* (August 24—September 9, 1943), was based on Chō’s own experience of having spent a considerable amount of time in one of the military training schools (*kunrenjo*) that had been established on the peninsula to train Korean volunteers [IM 1994: 211]. *Kokumin sōryoku*, the journal that had been launched in Korea as part of the national wartime mobilization effort, began serializing “Atarashii shuppatsu” (A New Beginning) on July 15, 1943 [NOGUCHI 1944: 155; ŌMURA and HOTEI 1997: 213]. The national radio station, Dai Nippon Hōsō Kyōkai, commissioned the book’s final story, “Shuppatsu” (A Beginning), and aired it in August 1943 as part of a weeklong assortment of special programs commemorating the extension of military conscription to Koreans [NOGUCHI 1944: 1].

Among the three short stories on which I focus, the theme of masculinist national bonding is least explicitly developed in “Iwamoto shiganhei.” But that story is a useful place to begin, since it has a complexly structured narrative that not only assumes the growth of Korean youths into Japanese manhood through soldiering but also contains many other tropes that were central to the discourse on *Naisen ittai*.

## 2. VOLUNTEER SOLDIER IWAMOTO

Chō’s stories of Korean men becoming Japanese soldiers and citizens call our attention to the ways in which spaces and places work to constitute them as national subjects. Famous sites on the national symbolic topography—places such as Ise, Meiji, and Yasukuni Shrines as well as the Imperial Palace—interpellate Chō’s characters as Japanese. Other far less well known shrines—Koma Shrine and other religious sites in Japan that were regarded as having been founded by immigrants from the Korean peninsula, as well as anonymous shrines throughout the “Peninsula”—offer material evidence for the claim that the Mainland and Korea were and should be one. Moreover, the spatial colonial tropes of Mainland (Naichi) and Peninsula (Hantō), or Mainland and Korea (Chōsen), simultaneously and contradictorily both differentiate between Japan and Korea and enable the inclusion of Korea in Japan. In other words, the juxtaposing of the Mainland and either the Peninsula or Korea, rather than Japan and Korea, does not posit the two

---

6) Important pioneering histories of Koreans in the Japanese military include Higuchi [1991], Kang T. [1997], Miyata [1985: 11–147], and Utsumi [1991].

formations as mutually exclusive communities but offers the possibility of their cultural and political commensurability across space, within Japan. It is for this reason that when describing the discourse on Korean and Japanese sameness I will consistently translate Naichi as “Mainland,” rather than as “Japan.” The point was that the Korean peninsula and the Japanese metropole were parts of one nation.

Many of the spaces that Chō constructs are what Michel Foucault would describe as “spaces of confinement”—namely, military training schools (*kunrenjo*), military barracks (*hei'ei*), an academy for delinquent youth, and so on: bordered spaces of visibility where individuals are both objectified and constituted as self-disciplining subjects. As I have argued elsewhere [FUJITANI 1994a: 139–169; 1994b; 1996], the nation itself might also be regarded as an expansive “space of confinement,” its national subjects much like the prisoners in Foucault’s version of the Panopticon, visible to and disciplined by mechanisms of observation. In the prewar and wartime Japanese nation and empire, the emperor and his palace represented the central point in such an intersecting system of disciplinary gazes. Chō’s literary productions of space reproduce the nation in these terms and narrate the crossings of Koreans across the borders of the Mainland and the Peninsula as being in large part about the amalgamation of the Peninsula, as a “space of confinement,” into the larger territory of the nation. Chō’s understanding of the relations of nationalism, space, discipline, and masculinity resonate with that of Ueda Tatsuo, the *Naisen ittai* enthusiast cited earlier; for the latter not only described women as respectable national subjects of a secondary order but also labeled the entire space of Korea under the new assimilationist policies a “training school for imperial subjects” (*kōkoku shinmin no kunrenjo*) [UEDA 1942: 70].

The centrality of space, place, and memory in the constitution of Koreans as national subjects is most fully developed in the short story “Iwamoto shiganhei” [NOGUCHI 1944: 11–58]. The narrative begins at Koma Station in the Musashino region. While the history of this area is not yet revealed to readers, the place’s associations with Korea are intimated by the figures of the deities that stand near the station exit. They are the paired images of Tenka Daishōgun and Chika Joshōgun, guardian spirits called *changsūng* in Korean, whose images can often be found at the entrances of Korean villages and temples. Seeing these figures jolts the first-person narrator—who, the book’s preface has already informed us, is modeled on the author—into a flashback that takes him on a memory journey through time, space, and history. It begins with a recollection of his childhood in Korea, when he had once been startled by the frightening figure of a Daishōgun, and ends by circling back to Koma. The core of the story revolves around the narrator’s relationship with Volunteer Soldier Iwamoto. What had Iwamoto felt when he had visited Koma and seen these figures? Iwamoto’s feelings were probably different from his own, he conjectures, for while he had been raised in Korea, Iwamoto had been brought up on the Mainland. Yet by the time the memory journey returns to Koma at the story’s end, we see that the doubled travels of the narrator and



Iwamoto, which take them in opposite directions between Korea and the Mainland, both end in erasing the imaginary borders between the two geographical spaces.

Near the beginning of the memory journey, the narrator recalls again his childhood and his great sadness and envy at watching Japanese soldiers marching through the streets of his native place in Korea. He had been a child with no hope of ever achieving the soldierly manhood that he had witnessed. Yet the voluntary system and recent changes in the conscription law had made it possible for Koreans to participate; and when he received an invitation to enter a training school in Keijō (Seoul) he accepted with the full intention of becoming a regular trainee. The narrator's and hence Chō's travel back to Korea can thus be read as a journey to recuperate the manhood and national subjecthood that he had earlier been denied.

However, on his arrival at the training school the narrator is informed that he is too old to be a regular trainee, and he accepts a position within the school as an instructor's apprentice (*kyōkan minarai*). The narrator's and Iwamoto's lives first intersect when one day the narrator notices Iwamoto sobbing during the moment of silence that trainees daily observe to remember their gratitude to their parents. This sparks the narrator's intense curiosity about the young man's past. He soon learns that the youth has had a troubled life. Iwamoto's father had until recently been a drunkard, and the academy that he had attended was for boys who had been delinquents. But Iwamoto had somehow managed to become a model Mainland-raised Korean youth, and by volunteering for military service he had caused his father to change his ways and inspired other youths in the academy to also volunteer.

The little that the narrator initially learns only whets his appetite to know more. Iwamoto responds to all of his questions, describing the life processes through which a wayward Korean boy had come to be constituted as a self-disciplining Japanese national subject. As a child he had gotten into trouble, mainly out of frustration that as a Korean he was ineligible for military service. But perhaps, he reflects, he would not have given up on himself if not for his father. The narrator understands completely how discrimination against Koreans with regard to their military eligibility, a home life characterized by a drunkard father and a stepmother, and the general low standard of living of Korean immigrants might all have fed Iwamoto's despair, and the frustrations of other boys like him.

Iwamoto reveals that unlike most of the other boys in the academy, he did not have to be forced to attend. Instead, with the advice of someone from the local Kyōwakai branch (a governmental organization that had been established to control the activities of Korean residents in Japan), he had entered of his own volition so that, as he put it, "I could rigorously reform my past self" (*jibun no kako o tatakinaosō*) [NOGUCHI 1944: 43]. Although the academy's Principal Maruoka had taught the boys that they were the "emperor's children" (*heika no sekishi*) and that they should be reborn as "true Japanese" (*shin no Nipponjin*) [1944: 48], he had sometimes been troubled with doubts about his ability to achieve this. At those times he regretted having entered the academy.

Iwamoto confesses that on one such occasion he lied in order to temporarily escape from the academy. Although he said that he would be visiting Meiji Shrine, a worthy patriotic activity, he actually planned only to see his old friends. He recalls that by chance he met one of them in Ginza and they then decided to take the bus to their old neighborhood in Meguro. But as they waited at a bus stop at Hibiya, he happened to catch a glimpse of the Imperial Palace's moat. Until then he had "completely returned to [his] old self" (*sukkari moto no jibun ni narimashita*), undisciplined and frivolous; but the moment he saw the moat (obviously associated with the emperor) he "suddenly froze in fear" (*hatto tachisukumu*). His "heart was violently smashed to bits" (*ganto kokoro ga tatakikudakareta*). Sending his confused friend off alone, Iwamoto walked to the Nijū Bridge in front of the Imperial Palace, "as if [he] were being unwittingly sucked toward it" (*suitsukarete yukuyō ni*). There he remembered his monthly patriotic trips to worship the palace and he felt as if he saw the "face of Principal Maruoka standing there." After worshipping the palace in tears, Iwamoto returned to the Academy and confessed to the principal [NOGUCHI 1944: 49].

Yet when he was a youth, one further question had weighed heavily on Iwamoto's mind. While he had heard that Korea and the Mainland had been one (*Naisen ittai*) since ancient times, such an idea seemed distant from his everyday life ("kimochi no ue ni ikite kimasen deshita"). Only on making a pilgrimage to Koma Shrine did the reality of *Naisen ittai* come to him in "a flash of illumination" (*hatto satotta*) [NOGUCHI 1944: 50–51]. The materiality of the landscape showed Iwamoto that Koreans had come to the Mainland over 1,200 years earlier and had become completely Japanese. The official historical narrative of *Naisen ittai* could only become a lived reality for Iwamoto after his journey to Koma Shrine.

It is at this point in the story that the narrator begins his travels back to Japan, first visiting northern and middle Korea, and witnessing throughout the provinces the training of imperial subjects and young men of draftable age. Somehow, Iwamoto is constantly on his mind and we find him retracing the youth's spiritual journey. Thus he visits the Maruoka Academy and sees the disciplined lifestyle of its students. Principal Maruoka explains to the narrator his philosophy of teaching: the main purpose of the academy is to teach the boys "that they are Japanese" and "that they are subjects of the imperial nation." As for Iwamoto, the principal reaffirms, only on making the pilgrimage to Koma Shrine did he learn that "his own ancestors were the same as those of the Yamato race" (*Yamato minzoku*) [NOGUCHI 1944: 55].

After calling on Maruoka the narrator makes his own pilgrimage to Koma, so that we are returned to the time and place at which the story began. The narrator parts with Tenka Daishōgun, making his way to the shrine itself. Along the way, as he tracks the route that Iwamoto had taken, he recalls the history of *Naisen ittai* in that region. And, following the scholarship on *Naisen ittai*, he notes that 1,797 immigrants led by a Koguryō (Kōkuri) prince had settled in Koma over 1,200 years ago. Just then, he passes by the Koma National Elementary School, where some

children have begun to leave the school grounds. He observes the faces of the children and it seems to him that “two out of five look so much like recent [Korean] immigrants that they could be misrecognized as such.” He thinks of Iwamoto again and conjectures that he too must have been shocked and moved by these faces, but then reflects that “in the same way that the faces of 1,200 years ago have become Mainland faces (*Naichika*), Iwamoto’s face is also changing.” The Mainland and Korea are, after all, one [NOGUCHI 1944: 57].

The story comes to its dramatic conclusion when the narrator finally reaches his destination. Like Iwamoto, it is here that he is most impressed by the reality of *Naisen ittai*. He thinks back again to Iwamoto and toward the future, when many other pilgrims will also be moved by this site. But most important, he reflects that “in ancient times Koreans had come not only to this place, Musashino, but to every corner of the country and are also prospering in this fashion.” Furthermore, he calculates that more than a hundred other shrines on the Mainland could be traced back to Korea. The narrator’s final vision of the landscape, then, is of the Mainland covered with sacred sites such as Koma Shrine that bear visual witness to the complete melding of Korea and the Mainland in ancient times. The story ends with the narrator praying that Iwamoto will become an even better soldier and that “all Korean comrades will even a day earlier complete the task of becoming imperial subjects” [NOGUCHI 1944: 58].

“Iwamoto shiganhei” may best be read as an allegory of Korea and its relationship to the Mainland. Like Korea as a whole in the dominant Japanese discourse on the colony, Iwamoto is represented as a lost and confused adolescent until he finds his own subjectivity as a Japanese and imperial male subject. Iwamoto, an ethnic and colonial youth in despair, seeks of his own volition to have his soul reformed in the disciplinary space of the academy. There are some successes, but the youth’s subjectivity is incompletely formed and his soul wanders. After only a half hour of walking along the Ginza he is returned to his former degenerate self. If the academy as a microspace of confinement guards against such an unreflexive soul, escape from it at first seems to foster lack of self-reflection. But it turns out that the space outside the academy—in other words, the nation—is yet another and far more expansive “space of confinement” where the individual soul is still subject to a disciplinary gaze. The imperial moat and the palace function like the Tower in Foucault’s description of Bentham’s Panopticon, and by their presence on the physical landscape they help to constitute the self-disciplining self that is the subject of the modern nation. Iwamoto returns to the academy, but the implication is that by now he no longer really needs to be confined there, for he can be both free and self-disciplining; and eventually he “volunteers” to become a soldier. In other words, Iwamoto’s, as well as by extension Korea’s, self-determination results in his self-subjectification to the nation of Japan.

In “Iwamoto shiganhei” Chō also brilliantly captures the importance of memory in the construction of nationalism. In his classic essay “What Is a Nation,” Ernest Renan argued that a nation is founded as much on the ability of its

people to forget incommensurable pasts as on their capacity to possess a common memory [RENAN 1990]. But with regard to the relationship between memory and the national community, Chō and many other proponents of *Naisen ittai* reasoned that forgetfulness was responsible for most people's inability to imagine the Mainland and Korea as one nation. To imagine two peoples or nations instead of one was precisely a problem of not remembering, and one of Chō's central tasks in "Iwamoto shiganhei" was to recuperate and make believable the memory of oneness by remapping the Mainland and the Peninsula as two parts of a whole.

Kang Ch'ang-gi, Chō's contemporary and another Korean proponent of the *Naisen ittai* thesis, expressed this relationship between memory and nationalism in a particularly direct way. He emphasized that the most fundamental obstacle to realizing the unity of the Mainland and Korea was mutual ignorance about their forming "in essence and in origin one ethnic body" (*honraiteki niwa ittai no minzoku*). Furthermore, he noted that this mutual ignorance was the result of "the ethnic forgetfulness (*minzokuteki bōkyaku*) that had taken place over the course of more than a thousand years and the ethnic hallucination (*minzokuteki sakkaku*) that had come as a consequence." His main point was that the hallucinatory consciousness of both Mainlanders and Koreans had to be eradicated by recuperating the memory of unity [KANG C. 1939: 183].

### 3. NEW BEGINNINGS

"Iwamoto shiganhei," "Atarashii shuppatsu" (A New Beginning), and "Shuppatsu" (A Beginning) are all primarily stories of men, most of them young men, who are figured as model Japanese citizens. In fact, the term *mohan seinen* (model youth) is used to describe some of them. Older men, such as the narrator of "Iwamoto shiganhei," a man "a year away from turning forty" [NOGUCHI 1944: 15] who is patterned after the author himself, young men's wives and sisters, as well as elderly fathers and mothers also appear to shed their ethnic and colonial difference as they become national subjects. But it is the young men who above all represent the great tide of history and the realization of the promises of the nation and the emperor. They demonstrate that progress in the nation's disavowal of discrimination is inevitable because they are now considered to be the equal of any Japanese man. As the titles of two of the short stories, "A New Beginning" and "A Beginning," indicate, the ability to serve in the military is presented as a point of departure for further progress in realizing the absolute equality between Mainlanders and Koreans as Japanese.

"Shuppatsu" [NOGUCHI 1944: 209-248] opens with Matsumura Akimori, a Korean youth residing in Japan, reading a Korean newspaper and telling his sister about his cousin Akikazu's heroics. Two days before Akikazu was to take the exam to enter the training school that would qualify him for entry into the army, a terrible mudslide destroyed his family's home, leaving his mother dead and his father severely injured. Yet instead of placing family and parent above the nation

by canceling his plans and caring for his father, Akikazu took the exam, passed, and succeeded in entering the army.

In the next scene Noda Seiji, a “Mainlander youth” (*Naichi seinen*), visits Akimori in order to ask the young man to take over his business, since he has been called up to serve in the military. Akimori readily agrees but is also saddened; having just heard about his cousin’s heroics and now Noda’s imminent departure to the war front, he feels feminized and excluded from what the author is constructing as a masculinized national community. Akimori looks distraught and Noda criticizes him for his “effeminacy” (*memeshii zō*). But Akimori protests: it is only that he envies Noda and other Mainlanders for being able to “go bravely off to the battlefields” [NOGUCHI 1944: 218].

When Akimori sees his Korean friend Kaneyama, he relays the news about Noda’s imminent departure, and they rejoice together but confirm their sense of “being forlorn” (*sabishii*) since they will not be called on to serve [NOGUCHI 1944: 220]. Akimori tells Kaneyama that new training schools for Korean youth wishing to volunteer have just opened up in Osaka and Fukuoka on the Mainland, and they vow to enlist. Kaneyama declares that he wants to distinguish himself even above Yi In-sōk, the first Korean volunteer soldier to die in battle, who was then being heroized by the national and colonial state as well as by the media.<sup>7)</sup> Akimori’s resolve is just as strong, but he worries about his family. His mother needs to be cared for and it would be difficult for him to leave.

In the next scene the head of the local neighborhood association informs Akimori and Kaneyama that he has just heard over the radio that the Japanese cabinet has decided to extend military conscription to Koreans. He congratulates them and declares that because of this and the recent decision to establish compulsory education in Korea, “the unity of the mainland and Korea (*Naisen ittai*) is now realized in name and in fact” This man encourages the two Korean youth to continue to work for the community and describes them as the “neighborhood’s model youth” (*chōnai no mohan seinen*) [NOGUCHI 1944: 225–226]. Akimori and Kaneyama agree that the occasion calls for them to visit and pay their respects at Meiji Shrine, a place that most readers would have recognized as one of the prewar and wartime regime’s most sacred national and imperial sites. There they are overcome by emotion, and Kaneyama declares that the opening up of the draft to Koreans is truly unbelievable “good fortune” [NOGUCHI 1944: 228].

This “good fortune” reminds Kaneyama of an earlier “miracle” (*kiseki*)—the February 1940 reform of the household registry system that had allowed colonials to adopt “Japanese” names. While most recent scholars of the “Name Changing Campaign” (*sōshi kaimei*, literally “to establish surnames and change given names”) consider it to have succeeded through coercion,<sup>8)</sup> Chō presents the

7) For the official representation of Yi In-sōk, see Utsumi [1991: 47–48].

8) Representative works on the Name Changing Campaign are Chou [1996] and Miyata, Kim, and Yang [1992]. Recently, Kim Yōng-dal [1997] has also emphasized that it is important to consider Korean collaboration in the Campaign.

situation very differently. Kaneyama reminisces about the impact of *sōshi kaimei*, praising it for its homogenizing effects—that is, its erasure of the differences that would allow discrimination to continue. As Kaneyama explained:

Those of us raised on the Mainland felt most uncomfortable when called by such [Korean] names as Boku-san or Ri-san. We're considered different just because of something as minor as that, you know. From the time we were small, we never distinguished ourselves from Mainland people. But with surnames like Boku (Pak) or Ri (Yi), distinctions started to be made. This was the beginning of the warping of our minds (*higamasetta*) [NOGUCHI 1944: 229].

Kaneyama further explained that by passing with Japanese names such as Tanaka or Nakamura, some Koreans became more intimate with Mainlanders and “we believed that we did not have to distinguish ourselves from others” [NOGUCHI 1944: 230]. But this nonlegal passing left the Koreans feeling guilty because their families were still registered with non-Japanese names. Thus, according to Kaneyama's (and, by extension, Chō's) explanation, the Name Changing Campaign was not an unwelcome coercion but rather a marvelous opportunity to become indistinguishable from Mainlanders. Using the language of current U.S. discourses on race metaphorically, we might say that Kaneyama welcomed the coming of a “colorblind” society that rejected the recognition of differences among its members.

In their excitement Akimori and Kaneyama have forgotten to calculate how old they will be when the newly revised draft law goes into effect. When they do so Kaneyama discovers that his age will make him ineligible and he decides to volunteer immediately. Akimori will not have this problem. Moreover, his sister and brother-in-law have said they will look after his elderly mother. Yet 1944 seems too far away and he, like Kaneyama, ultimately volunteers to enter a training school as soon as possible so that he can become an aviator.

The story ends at the train station where people have gathered to give the Mainlander Noda a warm sendoff. Akimori and Kaneyama are among the well-wishers, and Akimori encourages him: “Mr. Noda. Do your best (*shikkari yatte kure*).” To which Noda unexpectedly responds, “It is above all a new beginning for the two of you. The road ahead is only full of brightness.” Akimori shouts, “Hooray for Mr. Noda.” But Noda shouts back, “Hooray for Matsumura. Hooray for Kaneyama” [NOGUCHI 1944: 248]. By the end of the story, progress in the national disavowal of discrimination has had the effect of constituting the Korean youth into national subjects who are recognized as such by each other, and by other Japanese. They have become men who not only participate in sending Japanese off to the battlefields but also are themselves Japanese and can join in this male fraternity of soldier-subjects who make up the front ranks of national community.

“Atarashii shuppatsu” [NOGUCHI 1944: 59–155] is likewise a story of progress in the national disavowal of differences and the inclusion of Korean men into the

fraternity of the nation. But even more than “Shuppatsu” and “Iwamoto shiganhei,” the narrative demands the self-disciplinization of Korean individuals and the normalization of the entire Korean community to what are imagined to be Japanese culture and values. In other words, becoming truly Japanese is seen as requiring not just the opportunity bestowed by the nation and emperor, but constant self-reflection on the practices of everyday life.<sup>9)</sup> Excessive talkativeness, excitability, loss of reason, extreme valuation of filial piety at the expense of loyalty to nation and emperor, and so on—these are understood to be the character traits not simply of individuals but of Koreans generally. And it is this Koreanness that must be shed in order for those from the Peninsula to become completely Japanese. Psychologically, they must be constantly vigilant about not being Korean and about refining the “Japanese spirit” (*Nippon seishin*) [NOGUCHI 1944: 122]. The taut contradiction between the possibility of Koreans being included in the nation and their very abjection as Koreans itself generates their self-disciplining subjectivity as national and imperial subjects. Thus the story is filled with such expressions as “self-subjectification as an imperial subject” (*jiko kōminka*), “training in becoming imperial subjects” (*Hantō no kōminka rensēi*), “the self-consciousness of Peninsulars” (*Hantōjin no jikaku*), and the “training of the soul” (*tamashii no rensēi*) [NOGUCHI 1944: 75, 142]. When a group of Korean youths send off one of the story’s heroes at a train station, they agree to do so solemnly, in a “model way” (*mohanteki*), not noisily as they say Koreans are prone to do. Moreover, Chō represents the military training school as a place where young men are Japanized, where they first learn the proper relation between filial piety and loyalty and then “reform their everyday lives to the Mainland style (*Naichishiki ni*)” [NOGUCHI 1944: 115, 135].

The initial drama of “Atarashii shuppatsu” is provided by its two main characters, Sawada and Shimamura, who have been driven apart for personal and political reasons but are eventually reunited through the new possibility of Koreans serving in the military. The story’s narrator explains in retrospect that years before the so-called China Incident (1937), when Sawada went by his former name Pak and Shimamura was Yi, and when “the level of subsistence of immigrant Koreans was not as good as it is today” [NOGUCHI 1944: 66], Sawada’s father had arranged for Shimamura’s father to come to Japan and to find employment at the construction company where he worked. Sawada’s family was unsparing in its generosity, even looking after the Shimamura family’s housing and clothing. But the relationship between the two families soured because Shimamura’s father apparently ingratiated himself with their employer and then finally, or so Sawada thought, forced Sawada’s father out of the company. Some years later, after the death of Sawada’s father, Shimamura’s father visited the Sawada family and claimed that he had been

9) Tomiyama Ichirō’s writings are very suggestive concerning this process for Okinawans. For example, see Tomiyama [1995].

falsely accused of wrongdoing. In fact, he insisted, he had tried to support Sawada's father. The two families once again grew close, and circumstances again put Shimamura in the Sawada family's debt as he began to live with them in Tokyo. But Shimamura and Sawada quarreled for some unexplained reason, and—forgetting his debt to the Sawada family yet another time—Shimamura mysteriously disappeared. Sawada only heard rumors that Shimamura had married a Mainlander woman in Fukushima.

Over the years Sawada gave little thought to Shimamura, but unexpectedly received two letters, the first apologizing for the quarrel that had taken place so many years earlier and a second announcing that he would be volunteering for the military. Shimamura asks Sawada to meet him at the train station, but Sawada is conflicted: while he is happy that Shimamura has decided to volunteer, he still cannot forget the past wrongs that he and his family have endured. Yet Sawada decides that he will go to the station; and when he notices other men in military uniform, he is glad that he did. Seeing these men while looking for Shimamura, Sawada muses on his new sense of inclusion in the nation.

In the past he had always intended to be patriotic and to think of himself as Japanese. To be sure, before Governor-General Minami Jirō's *Naisen ittai* campaign he had sometimes felt a gap between himself and Mainlander people. But this sense of difference had been erased with the Name Changing Campaign, his work with the Kyōwakai, his self-subjectification as an imperial subject (*jiko kōminka*), and news and radio reports of Koreans being honored at Yasukuni Shrine, the national shrine to the war dead. "Today under the Great East Asia War," he reflected, "no longer does anyone think that Koreans are only immigrants." This "changing figure of the Mainland" (*Naichi no kawatte iku sugata*), this disavowal of difference, engenders Sawada's ever-growing patriotism [NOGUCHI 1944: 75].

And yet, Sawada cannot help but admit that a certain distance remained when he had sent off soldiers in the past: "somehow, in a way it seemed like someone else's affair" (*tanin gyōji no tokoro ga atta*). But now, he was coming to see his fellow Korean Shimamura, and "this feeling of dissatisfaction melted away in an instantaneous flash of illumination" (*shakuzen to toketekuru*). At that moment, the faces of the Japanese soldiers looked like Shimamura's. Self and Other, Peninsula and Mainland, Korean and Japanese, had all become one and the same [NOGUCHI 1944: 78].

The day after Shimamura's arrival in Tokyo, Sawada takes him to the Shibuya Ward Office, where he must take the exam administered to those wishing to join the training school for Korean volunteers. While he waits for Shimamura, Sawada recalls the startling conversation they had had the prior evening. Shimamura had told Sawada that his leaving for Fukushima had only been indirectly related to their quarrel. Actually, everything could be explained by Shimamura's intense frustration that as a Korean he had been unable to join the military.

Shimamura explained that when he was living in Tokyo he had become very



close to a young man named Sugimoto, the master of an established wholesale seaweed business in Nihonbashi. They had become the best of friends, sharing everything, including their dreams about the future. By chance, they had been born in the same year on the same day, and they made a firm pledge to take their military conscription exams together and then to be inducted into the same unit. But, of course, Shimamura was not eligible for the draft and in those days he could not even volunteer to join the army. His deception gnawed at him; many times he tried to explain his situation to the Mainlander Sugimoto, yet he could never bring himself to do so.

It was just at this moment that Sawada and Shimamura had their quarrel. The fight itself concerned Shimamura's spending too much time with Sugimoto. The argument, coming as it did when Shimamura's relationship with Sugimoto was not going well, drove Shimamura to flee from Tokyo to somewhere far away. Thus, we learn that the quarrel had not been a simply personal matter and that it had nothing to do with the past relationship between the Sawada and Shimamura families. Instead, the root cause of the problem had been the exclusion of Korean men from the national community. Shimamura's apparent character flaw, what in "Shuppatsu" Chō described as the "warping of our minds," stemmed from the nation's incomplete disavowal of discrimination. But now Korean men could join the military and become part of the nation. Just as in "Shuppatsu," the future looks bright. Chō makes the nation stand for progress so that Sawada, Shimamura, and all other Koreans can be completely delivered from their distress.

It could be argued that there is a great deal of homoeroticism in this story. Sugimoto and Shimamura are like lovers, "studying together, taking walks together, sharing interests, reading the same books, thinking the same things." "In the Korean fashion you could say," remarks Shimamura, "we were so close that we would even have shared what was in our mouths." Sawada as well had acted like a spurned lover, jealously interrogating Shimamura about his time spent with Sugimoto. And Shimamura insists that had his relationship with Sugimoto been more secure, he and Sawada might have been able to "tenderly make up." In fact, throughout his short stories Chō notes the attractiveness of the young soldier's uniforms and the fitness of their bodies. Later in "Atarashii shuppatsu," for example, when Shimamura has already gone off to training school, Sawada imagines him in uniform "losing himself in the regularity of the manly daily routine" [NOGUCHI 1944: 91, 93, 117].

Yet the allure of the military is not strictly its underlying homoeroticism; rather inclusion into the military and thus the nation is understood by Chō as the confirmation of masculinity. Moreover, this confirmation is constituted through a misogynistic process of homosocial bonding. For Shimamura, rejection by Sugimoto results in marriage to a woman in whom he cannot confide. She cannot be an intimate partner in the manner of either the Mainlander Sugimoto or the Korean Sawada. At one point Shimamura confides to Sawada that only Sawada can understand him, not his wife [NOGUCHI 1944: 73]. And when Shimamura is

finally on the train bound for the training school, even after his wife has dutifully seen him off, he resists any signs of affection, only noting, "In my heart I no longer have a shop or a wife. There is only the emperor and the nation" [NOGUCHI 1944: 112].

In her important book on American masculinity and the Vietnam War, Susan Jeffords argues that one of the most prominent motifs in U.S. representations of the war was that of racial and class differences being overcome by the masculine bond. Camaraderie among soldierly men enabled the military unit to become "the location for the eradication of social, class, ethnic, and racial boundaries" [JEFFORDS 1989: 54]. Yet she also incisively argues in deconstructionist fashion that the constitution of this masculinist bond among such heterogeneous men depended on the repulsion of women and their exclusion from the national community of men. Only by marking women as absolutely different from men could Vietnam narratives constitute diverse men as the same.

Although Vietnam narratives show the bonding of soldiers from diverse and often antagonistic backgrounds, those bonds are always and already masculine. At no point are women to be included as a part of this collectivity.... It is through this elision—"America's collective consciousness" as a masculine consciousness—that the claim of collectivity is most safely made, as the firmly established structure of gender difference maintains a frame within which other change can (apparently) occur, change circumscribed by the masculine bond [JEFFORDS 1989: 59].

As the above descriptions of Chō's short stories make clear, a similar argument could be made about his gendered representations of Mainlanders and Koreans during the total war years of Japanese colonial rule. Like representations of the Vietnam War, Chō's narratives construct the military as the site through which Mainlanders and Koreans reject their ethnic and colonial differences through their male bond. Moreover, this bonding is enabled by the absolute and hierarchized boundary that is formed between men and women. All men, Mainlander or Korean, must first reject all women, Mainlander or Korean, in order for the diverse men to realize their sameness. Therefore, in the passage cited above the Korean Shimamura rejects his Mainlander wife even though in another context he might have continued to possess her as a token of his having become Japanese.

In such an exchange—that is, ethnic and colonial men being included in the nation in exchange for the exclusion of all women, including Japanese women—women are figured as threats to warfare, the masculine bond, and hence the nation.<sup>10</sup> Mothers and wives are potentially menacing presences who may endanger the nation through their propensity to love their men excessively or to be the objects of inordinate male affection. If it is the homosocial bond that unifies

10) Similarly, Jeffords makes the point that "when women appear in Vietnam narratives, it is never as part of the 'brotherhood' that is created in battle. They are instead usually trying to stop their husbands, sons, or lovers from going to Vietnam" [JEFFORDS 1989:

the nation through its work of transcending differences among men and expelling women, then the heterosocial bond between mothers and sons, or husbands and wives, constantly threatens to unleash a process of degeneration into the narrow particularism of family interests. Women no less than men, then, must be reformed, and for Korean women the model of womanhood was the Mainland woman.

As in many other colonial texts, Korean women in Chō's writings are always suspect. Even when they are lauded for their behavior, this praise is premised on their acting contrary to the expectation that they are probably not "good women." When Shimamura in "Atarashii shuppatsu" is in training school he encounters a simple but pure-hearted trainee named Yoshimura. The noncommissioned (male) officers "loved (*aishite iru*) Yoshimura for his ingenuous personality" [NOGUCHI 1944: 137]. But one day Yoshimura bursts out crying during the evening moment of silent self-reflection. Shimamura repeatedly asks him why he is so sad, each time suspecting that Yoshimura longs inappropriately for his wife or children and is not attentive enough to his soldierly duties. When Yoshimura mentions that he has left his wife and children behind, Shimamura is angered and responds that many trainees have wives and children. When Yoshimura says his wife has taken ill, Shimamura finds the situation laughable. But Shimamura is taken by surprise. Yoshimura's tears are not the result of longing selfishly to be with his wife and family; they stem from his being moved by the incredible sacrifices that his wife and mother have made in order to help him become a good soldier—in fact, to become a man who can do without them. As it turns out, Yoshimura's wife's illness was caused by the daily cold-water rigors she had undergone at a local shrine to pray that he might become a good soldier. Furthermore, when Yoshimura worried about who would care for his aging mother while his wife was ill, this widowed mother, barely able to get up on her own, had scolded him for worrying about his family even though he was an "imperial soldier," saying that his "heart still lacks sufficient training" [NOGUCHI 1944: 140].

While Yoshimura's mother and wife are good women because they do not endanger the boundary that separates them from the world of soldiers, they also

---

64]. She also discusses the reassurances that the collectivity of men acquire through their comradeship against women, but her references to sexual sharing and gang rape, though not entirely irrelevant, would be misleading here [see esp. 65–73]. Furthermore, while Jeffords notes that in Vietnam War representations men are depicted as self-sufficient enough to be able to exclude women from even their nurturing and reproductive role as parents [87–115], this was certainly not the case in the stories that I summarize here. Instead, as we shall see, Japanese colonial discourse sought to reestablish a respectable position for Korean women within a "Japanized" heterosexual family. In fact, as previous scholarship has already made clear, the Name Changing Campaign that was also promoted in the late colonial period was concerned not simply to change names but also to establish a family structure in Korea modeled after the officially sanctioned Japanese one.

defy expectations about the characteristics of Korean women. When Shimamura tells Yoshimura's story to his instructor, the latter is surprised: "What a splendid mother. We've got to have a better opinion about the Peninsular mother (*hantō no hahaoya*)" [NOGUCHI 1944: 143]. The instructor is astonished because, as Shimamura explains, it had been said that "the Korean mother (*Chōsen no haha to iu mono wa*) is obsessed with loving only her own children, and does not give a thought to training her children or offering them to the nation." Yoshimura's mother is splendid because in tempering her son's soul she is not behaving like "the Korea mother." Indeed, the instructor concludes that she is nothing other than "a splendid Japanese mother" (*rippa na Nippon no haha oya da*) [NOGUCHI 1944: 142].

Paralleling the demands placed on Korean men to rid themselves of what are deemed Korean or Peninsular tendencies and to become "Japanese," the narrative calls on Korean women to eradicate what are described as their Korean ways and to become Japanese mothers. They must become the Japanese Other. In fact, by the end of the story we learn that the parable of Yoshimura's splendid "Japanese" mother has had a deep impact on many people. Shimamura's friend Sawada is greatly moved by the thought that "even in Korea there is such a splendid mother." And not only has Sawada's mother begun to reform her old ways as a result of hearing the story, she and Shimamura's sister have decided to start a "mother's association" (*haha no kai*). "In other words," Sawada concludes, "they have decided to start training as mothers" [NOGUCHI 1944: 148].

Thus in Chō's stories Korean men and women are compelled to overcome their ethnic difference with Mainlanders—that is, to imagine their common ethnicity and therefore equality as Japanese—through parallel bonds of gender. Proper manliness and respectable womanliness are the avenues through which colonial subjects might imagine their equalities with Japanese; but the boundaries of gender are never transcended. The imaginary equalities exist within and not across gender categories, and they presuppose the nation as first and foremost a fraternity. It is only as wives, mothers, and sisters—in other words, only through the social relations mediated by men—that women, Korean or Mainlander, become Japanese. This discursive structure, by which ethnicity is overcome by parallel but gender-differentiated and hierarchical avenues of inclusion, is particularly striking in the script for the film *Kimi to boku*.

#### 4. YOU AND I

Like Chō's stories analyzed above, Hinatsu's script for *Kimi to boku*, or *You and I*, depicts Korean youth successfully becoming soldiers and, through that rite of passage, acquiring their manhood and national subjecthood. Furthermore, not only do Korean men expel women from the core national community of Mainlander and Korean men, as in Chō's writings; they also exchange women as a sign of masculine camaraderie. In the end, Korean men are represented as potentially interchangeable with Mainlander men, and Korean women with Mainlander

women; but this transcendence of ethnicity occurs through and not across gender, thereby reinforcing and naturalizing the sharp boundaries distinguishing men from women.

As in "Iwamoto shiganhei," physical sites of memory that demonstrate the historical roots of Korean and Mainlander unity constitute an important mise-en-scène for *Kimi to boku*. The story's leading character, the Korean youth Kaneko Eisuke, as well as his fellow volunteer soldier Kinoshita Tarō, are both from the town of Puyō in Ch'ungch'ōng Namdo. Two Mainlander *Naisen ittai* enthusiasts who are central to the plot's unfolding, Kubo Ryōhei and his wife, Kubo Fusako, also live there; and Puyō is the setting for more than half the story, including the love scenes between Eisuke and Mitsue (Fusako's sister) and the arrangement of the couple's marriage. The Paekche capital of Sabi had been located on the Puyō plain, and when Eisuke takes Mitsue and her friend Yi Paek-hŭi on a tour of the area, he shows them the remains of the ancient court. Puyō was important in the discourse of *Naisen ittai*, as Mitsue's and Fusako's brother Asano Kenzō partly explains, because it had been said that ancestral connections between Mainlanders and Koreans could be traced to this area [HINATSU and IJIMA 1941: 142]. As director of the local museum, Kubo Ryōhei gives modern scholarly legitimacy to such claims. While the details of this connection are not described in the scenario itself, we know that proponents of the *Naisen ittai* thesis commonly argued that when the Paekche Kingdom on the Korean Peninsula fell to the Tang and Silla forces in the seventh century [KIM I. 1984: 178–184], many exiles from Paekche migrated to the Mainland, where they established their communities and subsequently blended into the Mainland population. Therefore, as in "Iwamoto shiganhei," the realization of Mainlander and Korean unity in the narrative present is understood as the natural result of an original oneness.

The repulsion and then reform of Korean women, as Japanese women, is another theme that replicates the structure of Chō's stories. A rather long subplot concerning this motif involves Kinoshita Tarō. One day while in the training school for Korean volunteer soldiers, Kinoshita is discovered crying. Kaneko Eisuke, who is the leader of the detail, calls Kinoshita "effeminate" (*memeshii*) and suspects that the latter either misses his hometown (and therefore his wife and family) or is afraid of battle. Instead, we learn that Kinoshita is in a very complex way upset at his wife for not behaving properly as a "Japanese lady" (*Nippon no fujin*) and "a wife of a Japanese military man" (*Nippon gunjin no tsuma*). Kinoshita's wife had not reported the death of their son to him out of fear that she would disturb his spiritual concentration as he trained to become a soldier. This upsets Kinoshita because she should have had faith in his spiritual strength. Furthermore, it is not the "attachment of love" (*aichaku*) to his family that disturbs Kinoshita. He is distraught and brought to tears primarily because the nation had lost a "male child of Japan" (*Nippon danshi*) who would have become "a splendid male youth of Japan" (*Nippon no rippa na sōtei*) [HINATSU and IJIMA 1941: 133–135]. As a result of being scolded by her husband, Kinoshita's wife resolves to

study harder to become a “Japanese lady” and a “wife of an imperial soldier.” The suspect Korean woman gains respectability by becoming a Japanese woman [HINATSU and IJIMA 1941: 137].

The demonstration of the interchangeability of ethnicity through gender, together with the exchange of women between men that is allowed by the gendered hierarchy in such a discourse, forms the core theme of *Kimi to boku*. The rite of passage in Kaneko Eisuke’s development into manhood and national subjecthood begins with the forging of a masculine if still unequal bond between this pure-hearted Korean youth and Asano Kenzō. In an early scene, before he has entered the training school for Korean volunteers, Eisuke welcomes Japanese soldiers at the Keijō (Seoul) train station, wishing them well as they depart for the war front. Eisuke is distributing good luck amulets and he gives one to Kenzō, one of the Mainlander soldiers. Kenzō stretches out his huge hands to take a charm and recognizes Eisuke with the words, “Thank you, brother.” Eisuke takes Kenzō’s hand and says, “I’m depending on you. Do your best (*shikkari yatte kudasai*).” As Kenzō takes the amulet, he says that he will “always keep it next to my body (*hadami hanasazu*).” Kenzō is so moved by the sendoff that he gives Eisuke a note expressing his gratitude for the reception the Koreans have given him. But folded inside the note is also a ten-yen bill that Kenzō says he will have no use for in the battlefield. Eisuke refuses what might appear to be purely monetary compensation for his loyalty and patriotism by in turn donating the money to a patriotic organization for national defense. In the end, as we shall see, the payoff for Eisuke’s loyalty, patriotism, and eventual growth into manhood is a Mainlander woman, since he is eventually presented with Kenzō’s sister, Mitsue. Yet this final exchange between men cannot take place until Eisuke becomes a truly Japanese man, and to do so he must become a soldier. For as we have already been told, to become a soldier is the “natural duty of a son of Japan” (*Nippon danji no tōzen no gimu*). At the station, Eisuke is still in the submissive, passive position of asking Kenzō, who has the demeanor of a “warrior” (*bujinrashiku*), to fight for him and the nation [HINATSU and IJIMA 1941: 133, 135].

Eisuke first meets Mitsue and her Korean classmate, Yi Paek-hūi, at the station. As they walk away from the scene Eisuke announces that he also intends to become a soldier. Mitsue looks toward him, as if she feels that he is someone who can be depended upon. They part, and because they are strangers who have been brought together only by the Japanese soldiers passing through, we cannot know that they will cross paths again.

But Eisuke and Mitsue are brought together once again by the beauty of the military. One day Mitsue and Paek-hūi see the Korean volunteers marching in town; when they run to have a glimpse of the “splendid” sight, they see Eisuke. They then decide to take a tour of the volunteer training center, where Eisuke serves as guide. Hinatsu presents Mitsue there and elsewhere as an object of Korean male desire. She is described as “an extremely beautiful Mainlander young lady” (*hijō ni utsukushii Naichi no ojōsan*) [HINATSU and IJIMA 1941: 137], and that she is a

respectable lady is signified by her playing the violin and being a student in music school. Moreover, she and her fellow classmates, including Paek-hŭi, are called "maidens" (*otome*), marking their sexual purity.

Eisuke and Mitsue part company yet another time, and Eisuke continues on his soldierly journey to equality. He graduates from training school and finally enters the Imperial Army. In the first scene to show him as a true soldier, Eisuke and his fellow Korean volunteers are seen wearing the brand-new uniforms of second-class privates. No longer are all the soldiers around Eisuke and his friends Koreans. Instead Koreans and Mainlanders are intermingled. Eisuke has come a long way from the scene at the train station, when he had been dressed in Korean clothes and infantilized himself by imploring the Mainlander soldiers for protection and sending them off with good luck charms. But now at last Other and Self—or, as the directions for the scene stress, "Kimi to boku," "you and I"—blend together as one [HINATSU and IJIMA 1941: 138].

Now that Eisuke has overcome his ethnic difference, he can finally take Mitsue as his bride. The immediate conduit is another homosocial, transethnic bond that forms between Eisuke and Kubo Ryōhei, who is the husband of Mitsue's sister. When Eisuke and his Korean fellow volunteer Kinoshita return to their native town to visit their families before leaving for the war front, they are befriended by Ryōhei. The latter takes an immediate and "enormous liking" (*zokkon horekonda*) to Eisuke because he is a soldier and a "splendid young man" [HINATSU and IJIMA 1941: 141]. Although neither he nor his wife, Fusako, has any inkling that Eisuke and Mitsue already know each other, Ryōhei decides that he would like to arrange the marriage of this Korean youth to his sister-in-law. Of course, Ryōhei is successful; and by the story's end, we know that Eisuke and the beautiful Mitsue will become husband and wife if he returns safely from battle. Thus the masculinist bonds between volunteer soldier Eisuke, on the one hand, and Mitsue's brother Kenzō and brother-in-law Ryōhei, on the other, enable Eisuke not only to become Japanese but also to acquire a Mainlander wife. With regard to Eisuke's relationship to Kenzō, it might be argued that Eisuke had been nearly feminized in the early train station scene, since sending men off to war with good luck charms was behavior typical of women, children, and civilian men. But just as Ryōhei is plotting to arrange the marriage, Kenzō writes to Mitsue from the battlefield praising Koreans, amplifying on the theme of *Naisen ittai*, and also revealing how much he still holds dear the "noble figure of one [Korean] youth," who we know is Eisuke. Through this scene Hinatsu allows Kenzō to finally repay the colonial subject Eisuke for his loyalty and patriotism, by recognizing his manhood and in fact presenting him with his own sister. The unpaid debt signified by Eisuke's earlier rejection of the monetary transaction is repaid in the currency of a "maiden."

A highly unexpected twist in the story further shows how the discourse on *Naisen ittai* operates through the promise of the interchangeability of Mainlanders and Koreans along, but not across, gendered boundaries. Mitsue and her Korean

classmate Paek-hŭi are extremely close friends; throughout the film they are almost always together. Paek-hŭi accompanies Mitsue to her sister Fusako's home in Puyŏ, where she is treated as a houseguest. One evening the two of them bathe together; when they have finished, Mitsue decides that she is going to clothe Paek-hŭi in her own Japanese kimono. Mitsue remarks that Paek-hŭi looks nice in the kimono, that it "suits her very well" (*totemo niau*), and suddenly she asks if Paek-hŭi would like to be her brother Kenzō's bride. She also says that more Koreans ought to wear Japanese clothes (*wafuku*). Paek-hŭi protests that it is difficult to know how to put on Japanese clothes properly, but Mitsue remarks that she herself wears Korean clothes and does not give the matter a second thought. With that she proceeds to put on Paek-hŭi's Korean clothes, and Paek-hŭi this time assists Mitsue in dressing. After having ethnically cross-dressed each other, the two show themselves off to Eisuke and Ryōhei. It has already been decided that Eisuke and Mitsue will eventually marry, and when Mitsue sits next to Eisuke wearing Paek-hŭi's Korean outfit, Ryōhei comments that she looks like his bride. Thus paralleling Eisuke's transformation into a Japanese man, Mitsue's and Paek-hŭi's cross-dressing represents the transcending of ethnic difference among women. At the same time, it is again clear that whether they are Mainlander or Korean, women achieve inclusion in the nation through their relations with men. Finally, through the intimation that the Korean "maiden" Paek-hŭi and the Mainlander soldier Kenzō may marry, a complete and equal exchange of women has been accomplished [HINATSU and IJIMA 1941: 144-145].

## 5. CONCLUSION

In the above I have argued that Japanese nationalist and colonial discourse, as it was articulated in the idea of *Naisen ittai*, had a strongly gendered character. I suggest that scholarship on Japanese nationalism and colonialism should be attentive to the ways in which issues of not only class and ethnicity (or race) but also gender and sexuality were constitutive of national and colonial discourses. Particularly in the period of total war, when military and civilian manpower needs served as an engine for producing and reproducing a discourse on the "unity of Japan and Korea," this dominant discourse operated through a logic that promised the equality of Korean and Mainlander men, as well as Korean and Mainlander women, but not the equality of men and women. In this logic, the Japanese nation disavowed ethnic differences between Koreans and Mainlanders while reinforcing or renaturalizing gender differences. In fact, the transcendence of ethnic difference depended on the renaturalization of gender difference.

The interdependent relationship between discourses on gender, on the one hand, and nationalism and colonialism, on the other, is further suggested by an interesting text titled "Japanese Women" ("Nihon no josei") that Chō wrote in April 1937. This short article was published several months before the China



Incident, and therefore prior to the national crisis brought on by the escalation of all-out war on the continent. Most significantly for the purposes of my argument here, this article's publication preceded Chō's transformation from critic to proponent of the Japanese colonial regime. Instead of praising Japanese women as models to be emulated by colonized women, as he would do in his later writings, he here criticized them for their soft-spoken and reserved demeanor, their dependence on men, their general "weakness" (*yowayowashisa*) and inability to express their own selves, their "fragility" (*moroi*), and their "passivity" (*judōteki, shōkyokusei*). In short, he complained that "Japanese women are too womanly" (*amari ni joseiteki de arisugiru*) [CHŌ 1937: 86]. To be sure, there are continuities between this earlier piece and the later writings that I have already analyzed at length. For example, as in his later stories Chō did not in the 1937 text deny the naturalness of gender difference or the superiority of men. Furthermore, he valorized women of spiritual fortitude and he unreflexively adopted a transcendent male position from which to pronounce on the ideal woman.

But what is strikingly different is that here Chō suggested that Japanese women had something to learn from both Korean and Chinese women. Korean and Chinese women, he noted, spoke with vigor and authority, as independent women who could talk face-to-face with men. Japanese women, in contrast, spoke in a way that merely flattered men and sought dependence. Furthermore, in this earlier text Chō urged Japanese feminists to be more politically active; he declared that massive and welcome changes would result from women's gaining suffrage. While there were significant limits to Chō's feminism that perhaps foreshadow his later turn—for example, he said that women who were active and spoke forthrightly made life easier for busy men—he at least recognized the possibility of including women in the national political community independent of their social relations with men. Moreover, in suggesting that Korean and Chinese women might be models for Japanese women, he confounded the colonial relationship and held open the possibility of an anticolonial heterosocial bond between non-Japanese men and women. However limited and problematic his representations of non-Japanese women might have been, we can glimpse in Chō's early praise of Korean and Chinese women a kind of resistance to the Japanese colonial and nationalist idea, expressed in his later works, that Korean men ought to become Japanese men and Korean women, Japanese women. Chō's reversal from critic to enthusiast of Japanese nationalism, then, was paralleled by his conversion from critic to adulator of the "Japanese woman," as well as by a narrowing of his vision of the possibilities for women as independent political subjects. Put even more strongly, for Chō the enlargement of opportunities for Korean men within Japanese nationalism seems to have been inextricably linked to his steadily contracting view of the prospects for women.

The recirculation of this logic in the writings of Korean men in itself demonstrates how compelling such a masculinist discourse could be for some male colonial subjects, but we might also consider another extremely suggestive text

which indicates that this appeal extended considerably beyond the world of the cultural practitioners considered here and that it was far more persuasive for Korean men than Korean women. This is a survey of the social backgrounds of the 1,709 Korean volunteers who entered the military training school in Keijō (Seoul) in the second half of 1942. From this survey it is possible to determine that while more than half the volunteers (959) were peasants, the overwhelming majority of them were not from the most impoverished classes: 1,529 of the volunteers had at least a sixth-grade education, an accomplishment that would have been impossible for the very poor. But the information most relevant for our present purposes is to be found in a tabulation of who, among the volunteers' friends and relatives whose views could be ascertained, opposed or supported their enlistment in the Japanese military. In almost every kinship category, women overwhelmingly opposed their relative's enlistment, while men overwhelmingly supported them. Thus while 585 fathers supported their sons and only 52 opposed them, the figures for mothers are 261 and 354, respectively. Wives were in opposition 78 to 37, while only 4 brothers dissented compared to 533 who approved. The only exceptions were grandfathers, the majority of whom joined grandmothers in opposition, and sisters, the majority of whom approved of their brothers' actions, although not as overwhelmingly as did male siblings.<sup>11)</sup>

Yet it is important to understand the operations of the prewar and wartime Japanese empire not only in order to focus on the imbrications of gender, race, ethnicity, and class with nationalism and colonialism. Such understanding also furthers our interrogations of the continuing effects of colonial and national modernity on the postcolonial world. As feminist scholars have recently insisted, anticolonial nationalisms have tended to be masculinist formations and have resulted in the doubly layered oppression of colonized women. In a pathbreaking volume of essays on gender and Korean nationalism, Chungmoo Choi points out that even in their resistance, colonized Korean men mimicked the colonizers in oppressing Korean women, so that "in the sacred mission of anti-colonial nationalism, the object of which is often to restore national masculinity, women of the colonized nation are doubly oppressed" [CHOI 1998: 14]. In the same volume, Seungsook Moon shows how Korean nationalist views of history have followed an androcentric and masculinist logic. The official discourse on national history, she demonstrates, has been one of national defense; and in this logic, the "continuous necessity to defend the Korean nation masculinizes it by linking citizenship to soldiering" [MOON 1998: 43]. Other work has maintained that the masculinist and patriarchal shame of postcolonial Korean nationalists colluded with other factors to

---

11) I discovered this survey [CHŌSEN SŌTOKUFU DAICHI RIKUGUNHEI SHIGANSHA KUNRENSHO ca. 1943] among the papers of the eminent historian Kajimura Hideki. His library is presently housed at the Bunka Sentā Ariran in Kawaguchi (Saitama Prefecture, Japan), and I thank the staff there for their assistance. The figures for grandfathers are 39 opposed and 19 supporting; while for sisters the figures are 13 and 83, respectively.

silence discussion of the issue of “comfort women” over so many postwar decades.<sup>12)</sup>

My final point builds on such feminist critiques of postcolonial nationalism. As can be seen in the writings of Chō and Hinatsu, the masculinist logic of nationalism was typical not only of anticolonial Korean nationalists but also of many Korean proponents of Japanese nationalism. In either case, the masculinist bond was what promised an avenue for inclusion in the nation, whether Korean or Japanese. Such a perspective makes it easier to understand the relatively noncontradictory movement of someone like Park Chung Hee (Pak Chōng-hŭi, 1917–79), from graduate of the Japanese Military Academy and first lieutenant in the Manchukuo army [ECKERT 1996: 28–33], to becoming president of the Republic of Korea in 1963 and, according to Moon in the article cited above, “the main architect of official nationalism” in the postcolonial regime, who sought to establish a national history that represented the Korean nation as primarily a community of men [MOON 1998: 34]. My purpose is not to locate the ultimate origins of a masculinist logic in Japanese colonial and nationalist discourse, but to say that such a logic was integral to maintaining the Japanese nation and empire, that it was nurtured within the modern nationalist and colonial context, and that we are still feeling its effects in the world today.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHŌ Kakuchū (張赫宙)

1932 「餓鬼道」『改造』4: 1–39. (“Gakidō.” *Kaizō*.)

1937 「日本の女性」『文学案内』4: 86–88. (“Nihon no josei.” *Bungaku annai*.)

CHOI Chungmoo

1998 “Nationalism and Construction of Gender in Korea.” In Elaine Kim and Chungmoo Choi (eds), *Dangerous Women: Gender and Korean Nationalism*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 9–31.

CHOI Chungmoo (ed.)

1997 *The Comfort Women: Colonialism, War and Sex*. A special issue of *positions* 5(1).

CHŌSEN SŌTOKUFU DAICHI RIKUGUNHEI SHIGANSHA KUNRENSHO (朝鮮総督府第一陸軍兵志願者訓練所)

ca. 1943 「生徒諸調査表」梶村文庫, 文化センターアリラン近現代史研究所 (埼玉県川口市) 所蔵. (“Seito shochōsahyō,” Kajimura Bunko, Bunka Sentā Ariran, Kingendaishi Kenkyūjo, Kawaguchi, Saitama Prefecture, Japan.)

CHOU Wan-you

1996 “The *Kōminka* Movement in Taiwan and Korea: Comparisons and Interpretations.” In Peter Duus, Ramon H. Myers, and Mark R. Peattie (eds), *The Japanese Wartime Empire, 1931–1945*. Princeton: Princeton University

12) This point is touched on in several articles in Choi [1997] and E. Kim and Choi [1998], but is most explicitly discussed in H. Yang [1997, 1998] and H. Kim [1997].

Press, pp. 40–68.

DUUS, Peter

- 1995 *The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1859–1910*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

ECKERT, Carter J.

- 1991 *Offspring of Empire: The Koch'ang Kims and the Colonial Origins of Korean Capitalism, 1876–1945*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- 1996 “Total War, Industrialization, and Social Change in Late Colonial Korea. In Peter Duus, Ramon H. Myers, and Mark R. Peattie (eds), *The Japanese Wartime Empire, 1931–1945*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 3–39.

FUJITANI, T. (T・フジタニ)

- 1994a 『天皇のページェント—近代日本の歴史民族誌から』米山リサ訳, 日本放送出版協会. (*Tennō no pējento: Kindai Nihon no rekishi minzokushi kara*. Trans. L. Yoneyama. Nihon Hosō Shuppan Kyōkai.)
- 1994b 「近代日本における権力のテクノロジー—軍隊・『地方』・身体」梅森直之訳 『思想』845: 163–176. (“Kindai Nihon ni okeru kenryoku no tekunorojii: Guntai, ‘chihō’,shintai.” Trans. Umemori Naoyuki. *Shisō*.)
- 1996 *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

HIGUCHI Yūichi (樋口雄一)

- 1991 『皇軍兵士にされた朝鮮人—15年戦争下の総動員体制の研究』社会評論社. (*Kōgun heishi ni sareta Chōsenjin: jūgonen sensōka no sōdōin taisei no kenkyū*. Shakai Hyōronsha.)

HINATSU Eitaro and IJIMA Tadashi (日夏英太郎・飯島正)

- 1941 「シナリオ 君と僕」『映画評論』7: 132–145. (“Shinario kimi to boku.” *Eiga hyōron*.)

IM Jon-hye (任展慧)

- 1994 『日本における朝鮮人の文学の歴史』法政大学出版局. (*Nihon ni okeru Chōsenjin no bungaku no rekishi*. Hōsei Daigaku Shuppanyoku.)

JEFFORDS, Susan

- 1989 *The Remasculinization of America: Gender and the Vietnam War*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

KANG Ch'ang-gi (姜昌基)

- 1939 『内鮮一体論』国民評論社. (*Naisen ittai ron*. Kokumin Hyōronsha.)

KANG Tōk-sang (姜徳相)

- 1997 『朝鮮人学徒出陣—もう一つのわたつみのこえ』岩波書店. (*Chōsenjin gakuto shutsujin: mō hitotsu no wadatsumi no koe*. Iwanami Shoten.)

KAWAMURA Minato (川村湊)

- 1993 「金史良と張赫宙—植民地人の精神構造」大江志乃夫他編『岩波講座・近代日本と植民地・第6巻・抵抗と屈従』岩波書店, pp. 205–234. (“Kim Sa-ryang to Chō Kakuchū: Shokuminchijin no seishin kōzō.” In Ōe S. et al. eds, *Iwanami kōza, kindai Nihon to shokuminchi, vol. 6, teikō to kutsujū*. Iwanami Shoten.)

KIM Elaine H. and Chungmoo CHOI (eds)

- 1998 *Dangerous Women: Gender and Korean Nationalism*. New York and London: Routledge.

KIM Hyun Sook

- 1997 “History and Memory: The ‘Comfort Women’ Controversy.” *positions* 5(1): 73–106.

KIM Il-myŏn (金一勉)

1984 『天皇と朝鮮人と総督府』田畑書店. (*Tennō to Chōsenjin to sōtokufu*. Tabata Shoten.)

KIM Yōng-dal (金英達)

1997 『創氏改名の研究』未来社. (*Sōshi kaimei no kenkyū*. Miraisha.)

MIYATA Setsuko (宮田節子)

1985 『朝鮮民衆と「皇民化」政策』未来社. (*Chōsen minshū to "kōminka" seisaku*. Miraisha.)

MIYATA Setsuko, KIM Yōng-dal, and YANG T'ae-ho (宮田節子・金英達・梁泰昊)

1992 『創氏改名』明石書店. (*Sōshi kaimei*. Akashi Shoten.)

MOON, Seungsook

1998 "Begetting the Nation: The Androcentric Discourse of National History and Tradition in South Korea." In Elaine H. Kim and Chungmoo Choi (eds), *Dangerous Women: Gender and Korean Nationalism*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 33-66.

NOGUCHI Minoru (野口稔)

1944 『岩本志願兵』興亜文化出版株式会社. (*Iwamoto shiganhei*. Kōa Bunka Shuppan Kabushikigaisha.)

OGUMA Eiji (小熊英二)

1994 『単一民族神話の起源—〈日本人〉の自画像の系譜』新曜社. (*Tan'itsu minzoku shinwa no kigen: "Nihonjin" no jigazō no keifu*. Shin'yōsha.)

ŌMURA Masuo and HOTEI Toshihiro (eds) (大村益夫・布袋敏博編)

1997 『朝鮮文学関係日本語文献目録』緑陰書房. (*Chōsen bungaku kankei Nihongo bunken mokuroku*. Ryokuin Shobō.)

RENAN, Ernest

1990 "What is a Nation?" Trans. and annotated by Martin Thom. In Homi Bhabha (ed.), *Nation and Narration*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 8-22.

SUZUKI Yūko (鈴木裕子)

1992 『従軍慰安婦—内鮮結婚—性の侵略・戦後責任を考える』未来社. (*Jūgun ian-fu, naisen kekkon: Sei no shinryaku, sengo sekinin o kangaeru*. Miraisha.)

TOMIYAMA Ichirō (冨山一郎)

1995 『戦場の記憶』日本経済評論社. (*Senjō no kioku*. Nihon Keizai Hyōronsha.)

UEDA Tatsuo (上田龍男)

1942 『朝鮮の問題と其の解決』正学研究所. (*Chōsen no mondai to sono kaiketsu*. Shōgaku Kenkyūjo.)

UTSUMI Aiko (内海愛子)

1991 『朝鮮人〈皇軍〉兵士たちの戦争』岩波書店. (*Chōsenjin "kōgun" heishi tachi no sensō*. Iwanami Shoten.)

UTSUMI Aiko and MURAI Yoshinori (内海愛子・村井吉敬)

1987 『シネアスト許泳の「昭和」植民地下で映画づくりに奔走した一朝鮮人の軌跡』凱風社. (*Shineasuto Kyo Ei no "Shōwa": Shokuminchika de eiga zukuri ni honsō shita ichi Chōsenjin*. Gaifūsha.)

YANG Hyunah

1997 "Revisiting the Issue of Korean 'Military Comfort Women': The Question of Truth and Positionality." *positions* 5(1): 51-71.

1998 "Re-membering the Korean Military Comfort Women: Nationalism, Sexuality,

and Silencing.” In Elaine H. Kim and Chungmoo Choi (eds), *Dangerous Women: Gender and Korean Nationalism*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 123–139.

