

No Place to Call Home: Negotiating the “Third Space” for Returned Japanese Americans in Tamura Toshiko’s “Bubetsu” (Scorn)

Anne SOKOLSKY

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, U.S.A.

Many literary critics consider Tamura Toshiko (1884–1945) to be the archetype of the Japanese New Woman writer, a Western-influenced literary and cultural phenomenon at the turn of the twentieth century. Yet this “New Woman” label reflects only half of Tamura’s writing career. The other half, represented by works that drew on her experiences in North America, where she lived from 1918 to 1936, has been given scant attention in either Japanese or Western scholarship. Back in Japan from 1936 to 1938, before going to China for the remainder of her life, Tamura published nine short stories and more than fifty essays in the leading journals of the day. The stories are about the racism Japanese immigrants had to endure in North America in an era of heightened anti-Asian sentiment, and about her own reactions to the militarism she encountered upon her return to Japan. This article analyzes one of these stories. “Bubetsu” (Scorn) is about the plight of a young man and his girlfriend, Japanese Americans growing up in Los Angeles. Disheartened by the racism they face in the United States in the early 1930s, they go to Japan to study its culture and to learn about their ethnic identity. In the United States, they are scorned for being non-white; in Japan, they are scorned for being *too* “white.” They have nowhere to safely call “home.” Using the theoretical framework of Homi Bhabha’s “third space,” I examine how Tamura, by juxtaposing words such as *bunka* (culture) and *bunmei* (civilization) with words such as *anadoru* (hate) and *bubetsu* (scorn), shows how uncivilized self-proclaimed civilized people can be. By reversing and subverting the binaries of “Us” versus “Them”, both on racial and gender lines, Tamura reveals the false premises and paradoxes upon which ideas of cultural supremacy, pure race, and nationalism are based and how they are used as rhetorical weapons of destruction to justify one group’s oppression of another.

Keywords: TAMURA TOSHIKO, JAPANESE MODERN LITERATURE, GENDER STUDIES, JAPANESE AMERICAN LITERATURE, POST COLONIALISM, ISSEI, NISEI, THIRD SPACE

Unlike many Japanese women writers, Tamura Toshiko 田村俊子 (1884-1945) has been included in what is generally regarded as the canon in histories of Japanese literature.¹ Yet the way in which she is canonized is limited. Japanese literary critics typically regard her as one of the foremost New Woman voices during the late Meiji and early Taishō eras, but they tend to dismiss her work of the late Taishō and early Shōwa years.

Although Higuchi Ichiyō 樋口一葉 is most often seen as the representative woman writer of the Meiji period, to be precise, the idea of making a career in literature and being a success in the *bundan* 文壇 (literati circles) should be ascribed to Tamura Toshiko. Critic Kurosawa Ariko 黒澤亜里子 gives Tamura credit for being a pioneer, remarking that her fiction was really the starting point of Japanese woman's writing. Not only in terms of ambition to carve out a career, but also of style, modes of expression, and motifs, Tamura's work was the point of departure for modern women's literature.²

The stories of Tamura's that scholars usually discuss are the ones she produced from 1911 to 1918. These commonly are read as articulations of the struggle of women to attain sexual and economic independence in the patriarchal system of late Meiji and Taishō Japan. For example, Ogata Akiko 尾形明子 writes:

In works such as "Seigon," "Onna sakusha," "Miira no kuchibeni," "Hōraku no kei," and "Eiga," based on her own conflict with her husband Tamura Shōgyo 田村松魚 [1874-?], Tamura depicted protagonists who, though they had been awakened as New Women, were weakened by the world of sensuality and emotion.³

Most often, these stories are regarded as confessionals based on the author's contentious marital relationship and her dramatic life, which included episodes of extravagance, gambling, adultery, and even same-sex love.⁴ Watanabe Sumiko 渡辺澄子 notes that Tamura's notorious lifestyle has unfortunately thwarted research on her *oeuvre*. She writes,

Although she is considered the successor to Higuchi Ichiyō and the representative of Taishō women's writing, there is hardly any serious discussion of her. She has been lionized as an unconventional woman writer. The end of Meiji to around the fifth year of Taishō was the golden age of her writing. She dominated the day. Yet, research on her has been thwarted by her dramatic lifestyle.⁵

The main problem is that most critics view Tamura as a mixture of Edokko 江戸子 (child of Edo) and *atarashii onna* 新しい女 (New Woman). The latter was patterned after a Western literary and social feminist phenomenon, and had entered Japanese consciousness through the Shingeki 新劇 (New Theatre) movement, beginning with the production of Henrik Ibsen's play "A Doll's House" in 1911. Hasegawa Kei, one of the editors of the three-volume anthology of Tamura's works, observes that she was raised in the *shitamachi* 下町 (downtown) area of Tokyo, and describes her as a conflicted woman, on the one hand an "Edokko" with an Edo sensibility for the erotic and a tendency toward histrionic displays of emotion, and on the other, a modern woman living at a time of feminist awakening.⁶ The

emotional outbursts and propensity for extravagance seen both in her personal life and in the lives of the characters she created seem to be attributed to her “Eddoko” nature. Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう (1886-1971), Tamura’s contemporary but not social equal, was quite critical of Tamura for her Eddoko nature and judged her as old-fashioned, not at all a New Woman. Raichō wrote, “Tamura is not a woman with a special innate individuality. Nor is she a New Woman who tries to lead a true life as a human being. She was born in the decadent world of Tokyo’s *shitamachi* whose culture of the past is based on materialism and conformity. Is she not just a clever old Japanese woman?”⁷

As Hasegawa and Raichō’s remarks suggest, literary critics, and even Tamura’s peers, have tended to view Tamura as an emotional writer with a tendency for excess who could only write about sex, love, and the violence that stemmed from antagonistic relationships with men. This is, however, a very limited view of her writing career. She wrote many stories that drew on an imagination that surpassed her personal experiences of strained romantic relationships and proclivity for extravagance. She also wrote in styles that broke the mold of the confessional novel, which was the dominant genre in Japan when she first made her name in the early 1900s. Yet the other themes and styles in Tamura’s work have generally been ignored or placed in the margins of literary scholarship. The reasoning is that the later works in which she treats other themes and demonstrates mastery of other styles are not of the same literary quality as her literature of the late Meiji and Taishō eras. The objective of this essay is to argue the contrary.

For eighteen years, from 1918 to 1936, Tamura lived in North America. There she wrote under several different pen names and treated diverse subjects that showed she was concerned with more than just the plight of Japanese women trying to survive the modernization process. While living in Vancouver with her lover Suzuki Etsu 鈴木悦 (1886-1933), an activist in the socialist movement that was trying to unite Japanese and Canadian laborers, Tamura became involved in his causes.⁸ Under the name of Tori no ko 鳥の子, she wrote numerous articles and poems for the *Tairiku nippō* 大陸日報 (The Continental Daily News) and Suzuki Etsu’s labor movement paper *Nikkan minshū* 日刊民衆 (The People’s Daily News). In 1933, after Suzuki’s return to Japan and subsequent death, Tamura moved to Los Angeles.⁹ In nearly three years there, she wrote several essays under the pen names of Suzuki Toshiko 鈴木俊子 and Yukari 優香里, and using the latter name she did some regular newspaper work, contributing a column titled “People Whom I Meet” 人に逢う (Hito ni au) to the *Rafū shinpō* 羅府新報 (Los Angeles Japanese Daily News).

In March 1936, after eighteen years of observing the struggles of Japanese immigrants in Canada and the United States—during the height of anti-Asian sentiment in those countries—Tamura returned to Japan. The social milieu she returned to was quite different from that of the Taishō democracy which she had left. Rather, it was the dark days of Shōwa militarism and nationalism. In Japan until 1938, when she departed for China, Tamura turned out nine short stories and numerous essays. These were published in major Japanese journals. The stories Tamura produced during this brief stay are about either the experiences of Japanese

immigrants in North America or the struggles of Japanese socialists in Japan. The first few stories Tamura published were specifically about Canada and the United States. Maruoka Hideko 丸岡秀子, a friend of Tamura's, believes this is because she was unfamiliar with Japan after such a long absence. Maruoka writes,

During a time when Japanese fiction was influenced by gathering information from the laboring class, along with the deepening darkness that influenced the Japanese writing environment with the unnatural death of Kobayashi Takiji resulting from police torture, Toshiko's work focused on problems of foreign laborers... Toshiko had just come back from Canada and barely half a year had passed when she wrote "Chiisaki ayumi." Because she was in a fog, it was still too early for her to take material from Japan. Therefore, Toshiko could not help but write a work that was based on material from Canada. However, perhaps another reason was the condition of the time.¹⁰

Gaining some recognition for the stories and essays she wrote about life in North America, Tamura found herself in demand as an authority on Canada and the United States at various round-table discussions sponsored by Japanese journals.¹¹ The question that immediately arises is this: if Tamura was so well received by the *bundan* upon her return to Japan, as evidenced by the fact that she was publishing within a month of her return,¹² then why the subsequent silence in scholarship on this part of Tamura's writing career?¹³ Is it because these stories do not fit into the general way in which Tamura has been categorized as a woman writer writing about women's problems? Or is it because, as some of her literary critics have claimed, her writing of this time, which was more political than literary, was not very good? To cite an example of the latter view, Watanabe Sumiko writes,

Toshiko's return to Japan after an eighteen-year absence is because of Etsu's sudden death. Under the name of Satō Toshiko, she tried to recover her position in the *bundan*. Due to a long period, however, in which she wrote nothing, she was not able to recover her old writing talent.¹⁴

Tamura did, in fact, write while in North America. Her output was not at all inconsiderable. She just wrote in a different format and about different issues than those for which she had originally become well known. This North American material then became the source for the types of writing she produced once she returned to Japan. We have to wonder, thus, if something else is going on to account for the silence in scholarship on Tamura's 1930s works. Is it perhaps that the stories Tamura produced during this time are about issues that are not of strong interest to Japanese nationals—mainly the plight of Japanese immigrants in other countries? Could she have been marginalized for challenging (as she also did) the idea that Japan is a homogenous and harmonious nation, especially during the time leading up to the Pacific War?¹⁵

While many of the stories Tamura produced during this time, especially the ones set in North America, read today like history texts on Japanese immigrant labor issues and the

problem of Nisei adjusting to a new culture that was antipathetic toward their parents' values, there is a reason for her lengthy narrative passages. Suzuki Masakazu, one of the few critics in Japan to write about this period of Tamura's, notes that she was trying to teach her Japanese readership about something they would most likely not have known much about, and that despite the pedantic nature of her narratives, they are still valuable to study. He writes,

The conversations are few and the narrator's explanations are at times excessive. Her tendency was to write in a journalistic style and to earnestly explain the prejudice toward "immigrants" because her readership included Japanese who looked down on immigrants. Although her explanations might seem excessive at times, the theme of these works should be seriously considered.¹⁶

As Suzuki Masakazu states, these stories that Tamura wrote during the turbulent 1930s are important in the history of Japanese literature because they are about the experiences of Japanese immigrants from the voice of a Japanese writer who stood between the boundaries of East and West, not as an immigrant herself, but as an observer. Always on the margins of the communities she wrote about, Tamura was able to observe with some ironic distance the inconsistencies of social constructions such as culture, pure race, and nation. Her deconstruction of these ideas in the works she wrote in the 1930s is what makes these stories worthy of rereading despite their—perhaps—flawed narrative styles.

Of the nine stories that Tamura wrote during this time, "Bubetsu" 侮蔑 (Scorn) best illustrates what Tamura observed from her position between the boundaries.¹⁷ She depicts in literature, especially in this story, the anxiety that results when immigrants must live an interstitial existence in what Homi Bhabha calls the "third space," a location in which immigrants must find their identity between the mores of the old world they left behind and those of the new world they must try to enter. In this essay, I will focus on this story, the last that Tamura wrote before she left for China, where she would remain until her death in 1945. Through the depiction of two Nisei, one male and one female, who are in search of understanding their identities, Tamura challenges the constructed nature of ideas such as "nation" and its concomitant notions of "culture" and "race." The motif by which she shows the constructed nature of these ideas is performance.

The story "Bubetsu," published in the December 1938 issue of *Bungei shunjū* 文芸春秋, deviates from her canonized Taishō period literature exactly because it is not about the sexualized plight of a Japanese woman. Instead, this twenty-page story is about a young Japanese American boy named Jimmy ジミー and his girlfriend Mari マリエ,¹⁸ who struggle to find their "home" in the interstice of their hybrid identities—in the space between Japan and Los Angeles in the 1920s, a time of heightened anti-Asian sentiment.¹⁹

While the story provides a sympathetic portrayal of the struggle of Nisei who have to negotiate lives in the United States even as they are raised according to their parents' "Japanese" value system, this is not the only purpose of the story. In a broader sense, Tamura uses the motif of Nisei to attack both the prejudice of Japanese toward Japanese Americans and that of white Americans toward Japanese, and also—more daringly—to attack any kind of

nationalism that justifies its sovereignty on assumptions of cultural supremacy that ostracize people based on arbitrary lines of differentiation. By creating two principal characters who are of different genders and have very different reactions about how to survive their Nisei identity, Tamura also is attacking assumptions made by any signifying agent about the unity and fixed nature of the object it is signifying.

The word “nation” is a loaded word. A typical dictionary definition of “nation” is as follows: “A people who share common customs, origins, history, and frequently language. A relatively large group of people organized under a single, usually independent government.”²⁰ I would contend that the first part of this definition is problematic. It does not apply to the two countries Tamura is treating in her work. In a country like the United States, as is clear with characters like Jimmy and Mari, Americans come from a variety of places and by no means share the same history or customs. Even a country such as Japan that might seem on the surface to be “homogenous” is actually far from it, if one considers Ainu, burakumin, Okinawans, resident Koreans, and other non-mainstream elements. As an alternative to the typical definition of “nation” that erases people’s stories of difference, Benedict Anderson provides another definition that underscores the constructed nature of the word. He writes, “In an anthropological spirit, then, I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.”²¹ The nation is imagined, Anderson claims, because all nations have a finite boundary. Its sovereignty is imagined because such an idea was born during the age of Enlightenment and Revolution in which nations dreamt of being free and sovereignty was the measure of their freedom. Finally, and this is most pertinent for the story of “Bubetsu,” Anderson holds that the idea of the nation as a community is imagined because “regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings.”²² As for race, the historian Bruce Batten defines it as “a concept that refers to the idea that human beings can be readily divided into distinct groups or populations on the basis of physical (or genetic) characteristics.” Yet he notes that because there have been numerous classifications of race at different points in history, this lack of agreement “suggests that attempts to classify humans into racial categories are inherently subjective.” If anything, Batten argues, citing Anthony Giddens, race is on a continuum.²³ As for culture, another loaded word, Batten cites Elvin Hatch who defines culture “as a way of life of a people.” The question that Batten immediately raises is, how does one define “people”? Can “people” be a monolithic and stable entity, or is it on some continuum of variation?²⁴ In “Bubetsu,” Tamura plays with the idea of nation, race, and culture as she has her two protagonists, Jimmy and Mari, search for their cultural and racial identity to no avail. Tamura shows the imagined nature of communities and their creations of “race” and “culture” as her protagonists move between the United States and Japan in a futile search for a place to call “home” only to be ostracized by everyone whom they meet because they are either too Japanese or too American.

One of the key ways in which Tamura dismantles the assumed truth of “nation” is

through her repeated use of “civilization” and “culture.” In the first two pages of the twenty-page story, *bunmei* 文明 (civilization) appears five times, and *bunka* 文化 (culture) appears once. Tamura parodies the words *bunmei* and *bunka* by having her characters who profess themselves to be “civilized” behave in uncivilized ways as they display *anadoru* 悔る (hatred) and *bubetsu* (scorn), which appear eight times in the story, toward those whom they view as “uncivilized.” By doing so, Tamura reveals the arbitrariness of civilization and culture that serve as unifying constructs for an imagined “nation.” She challenges the sanctity of such concepts by revealing the hypocrisy behind those who choose to draw lines of difference along racial and national boundaries between those deemed to be “civilized” or “uncivilized.”

In the opening paragraph, the ideas of shame and inferiority are juxtaposed with the idea of civilization. Those shamed are Japanese. The purveyors of the shame are those who deem themselves as “civilized,” namely white American society. Tamura shows the lack of civility of “civilized” people when their “civility” is bred on hate and ostracism. The omniscient narrator reports Jimmy’s inner thoughts in the opening paragraph as follows:

Jimmy, born in America around the 1920s during the peak of anti-Japanese sentiment, is a second generation Japanese American who has spent most of his youth in shame. Though Japanese were mistreated worse than black people by civilized people as an inferior race, they continued to clench their teeth and work hard. It is in the bosom of such parents that people like Jimmy were raised (p. 376).²⁵

The narrator explains the paradox of young Japanese Americans raised in the United States. While Japanese Americans, the narrator notes, have been raised on ideas of democracy in American schools, they do not have the power to fight against the injustice they experience beyond the walls of academic learning. “Even though these minds, which have been cultivated by America’s superior education, think they can eradicate the contradictions in their lives, in reality, these children don’t have the power to stop these contradictions from spreading in society” (p. 376).

Unlike the first generation, whose universe of reference is still the cultural ethos of the old country, the second generation of immigrants, educated on Western ideas of democracy, but not able to implement them in their own lives, are forced to live in a state of frustrated paralysis. Consequently, they grow up to hate.

The source of this scorn on the part of this second generation comes from two places, the narrator explains. Second-generation Japanese Americans feel contempt toward their parents’ ignorance and dated social values; the children have this contempt toward their elders because they incorporate the scorn they feel coming from white society toward Japanese culture. In the following passage, the idea of *anadoru* appears twice.

Though they were raised in an American education system, they were not treated equally with fellow American white students, and they were not able to work with Americans. The cause was their parents’ ignorance. They sowed seeds that more than anything threatened American culture. Though the first generation thought

they had laid a foundation for the second generation, in fact, they gave the second generation nothing. The first generation worked from morning to night and sent the money they saved back to their home country. They did not even make an economic foundation in America for the future of the second generation. Therefore, the second generation became hateful of their parents and resisted their parents' wishes for them because of the inequality their parents had bred for them. Yet these young people could not flee the enclosed society built by their parents whom they despised (p. 377).

The first generation had good intentions in terms of working to provide a future for their descendants. Yet because the first generation was ignorant of the social mores of the culture to which they migrated, they created a trap for their children. Educated by Western ideas, but made to live in a makeshift Japanese world, these Nisei were caught between two worlds, and had their feet securely grounded in neither.²⁶

In "Bubetsu," it is through performance, as I stated earlier, that Tamura reveals the arbitrariness of culture and civilization that serve to define one group against another. Stuart Hall proposes that cultural identity is not a fixed static noun. It is a verb. Cultural identity, he writes, "is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being.' It belongs to a future as much as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialized past, they are subject to the continuous 'play' of history, culture and power."²⁷ Japanese Americans and Japanese Canadians, the two sets of immigrants Tamura depicts in her fiction of the 1930s because they were fully accepted neither as American or Canadian, nor (by Japanese nationals) as Japanese, were left in a state of limbo in which they had to figure out which "culture" they would adhere to and how best to "behave" in that culture. Thus they were relegated to living in a no man's land, or Bhabha's "third space." The result of such an interstitial existence is an ambiguity that stems from a struggle for strategies to enunciate a new self-identity. As Bhabha states, "These 'inbetween' spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood—singular or communal—that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself."²⁸ For Jimmy and Mari, there are several instances in the story when the negotiation of their identities is revealed as a performance.

One of the venues in which the assumptions of cultural supremacy, race, and nation are performed and deconstructed in this story is the 1932 Los Angeles Olympic Games.²⁹ The arena of Olympic sports competition is rich in symbolic potentiality. In this space, the boundaries of nation and race get blurred as the outcome of a twisting of the power paradigm of gazer and performer, as Jimmy and his Nisei friends watch Japanese swimmers beat the (presumably more powerful) United States swim team. The position of Japanese immigrants as they watched the Japanese Olympic athletes beat the Americans, was not, as Eriko Yamamoto points out, a simple matter in which national allegiances are easily defined.

She writes,

The Los Angeles Japanese American community of 1932 “[was] swept by a fervent nationalism for ‘the Country of the Rising Sun.’ As part of the city that hosted the tenth Olympic games, the local Issei and Nisei residents eagerly participated in the Olympiad and contributed to making it a success. However, their cheers were not for the United States but for Japan. Calling themselves *kaigai zairyū dōhō* (overseas brethren), the members of the local Japanese community earnestly supported Japan and, in doing so, testified to the international as well as local significance of the Olympics for Japanese Americans.³⁰

She notes that the attitude of Issei and Nisei toward the Olympics reflected many of the issues of Japanese American prewar history. Issei, especially, were actually devout nationalists of Japan and believed that Japan’s expansion into other parts of Asia would bring stability to the point that many Issei immigrants sent money and goods to Japanese soldiers, especially in China.³¹ As for the Nisei, Yamamoto notes, the victory of the Japanese Olympians becomes a means by which they can feel pride in their ethnicity as a contradistinction to the fact American culture tells them they are unassimilable. She writes that the Japanese Olympic players’ victory in the 1932 Olympics was “an open and emphatic affirmation of ethnic pride that did not conflict with their Americanism. Especially for members of the emerging Nisei generation, who were questioning the label of ‘unassimilable’ Americans, the Olympics became a focus for taking pride in their roots.” She continues, “Japanese Americans of the 1930s were caught between U.S. Nationalism, Japan’s state-controlled militaristic nationalism, and their own position as a transnational ethnic minority.”³²

The blurring of national and cultural boundaries is underlined when Jimmy’s friends scream “Nippon!” and feel a sense of pride as if they, the Nisei, were united with the Japanese competitors as one unit.³³ In this scene, Jimmy’s gaze does not reflect the typical power paradigm in which the gazer (signifier), as possessor of power and privilege, has the right to look upon someone else. Instead, in this scene, Jimmy’s gaze is not one of conquest, but rather of awe. Impressed with the perseverance of the Japanese athletes and their victory over the culture that scorns him, Jimmy wants to know the source of Japanese cultural pride. “As for these youth born in Japan, Jimmy wondered in what ways their culture was superior. He wondered what kind of culture this was and what great things existed in Japan” (p. 379). The idea that Japan was a great nation with a spiritual sense of “Yamato damashii” 大和魂 (Japanese spirit) was being transmitted to Nisei in the United States at this time through articles printed in the Japanese American newspapers. For example, in an article written in English and titled “What it Means to Be Japanese,” a Tokyo correspondent for the *Rafu shinpō*, Shogo Muto, states, “No doubt there are many points at which Japan is behind the United States. But even then, there is something about Japan and the Japanese which no one can look down upon as inferior, and that is the indomitable spirit of the race which the Nisei inherits in his blood.” Yet Muto criticizes Nisei parents for trying to educate Nisei on this special trait of Japaneseness, when they are not in Japan. The only way Nisei will understand the subtlety of

Yamato damashii, he claims, is by returning to Japan. He writes,

A realization of the existence of this intangible spirit of Japan alone is sufficient for the nisei [sic] to know. Any attempts to pump into these Americans of the Yamato Damashii theory when that person hasn't the slightest idea what Japan really is [sic] sheer foolhardiness and well-meaning parents and elders should discourage such methods. When one can stand before the austere quiet of the Imperial palace grounds and feel his head bowing in reverence, not by a sense of duty or obligation, but through an inherent consciousness of the 2600 years of his people's fountainhead, then the Nisei will have learned what and why of Japan and the Japanese."³⁴

Muto's article implies two things. One that Nisei are still a part of Japan; the other is that to realize this, they must physically visit Japan, the site of cultural essence.

Jimmy watches the Olympic swimmers as the Japanese flag is raised at the Olympic ceremony. He is, along with other Nisei, overwhelmed with a sense of pride. "The Nisei were happy as if Japan were their home country. Their faces blushed with pride moved by the strong spirit of the Japanese. The Nisei felt in their own blood a new Japan" (p. 379). Suzuki Masakazu argues that these Japanese Olympic players become, ironically, symbols of democracy and a source of imagined escape for Nisei such as Jimmy. Suzuki writes, "Jimmy believed that Nisei in America had something in common with these youths because of a shared blood. These players were a symbol for Jimmy and his friends that it was possible through democracy to free themselves from the prejudice that they were an inferior race. And Jimmy believed that he could discover the essence of Japan that his parents were never able to find."³⁵ Now Japan is a country of cultural pride and supremacy in Jimmy's eyes, even though in the United States, he has been made to believe by white culture that his Japanese heritage is vile and something to be scorned. The first of the four chapters of "Bubetsu" ends on a note of hope as Jimmy prepares to go to Japan, a country he believes to be "heaven" (p. 380). Jimmy naively assumes that because he is racially Japanese, he can have a piece of this pride. "Though he was raised on American soil, he was filled with disappointment. But Nisei have Japanese blood and have been bathed in the culture of Japan. Thus it is in Japan, Jimmy believed, that he could seek a lifestyle that possessed hope" (p. 380).

For Jimmy and his friends who become part of his study group, their "Orientalism" is an act of liberation. Generally, when one speaks of "Orientalism," it is in the parameters of how the Western world during the age of imperialism chose to regard non-Western countries. Edward Said argues that the West studied the Orient using scientific language to make it an "ism" to justify the way in which Westerners needed to "re-present" the Orient to fit their own socio-economic needs. They were able to do this, Said argues, because of their own sense of superiority juxtaposed against the dark, uncivilized nations of the Orient. He writes,

The Oriental is irrational, depraved, childlike, 'different'; the European is rational, virtuous, mature, and 'normal.' Knowledge of the Orient, because generated out of strength, in a sense creates the Orient, the Oriental, and his world. . . . The Oriental is *contained* and *represented* by dominating frameworks.³⁶

Now in post-colonial studies, many colonized groups have used the oppressors' narrative of nation and cultural supremacy to argue for a new sense of nation. In terms of diasporic people, Hardt and Negri note, the idea of an imagined nation sometimes is necessary for the subaltern group. They argue that "nationalism" can actually have a progressive nature. In reference to attempts at liberation by colonized countries by European empires, they write, "the concept of nation also served as an ideological weapon to ward off the dominant discourse that figured the dominated population and culture as inferior; the claim to nationhood affirmed the dignity of the people and legitimated the demand for independence and equality."³⁷ Oftentimes the very form of oppression used against people is what they copy to form their own liberation. As scholars such as Xiaomei Chen have shown in studies of Chinese culture, the West becomes far from a source of oppression, but rather one of liberation. Hence a reverse of Orientalism, "Occidentalism" becomes a means by which the subaltern can find a space of enunciation.³⁸ Jimmy and Mari's form of "Orientalism" adds a new dimension. First, they are turning to a country that is viewed by most others during this time as inferior. They are returning to what they perceive to be their racial and cultural roots, only to find, soon enough, that they will not be welcomed. Jimmy naively assumes that because he is racially Japanese, he can have a piece of this pride. He sees a mirror image of himself in the Japanese Olympic players due to shared physical attributes. Yet, what he does not understand is that physical attributes are not enough to unite him with his Japanese brethren on the other side of the Pacific. This need to mimic what one believes to be a superior's behavior is a twist on the way Komori Yōichi 小森陽一 discusses Japan's process of civilization as a process of mirroring its oppressor's image that is never quite its own. Combining the stages of civilization that Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉 (1834–1901) delineates in which the West is *bunmei* (civilized), Japan is *hankai* (half-developed), and its Asian neighbors are *yaban* (savage) with Lacan's concepts of "Mirroring the Other," Komori describes Japan's civilization process as follows:

[T]he "half-civilized" country seeing in its mirror the civilized country, can never get beyond its own image of itself as "half-civilized." Yet at the same time, the "half-civilized" country to avoid becoming the slave of Western Europe's aggressiveness, and from not becoming labeled a "savage" or "undeveloped," fabricates a new "savage" [Asian] in another mirror of the other, and it is in this mirror that the self is reflected, and when comparing the self to these newly discovered "savages," the "half-developed" country, as viewed by European eyes, becomes a developed country in the new mirror of the Other.³⁹

It should be noted, however, that in the case of Japan's expansion into Manchuria on 18 September 1931 and the subsequent creation of Manchukuo, there were Japanese who believed that Japan's "leadership" in the region was a good beginning for a new order in Asia and that Manchukuo was a good example of how Japan and its Asian neighbors could "co-operate." For example, Hasegawa Shun 長谷川濬 writes in his discussion of what makes Manchurian literature, "The foundation of Manchukuo is the realization of the first step in

Asia's new history. . . . [T]he creation of Manchukuo literature (*Manshū kenkoku bungaku* 満州建国文学) is the amalgamation of people who are Japanese and Manchurian, [which he notes is made up of many different races including Chinese, Mongolians, White Russians, and even Koreans]. . . . Manchukuo literature is a dream of the future where the goal is to create a world literature along with ethnic pride that results from literary freedom."⁴⁰ Hence for Hasegawa, Manchukuo is not a site of oppression for those Japan has colonized, but rather a site of experimentation in how multiple races can supposedly live side by side and unite their voices into a new form of literary expression.

In "Bubetsu," Jimmy also seems to hold Japan in veneration as he believes Japan can lead him out of his ethnic quagmire of American intolerance. Tamura's depiction of Jimmy copying that which he sees in the mirror is somewhat different from the paradigm Komori describes. Jimmy is mimicking not what he believes to be his oppressor, but rather his savior. The narrator notes, "Jimmy wanted to enter the center of Japanese society from the corners where he stood. Through an energetic source, he could breathe new knowledge and new intelligence so he could become a Japanese person in Japan. He decided to do this by inviting specialists on Japan and also having direct contact with young Japanese in Japan so he could study Japan's mature (*seijuku* 成熟) culture of the past. By doing so, he would encourage Nisei, who were sad and had no one upon whom to rely" (p. 383). The motive for his mimicking is to find a sense of pride for himself. But as he shall learn once he confronts the reality of Japanese society, the cultural pride he imagines and the cultural pride that exists are two different entities. Thus the ideal vision of Japan that Hasegawa describes in his essay and that Tamura creates in Jimmy's mind in the reality of Tamura's story does not in fact materialize.

The second instance in which the idea of nation and its concomitant culture are revealed to be a performance rather than an unmitigated truth is through a conversation Jimmy has with his aunt after he arrives in Japan. While in Japan studying its culture, Jimmy soon sadly realizes that the Japanese, far from embracing him because they share the same ethnic origins, actually scorn him. Even his aunt despises him because of his Western dress and inability to speak Japanese. The narrator notes, "Jimmy looked up at the thousands of cloud fragments in the fall sky. He compared *Nisei* who came to Japan with the cloud fragments. Jimmy slowly recoiled in a corner living in isolation with no connection to life anywhere, as he felt the scornful eyes of Japanese glare at him" (p. 380). The narrator continues, "Jimmy heard numerous times the words 'excuse him, he is a *Nisei*,' murmured from the mouths of Japanese who knew him, but treated him as different from them. The implied meaning behind the words 'excuse him, he is a *Nisei*' that trailed all sentences about him were full of criticism and scorn" (p. 381). Thus Jimmy sadly realizes that far from welcoming him as one of their own with a shared blood, Japanese are disappointed with him because he cannot correctly perform their culture. Even family ties mean nothing as Jimmy's aunt, a Japanese national, tells him he can never become Japanese unless he learns Japan's customs. She states, "Until you can speak elegant Japanese, you will always be treated like an idiot. . . . *Nisei* are ill-mannered. They are always in a daydream. They don't know how to behave themselves. Even in meeting people, they cannot make normal greetings. Even though in America there are many Japanese, what

kind of education is there, I wonder?" (p. 382). A good society to Jimmy's aunt is one of rules and proper behavior. She tells Jimmy, "If you do not know the basic rules of decorum, you cannot enter Japan's high society. People who do not know etiquette are of the lower races. If you know etiquette, even if you are of a lower race, you will be respected" (pp. 382-83). Civilization by the aunt's standards is defined against a backdrop of hatred. What makes people good has nothing to do with humane values, but whether they know the proper greetings. Tamura seems to underscore the constructed nature of "civilization," not to mention the hypocrisy of it as blood relatives treat their own with hate, by emphasizing its performative mode rather than any truth to its absoluteness.

In contrast, for Jimmy, a good society is about humanity, not about divisiveness. "A 'good society,'⁴¹ Jimmy thought, should be a lifestyle in which one lives with human beings in a loving way by doing away with the rules of a 'good society' his aunt espoused. Jimmy thought he must look for such a society. Nisei like himself have only one option if they want to blend into Japanese society. They must learn the culture so they can socialize with Japanese people" (p. 383).

The person who seems to see the reality of Japan rather than an imagined version of Japan, as Jimmy does, is his friend Mari. Tamura seems to introduce the character of Mari in "Bubetsu" to play with the boundaries that define any group, in this case the group of Japanese Americans. As Leo Ching points out in "Yellow Skins, White Masks: Race, Class, and Identification in Japanese Colonial Discourse," often race is the primary trope, if not the only trope considered when discussing colonial or imperial discourses. Referring to Japan's "racialism" during the Meiji era, he writes, "Japan's racialism is incumbent and crucial in concealing, and even suppressing, a very real and material exigency of early Meiji nation formation: that is, class struggle. This however, is not to insist on the primacy of class as an analytical category over other relevant social constructs such as gender, ethnicity or religion, but only to draw attention to two important, but often neglected, observations in the studies of imperialism and nationalism in which the concept of race has provided the ultimate trope of difference."⁴² Thus through the character of Mari, Tamura adds the issue of gender to the equation of cultural performance.

Jimmy's foil in terms of approach and reaction, Mari is unable to endure the daily criticism she receives from Japanese. Similar to Jimmy, she goes to Japan to study. While Jimmy approaches his understanding of Japanese culture intellectually, through study groups and meetings with Japanese youth, Mari chooses to study Japanese elegance (*yūbi* 優美) by learning how to play one of its traditional instruments, the koto 琴. The narrator explains Mari's motivation to learn how to play this instrument as follows:

[*Yūbi* is also an element of Japanese culture. Mari was attracted to this *yūbi*. Even in her Japanese hobbies, she tried to choose things that were refined. Mari enjoyed hobbies that possessed Japan's past traditions. She turned a blind eye to people who scorned her. And she was determined only to cultivate an appreciation for the beauty of Japan through her own hobbies and education (p. 385).

Suzuki Masakazu interprets Mari's study of the koto as an attempt to surpass boundaries of race and nation in search of true beauty. He writes, "Because Mari is in Japan for a short while to study Japanese music, she is able to gaze upon Japan's internal beauty. She embodies an attitude in which one can transcend national and racial boundaries, and share common interests with others."⁴³ Over time, however, the elegance of Japanese beauty is clouded by Japanese racism toward her as an outsider. Mari, saddened by the reality that beauty cannot conquer hate, decides to return to America. Toward the end of the story, she tells Jimmy that she has decided to return to the United States because she believes there is more freedom there for her as a woman. Nisei women in particular, the narrator notes, are in a double bind. They are expected to be *otonashii* 温和しい (docile) like young Japanese women, and yet they are not viewed as Japanese (p. 385). As a female Nisei, according to Suzuki Masakazu, Mari suffers not just racial oppression, but also gender oppression because of Japan's feudal family system. He writes, "As a Nisei and also as a woman, she is oppressed at two levels. Mari's story of struggle is beyond what Jimmy has to endure. She has to deal with the problem of Japanese women bound in the family system."⁴⁴ Mari compares Japanese society to a castle in which Nisei are not able to cross the moat and enter the gates that lead to Japan's elegant beauty. She states, "For those who don't own a castle, they cannot live a wonderful life in Japanese society. People like us, the children of immigrants, can't build a castle because Japan's castle is built on tradition" (p. 385). The plight of Jimmy and Mari who are far from welcomed in Japan reflects Tamura's challenge to the idea of Japan as a unified race.

By revealing how disunified the community of Japan is by the way Japanese nationals treat Japanese immigrants, Tamura seems to attack in "Bubetsu" the very premise by which the Japanese government was trying to encourage its minions to fight the Japanese cause. In this story, by showing her Japanese readership how Japanese immigrants were scorned by white North American society as no better than "the black race" (*kokujinshu* 黒人種) as well as by showing how divided the "Japanese" community could be, Tamura was poking gaping holes in the concept of *yamato damashii* as a superior culture and the conceit that the Japanese were a single monolithic harmonious race (as the militarist propaganda would have had citizens believe in the 1930s). As John Dower notes, the Japanese government, during the war years, made a great effort to appear to its people and the rest of the world as a unified nation-state in which everyone possessed the Yamato spirit. He writes,

During World War II, there flourished within Japan, and among Japan's Allied enemies as well, a mystique about the "Yamato spirit." Unlike the purportedly discursive West, it was said, the Japanese possessed intuitive ways of understanding one another: they did not depend much on words. They were, in addition, unusually harmonious as a race, culture, and society. And they fought to the bitter end.⁴⁵

One example of the constructed sense of union, John Dower notes, is the government's inculcation in the minds of its people of the idea of *ichioku* 一億, meaning "one hundred million." The overriding impression of harmony and homogeneity was captured in a sin-

gle resonant phrase: *ichioku*, “the hundred million.” This was a literal exaggeration...but it evoked a powerful sense of common purpose grounded in racial and cultural solidarity. “One hundred million hearts beating as one.” “The hundred million as a flaming jewel.” “The hundred million as one family.”⁴⁶ In July 1937, a little more than a year after Tamura’s return to Japan, Konoe Fumimaro 近衛文麿 became prime minister. Within months, he enacted policies that increased the government’s control of civil production. In 1937, the Ministry of Education published a book titled *Kokutai no hongī* 国体の本義 (Principles of the National Polity). The historian W. G. Beasley writes,

Over two million copies were sold and special commentaries on it were issued to teachers, with the result that its doctrines became the basis of an intensive propaganda directed at the young. For the most part these doctrines were conservative, in the sense that they rejected the revolutionary, anti-capitalist elements in the thinking of the radical right. But they were anti-liberal in the extreme. Individualism was anathema. Service to the State was service in its highest form. Moreover, patriotism taught that what was bad was foreign.⁴⁷

The community is not just divided by gender divisions but also class. Lon Kurashige notes that the elites of Tokyo viewed the Japanese who emigrated to the United States and Canada as an embarrassment to Japan’s civilization project. He instances Katayama Sen, who studied in the United States during the late 1800s and advocated going abroad, as chastising Issei, the bulk of whom were farmers, for their country bumpkin style of clothing and behavior. He quotes Katayama citing a student who was sent overseas to study, “The Japanese here are all mediocre types, unable to breathe the air of civilization even though they are in America.”⁴⁸

In the final performance of culture, Tamura continues challenging it through the gendered and racial paradigm of a white audience watching a Japanese American dance performance in Los Angeles. Unlike the performance of nationalism described in the first chapter of “Bubetsu,” in which Nisei are awestruck with the bravado of Japanese Olympic swimmers, this time the performance consists of Nisei women who are dancing on a stage for an audience of elite white people, including the mayor of Los Angeles. The purpose of the festival is to celebrate Nisei culture and by doing so not just teach white people something about it, but unite the Issei to the Nisei generation as well as make sure Nisei do not forget their own culture. Kurashige writes that Nisei week, which began in 1934, originated out of wishes to stave off the increasing domestic uncertainty resulting from the 1929 Depression, to get Americanized Nisei to buy from little Tokyo, and to diminish international uncertainty as Japan enlarged its militarist objectives, much to the chagrin of the Western world. It was also, however, about something more. He writes, “Although economically inclined, this festival was not just a device to spur consumption in Little Tokyo, nor was it merely an excuse to improve public relations for a racially marketed minority or even to groom and discipline the ethnic community. Nisei week, to be sure, was all of these things, but at heart it began as an open text for members of the second generation to understand themselves and their role as

the progeny of a historic admixture of Japanese and American civilizations.”⁴⁹

The young Nisei in Jimmy’s group, when they read about this event, are thrilled. “Thanks to Nisei⁵⁰, the dawn has come,’ some of his friends yelled” (p. 390). This seems to be a bitterly ironic moment in the story because what Jimmy has been striving to attain with his study group in Japan gets realized in his home country by women. In fact, Jimmy is not happy with the news because he believes that Nisei are entering American society on American cultural terms. “While Jimmy thought *Nisei* for a brief moment had made a step in entering American society, he realized the gaudy demonstration was a horrible form of Americanism” (p. 391). The success of the Nisei dancers is also a failure because for Nisei to be “accepted” by those who have power, they must perform assumed stereotypes of Japaneseness for the entertainment of the non-Japanese people watching them. In other words, the signified continues to perpetuate the act of signification by performing a stereotype rather than a reality.

The story ends with boundaries of race, culture, and nation dissolving into a space of amorphousness and ambiguity as national allegiances become blurred in metaphors of natural beauty. In a letter Mari sends to Jimmy from the United States after her return, she declares her lack of regret about her decision to leave Japan. She states how nature, in particular Japanese autumn, has taught her about the beauty of life. People, on the other hand, have taught her only hate. She writes, “Japanese cruelly rejected people like us, who truly loved Japan, and they scorned our lifestyles. They taught us nothing. Japan’s fall, however, has taught us the depth of human life. I have no regrets about returning to America. This is definitely my home. Is it fall in Japan now? Japan’s fall taught us a variety of things. It was Japan’s fall that accompanied our deep thoughts. Tokyo’s fall. Kyoto’s fall. The fall of our growth. The fall of deep truth. No matter what fall’s appearance may truly be, in my memory, Japan’s fall is like a sacred person to me” (p. 393). For Mari, the only solution to the problem of her hybrid identity is to focus on and find solace in her own sense of beauty that is devoid of gender, racial, and national boundaries.

The ending is very poetic as the narrator describes the sadness Jimmy feels thinking about Mari in the United States. Nature unites them spiritually despite their geographic separation. “The heart of Mariko⁵¹ who loved Japan reverberated in the fall Jimmy was experiencing at the moment. As if Jimmy could feel her emotions, he looked at the colors of the fall day that were reflected in the window. For Mari who truly loved Japan, including its fall, these autumnal colors that Jimmy saw made him feel empty and sad. He wondered if America was his country too. This sadness filled his heart like a drop of water that rippled into one small wave after another” (p. 393). While Jimmy is an idealist who can not seem to admit his ideals might be flawed, Mari is a pragmatist who does the best she can to find a space in which to live some semblance of her hybrid identity.

In “Bubetsu,” Tamura’s final story before she left Japan for China, she depicts a sadness that is linked with the subtlety of nature’s rhythms that continue despite human foibles. Her adulation of nature here hints at an idea of a broader form of humanism that can surpass the pettiness of racial, class, and gender prejudice. This broadened view of life, Suzuki Masakazu maintains, is a result of Tamura’s unique experience as a returned Japanese who

stood between boundaries of racism constructed by both Japan and North America. In reference to “Bubetsu,” he writes, “This story, as a result of its more international vantage point, differs from most Japanese works written during this time, which espoused nationalism. Satō Toshiko brings a perspective to the idea of ‘nation’ that has been called ‘Japan.’ Her works seem to be a reaction to this idea.”⁵² Tamura’s contempt for nationalism, especially Japanese nationalism, though hinted at in many of her stories in this period, is most clearly stated in an essay published a year prior to “Bubetsu.” In June 1937, she wrote an article titled “Nihon fujin undō no nagare o miru” 日本婦人運動の流れを観る (Looking at the Currents of the Japanese Women’s Movement) for *Miyako shinbun* 都新聞. In this essay, she attacks the Japanese government’s policy of using women to support the war effort. She exposes the contradiction of asking women to be the bearers of Japan’s future progeny while asking them also to surrender their children to death as soldiers in Japan’s war effort. In a twisted use of gender essentialisms, Tamura argues that by exhausting female labor for the war, Japan is only hurting itself in the long run because women are “the womb” of the nation. She writes, “The country’s policy of industrial expansion has resulted in the use of women as laborers. The womb of Japan’s citizenry has increasingly been exploited and maltreated. This policy attacks the health of Japan. In a word, it is not an exaggeration to say that Japan’s nationalist policies are leading Japan to its extinction.”⁵³

Japan’s nationalism, however, is not the only nationalism under attack by Tamura. Moving between the West and Japan, Tamura’s perspective allowed her to question the universality and naturalness of ideas of pure race, cultural supremacy, and the unified nation-state anywhere. The works Tamura wrote in the 1930s merit attention because they evidence the politicized dimension of her writing, as well as a new perspective for post-colonial discourse regarding the signifying “We,” which has usually been assumed to represent a white Western male hegemony, and the objectified “Other,” which has been assumed to be everything else. By depicting Mari’s roundtrip journey resulting from her loss of idealism and Jimmy’s mental and physical stagnation in his ideals that hinder his journey from moving forward, and by showing both of her protagonists’ realization that culture is not a truth, but a performance, as well as by her intertwining of these journeys with the sadly poetic depictions of nature, Tamura seems to be espousing a philosophy that tries to transcend the boundaries created by humans based on hate and differentiation. The truth for Tamura seems to reside not in the ugliness humans create, but in the beauty that nature continually produces despite human weaknesses.

Other canonized writers such as Natsume Sōseki, Shimazaki Tōson, and Mori Ōgai have been recognized as masters of diverse writing styles that reflected their developing and varying views on life, views drawing on their personal experiences. In a similar way, Tamura’s diverse writing styles, growing out of her uncommonly varied and adventuresome life experience, should be given more serious credit. Tamura is not solely a New Woman writer focused on the plight of gender inequality. Rather, as a result of her international existence, she became a humanist writer focused on the plight of men and women of all classes, both in the East and in the West.

REFERENCES

- Anderson 1991
Benedict Anderson. *Imagined Communities* Revised Edition. New York: Verso, 1991.
- Batten 2003
Bruce Batten. *To The Ends of Japan: Premodern Frontiers, Boundaries, and Interactions*. University of Hawaii Press, 2003.
- Beasley 1963
W. G. Beasley. *The Modern History of Japan*. Praeger Inc., 1963.
- Bhabha 1994
Homi Bhabha. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
- Chen 2002
Xiaomei Chen. *Occidentalism: A Theory of Counter-Discourse in Post-Mao China*, 2nd Edition. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002.
- Ching 1998
Leo Ching. "Yellow Skin, White Masks: Race, Class, and Identification In Japanese Colonial Discourse." In *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, ed. Kuan-Hsing Chen. London: Routledge, 1998, pp. 65–86.
- Dower 1993
John Dower. "Sensational Rumors, Seditious Graffiti, and the Nightmares of the Thought Police." In *Japan in War and Peace: Selected Essays* (New York: New Press, 1993), pp. 101–54.
- Hall 1990
Stuart Hall. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990.
- Hardt and Negri 2000
Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Hasegawa 1999
Hasegawa Kei 長谷川啓. "Tamura Toshiko: Kaisetsu." In vol. 87 of *Sakka no jiden* 作家の自伝. Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1999.
- Hasegawa 2002
Hasegawa Shun 長谷川澹. "Kenkoku bungaku shiron: boku no imajinēshon" 建国文学私論：僕のイメージーション. In Lu Yuan-ming 呂元明, et al., eds., *Manshū roman* 満州浪漫, vol. 5 (Yumani Shobō, 2002), pp. 1–7.
- Hiratsuka 1913
Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう. "Atarashii onna" 新しい女. *Chūō kōron* 中央公論 (January 1913), pp. 193–94.
- Hiratsuka 1983
———. "Tamura Toshiko san" 田村俊子さん. In *Hiratsuka Raichō chosakushū* 平塚らいてう著作集, vol. 1. Ōtsuki Shoten 1983, pp. 397.

Itō 1969

Itō Sei 伊藤整. “Tamura Toshiko ‘Akirame’ o kaku” 田村俊子「あきらめ」を書く. *Gunzō* 群像 24:5 (1969), pp. 230–41.

Kano 2001

Kano Ayako. *Acting Like a Woman in Modern Japan: Theater, Gender, and Nationalism*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Komori 2001

Komori Yōichi 小森陽一. *Posuto koroniaru* ポスト・コロニアル. Iwanami Shoten, 2001.

Kudō 1985

Kudō Miyoko 工藤美代子. *Tabibitotachi no Bankūbā: Waga seishun no Tamura Toshiko* 旅人達のバンクーバー：わが青春の田村俊子. Chikuma Shobō, 1985.

Kudō and Phillips 1982

Kudō Miyoko and Susan Phillips. *Vancouver no ai; Tamura Toshiko to Suzuki Etsu* 晚香坡の愛：田村俊子と鈴木悦. Domesu Shuppan, 1982.

Kurashige 2002

Lon Kurashige. *Japanese American Celebration and Conflict: A History of Ethnic Identity and Festival in Los Angeles, 1934–1990*. University of California Press, 2002.

Kurosawa 1988

Kurosawa Ariko 黒澤亜里子. “Kaisetsu” 解説. In vol. 2 of *Tamura Toshiko sakuhinshū* 田村俊子作品集. Oriijin Shuppan Sentā, 1988.

Kurosawa 2000

———. “Tamura Toshiko” 田村俊子. In *Josei bungaku o manabu hito no tame ni* 女性文学を学ぶ人のために, ed. Watanabe Sumiko 渡辺澄子. Sekai Shisōsha, 2000.

Lowe 1996

Lisa Lowe. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Duke University Press, 1996.

Maruoka 1977

Maruoka Hideko 丸岡秀子. *Tamura Toshiko to watashi* 田村俊子とわたし. Domesu Shuppan, 1977.

Miwa and Ryū 2002

Miwa Hatsuse 三輪初瀬 and Ryū Inshun 劉英順. “Tamura Toshiko: Feminizumu bungaku no senkusha” 田村俊子：フェミニズム文学の先駆者. *Seitō to Nihon joshi daigakkō dōsōsei “nenpu”* 「青鞞」と日本女子大学校同窓生「年譜」. Nihon Joshi Daigaku Daigakuin Nihon Bungaku Senkō / Iwabuchi Kenkyūshitsu 日本女子大学大学院日本文学専攻／岩淵研究室, 2002.

Muto 1935

Shogo Muto. “What Japan Means to the Nisei?: Material Advance is Due to ‘Seishin’”. *Rafū shinpō* (26 May 1935).

Ogata 1992

- Ogata Akiko 尾形明子. "Tamura Toshiko" 田村俊子. In *Meiji, Taishō, Shōwa sakka kenkyū daijiten* 明治・大正・昭和作家研究大事典. Ōfūsha, 1992.
- Said 1979
Edward Said. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1979.
- Sata 1978
Sata Ineko 佐多稲子. "Hai iro no gogo" 灰色の午後. Orig. pub. 1959; repr. in vol. 10 of *Sata Ineko zenshū* 佐多稲子全集. Kōdansha, 1978.
- Satō 1936
Satō Toshiko 佐藤俊子. "Go aisatsu" 御挨拶. *Kagayaku* 輝く. 17 April 1936, p. 151.
- Satō 1937
Satō Toshiko. "Nihon fujin undō no nagare o miru" 日本婦人運動の流れを觀る. Orig. pub. 13, 17–19 June 1937 in *Miyako shinbun* 都新聞; repr. in vol. 3 of *Tamura Toshiko sakuhin shū* 田村俊子作品集. Oriijin Shuppan Sentā, 1988, pp. 398–406.
- Satō 1938
Satō Toshiko. "Bubetsu" 侮蔑. *Bungei shunju* 文芸春秋 16: 21 (December 1938), pp. 376–93.
- Setouchi 1993
Setouchi Harumi (Jakuchō) 瀬戸内晴美 (寂聴). *Tamura Toshiko* 田村俊子. Kōdansha Bungei Bunko, 1993.
- Suzuki 1994
Suzuki Masakazu 鈴木正和. "Satō Toshiko 'Bubetsu' o yomu: ibunka kara mita Nihon e no shiza" 佐藤俊子「侮蔑」を読む：異文化から見た日本への視座. *Shōwa bungaku kenkyū* 昭和文学研究 29 (October 1994), pp. 45–55.
- Tamura 1987-88
Tamura Toshiko sakuhinshū 田村俊子作品集. 3 vols. Ed. Hasegawa Kei 長谷川啓 and Kurosawa Arika 黒澤亜里子. Oriijin Shuppan Sentā, 1987-1988.
- Tamura 1994
Tamura Toshiko: Miira no kuchibeni, Hakai suru mae 田村俊子：木乃伊の口紅・破壊する前, ed. Tamura Toshiko kai 田村俊子会. Kōdansha Bungei Bunko, 1994.
- Tierney
Robert Tierney. "Constructions of Savages and the South in Japanese Colonial Literature," Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, forthcoming (submission projected 2005).
- Tori no ko 1918
Tori no ko 鳥の子 [pseudonym of Tamura Toshiko]. "Tabigarasu no onshin" 旅鳥の音信. *Tairiku nippō* 大陸日報 (14 December 1918).
- Watanabe 1987
Watanabe Sumiko 渡辺澄子. "Tamura Toshiko" 田村俊子. In *Gendai bungaku kenkyū: Jōhō to shiryō* 現代文学研究・情報と資料, ed. Hasegawa Izumi 長谷川泉. Shibundō, 1987, pp. 369–370.

Watanabe 2002

Watanabe Sumiko. “Bungakushi no kakikae ni mukete – sono futatsu: Tamura Toshiko no ‘Kanojo no seikatsu’ no isō” 文学史の書き換えに向けて（その二つ）：田村俊子の「彼女の生活」の位相. *Daitōbunka daigaku: Jinbunkagaku* 大東文化大学：人文科学 (March 2002): 192–218.

Watanabe and Muramatsu 1990

Watanabe Sumiko and Muramatsu Sadataka 村松定孝. *Gendai josei bungaku jiten* 現代女性文学辞典. Tokyodō Shuppan, 1990.

Yamamoto 2000

Eriko Yamamoto. “Cheers for Japanese Athletes: The 1932 Los Angeles Olympics and the Japanese American Community.” *Pacific Historical Review* 69:3 (August 2000), pp. 399–430.

NOTES

¹ A three-volume anthology, *Tamura Toshiko sakuhin shū* 田村俊子作品集 (The Collected Works of Tamura Toshiko), was published in 1987 and 1988 (Tamura 1987-88). Aside from being included in dictionaries specifically focused on Japanese women writers such as the special volume of Chikuma Shobō’s *Meiji bungaku zenshū* 明治文学全集 (Collection of Meiji Literature) titled *Meiji joryū bungaku shū* 明治女流文学集 (Collection of Meiji Women Writers) (1985) and Watanabe and Muramatsu 1990, Tamura is also included in general dictionaries of Japanese literature. See the entries on her in *Nihon kindai bungaku dai jiten* 日本近代文学大事典 (The Dictionary of Modern Japanese Literature) published in 1977 by Kōdansha, *Shinchō Nihon bungaku jiten* 新潮日本文学辞典 (The Shinchō Dictionary of Japanese Literature) published by Shinchō in 1988, *Meiji, Taishō, Shōwa sakka kenkyū dai jiten* 明治・大正・昭和作家研究大事典 (The Dictionary of Research on Meiji, Taishō, and Shōwa Writers) published by Ōfūsha in 1993, and *Nihon gendai bungaku daijiten* 日本現代文学大事典 (The Dictionary of Modern Japanese Literature) published in 1994 by Meiji Shoin. A special volume (vol. 87) of the *Sakka no jiden* 作家の自伝 (Autobiographies of Writers) is devoted to Tamura’s Taishō period stories; see Hasegawa 1999. She is also listed in the English *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan*. Moreover, early in the Taishō period, both *Chūō kōron* 中央公論 and *Shinchō* 新潮 published special issues devoted to discussion of Tamura’s writing by her peers. The date of the *Chūō kōron* edition of “Tamura Toshiko ron” 田村俊子論 (A Discussion of Tamura Toshiko) is August 1914. The first *Shinchō* special issue appeared in March 1913 under the title “Tamura Toshiko ron” 田村とし子論 (A Discussion of Tamura Toshiko); the second, “Tamura Toshiko shi no inshō” 田村俊子氏の印象 (Impressions of Tamura Toshiko), appeared in May 1916.

² Kurosawa 2000, p. 107.

³ Ogata 1993, p. 346.

⁴ The main contemporary literary scholars who have written about Tamura include Watanabe Sumiko 渡辺澄子, Hasegawa Kei 長谷川啓, and Kurosawa Ariko 黒澤亜里子, the editors of *Tamura Toshiko sakuhinshū*. Novelist and essayist Setouchi Jakuchō 瀬戸内寂聴 has published a biography, Setouchi 1993. These writers tend to focus on Tamura’s Taishō period stories, regarding them as the fruits of the “golden age” of her career. The stories most often discussed include: “Tsuyuwake goromo” 露分

衣 (Dewy Weather Garments, 1903), one of the first works Tamura wrote under the mentorship of Kōda Rohan 幸田露伴 (1867-1947). This work follows the classical style of Higuchi Ichiyō 樋口一葉 (1872-96). It is about a young orphaned girl who begs her sister-in-law and brother to mend their differences so as to avoid a divorce. In the end, the girl dies as she sacrifices her body in her attempt to keep her guardians, her brother and sister-in-law, and hence her substitute family, intact. Another commonly studied work is “Akirame” あきらめ (Resignation, 1911), which won the *Ōsaka Asahi shinbun* 大阪朝日新聞 literary contest in November 1910 and was serialized from 1 January to 21 March 1911. This work put Tamura on the map, so to speak, and the prize represented recognition by the *bundan*. As the title plainly signals, it is about resignation. Although the main protagonist desires to become a playwright, in the end, she gives up both her attempt at artistic fame and same-sex love, and bows to the social constraints of a society ruled by a heterosexual patriarchy. She fulfills her familial obligation by returning to the countryside to tend to her dying grandmother. Ironically she travels home on a train, a symbol of Japan’s surface modernization, yet she is taking a backward journey toward the countryside, a trope for the traditions of Japan that still existed in the country despite superficial attempts at modernization. Another commonly discussed work is “Ikichi” 生血 (Lifeblood, 1911), published in the inaugural issue of Hiratsuka Raichō’s 平塚らいてう *Seitō* 青鞞 (Bluestocking, 1911-16). This story is about a woman’s regret that she has spent the night with a man at an inn. Her sense of regret at the defilement of her body is evoked through the imagery of noxious body smells and dirt juxtaposed against the pure white of other passersby on their way to a temple as she and her lover wander through the dirty streets of Asakusa on a hot sultry day. The female protest against patriarchal control is manifested through violence as the female protagonist pierces first a gold fish, whose smell resembles that of men after sex, and then with the same sharp object, she pierces her own finger. Other works include: “Miira no kuchibeni” 木乃伊の口紅 (The Rouged-Lipped Mummy, 1913), which is about Tamura’s struggle to write her story “Akirame” under pressure from her husband. The story ends in a dream in which the woman is a mummy who is lying under a male mummy. While he is completely ashen in color, she is wearing red lipstick, a symbol of her repressed sexuality. “Onna sakusha” 女作者 (The Woman Writer, 1913) is about a woman writer’s struggle to put on paper the thoughts in her head. She takes her frustration out on her husband by beating him. “Seigon” 誓言 (The Vow, 1913) is about an adulterous woman who is thrown out of her house by her angry husband. “Hōraku no kei” 炮烙の刑 (Burning at the Stake, 1914) is also about an adulterous woman who believes she has a right to love multiple men. “Kanojo no seikatsu” 彼女の生活 (Her Life, 1915) is about a woman who tries to balance her life as a writer with her duties as a wife and mother. Despite the help of her liberated husband, due to external factors of Meiji Japanese society that neither can control, the woman and husband are not able to maintain a relationship of equality. The home increasingly becomes a space for her entrapment, as she must care for her child while her husband must seek work outside the home to support them. “Hakai suru mae” 破壊する前 (Before the Fall, 1918), the last story Tamura wrote before she left Japan for Vancouver, is about a married woman’s awakening to the truth that her life has been a waste. The story ends with the female protagonist staring out the window as she realizes that her marriage is not good. Yet due to her emotional desire for her husband, she cannot leave him. All these stories follow a similar pattern: a young woman is tormented by her desire to be independent, yet is unable to free herself from the inexplicable emotional entrapment of love. Most often the female protagonist’s mental torment is depicted through the metaphor of physical entrapment of a body that has been sullied and defiled by sex, or through violence against the self or the woman’s oppressor. The stories almost always end on a bleak note of sadness, irresolution, and acceptance of (or resignation to) one’s fate. Because Tamura

published these stories when few other women were writing and because of her propensity to write boldly about female sexuality, as very few other women did, most Japanese literary scholars consider her to be the main representative of the Japanese “atarashii onna” 新しい女 (New Woman) writer of the Meiji and Taishō eras.

⁵ Watanabe 1987, p. 369.

⁶ See Hasegawa 1999, p. 259.

⁷ See Hiratsuka 1983, p. 397, originally published as Hiratsuka, “Tamura Toshiko-san,” *Chūō kōron* 29:9 (1914), p. 110.

⁸ Suzuki Etsu 鈴木悦 (1886-1933) had been a reporter for the *Asahi shinbun* 朝日新聞. He and Tamura met around 1914, and in 1917, they began an affair. On 30 May 1918, he moved to Vancouver, Canada, where he worked as a reporter for the *Tairiku nippō* 大陸日報, a Japanese-language paper for the immigrant community. Originally Suzuki’s contract with the newspaper was supposed to be three years. He extended his contract, however, for fourteen more years and used his journalistic skills to organize a Japanese immigrant labor movement, which resulted in the Canadian Japanese Laborers Union (加奈陀日本人労働組合). During Tamura’s eighteen years in Vancouver, she lived with Etsu as his wife. They officially married in March 1923. Apparently people in their Vancouver community did not know Tamura was a famous writer in Japan. They also did not know she was still married to another man. Her reaction to life overseas was mixed. She left Japan because she had developed a severe case of writer’s block. Even before that, her relationship with her first husband had increasingly deteriorated as her career soared and his declined. Following Suzuki to Canada was a means of escape for Tamura from both the dead end in her writing and her marriage. At first, however, Tamura was shocked by the undeveloped nature of Vancouver and wanted to return to Japan. She did not act on this wish, and instead remained in Vancouver for eighteen years. During this time, she only wrote one short story titled “Bokuyōsha” 牧羊者 (The Shepherd) for *Tairiku nippō* in January 1919. The story is based on the biblical myth of David and Goliath. Kudō Miyoko and Susan Phillips interpret the motivation for Tamura to write such a story as a reflection of how she viewed Japanese immigrants in Vancouver: like the people of Israel, the Japanese in Canada were engaged in struggle. The pen name Tamura used while in Canada was “Child of a Bird” (Tori no ko 鳥の子), chosen because she felt like a little bird who had come to a new country. Prior to the publication of “Bokuyōsha,” only two months after her arrival in Vancouver, Tamura wrote an article titled “Tabigarasu onshin” 旅がらす音信 (Correspondence from a Wanderer) that appeared in the *Tairiku nippō* in December 1918. In it she discusses her loneliness in a foreign country in which nothing is familiar, and she imagines the beauty of Japan’s snow, the smell of Japanese shoji paper, and the sound of the cold winter wind passing through the walls. She writes:

I have become a person living in the midst of a foreign country whose environment I have admired. . . . Having been assaulted by the extremely abundant cultural materialism from all directions, my spirit has only withered. The pathos of this wanderer who has flown from a small island has keenly been awakened. The sadness of this wanderer has just begun. It is because I have yet to become familiar with my surroundings nor have I experienced any intimacy with people here because I can not speak with the people here (Tori no ko 1918).

Until she got acclimated to life in Vancouver, Tamura spent most of her days by herself studying at home and waiting like a dutiful wife for her husband’s return. Around August 1919, however, she started writing essays for “The Saturday Women’s Column” (Doyōbi fujinran 土曜日婦人欄). In these she discussed her concerns about women’s issues in the Japanese immigrant community such as Picture

Brides. Initially she did not join in Etsu's socialist efforts. Gradually, however, with his encouragement, she began to write essays for his paper *Nikkan minshū* (日刊民衆). See Kudō and Phillips 1982 and Kudō 1985 (the latter work, however, is more about the composition of Kudō and Phillips 1982 than about Tamura herself). See also Miwa and Ryū 2002.

⁹ Suzuki Etsu died in September 1933, soon after returning to Japan. Tamura, who had remained in Canada, moved to Los Angeles upon the encouragement of her friends, who feared she might kill herself due to her depression over Etsu's death. Originally she planned to stay in Southern California only a few months. However, not wanting to return to Vancouver, which was replete with memories of Etsu, she remained in Los Angeles until about February 1936. There, under the penname of Yukari 優香里, she wrote a column titled "Hito ni au" 人に逢ふ (People Whom I Meet) for the Japanese language newspaper *Rafu shinbō* 羅府新報. The format called for her to interview Japanese living in Los Angeles, such as the president of the Japan Society (Nihon Kai 日本会). This column met with a mixed reception; some readers felt it was inconsistent in quality and oftentimes boring to read. While in Los Angeles, she returned to the more extravagant lifestyle of her pre-Canadian years, and got involved with a rich Japanese man who most likely supported her. In February 1936, she returned to Vancouver with the hope of obtaining another visa to re-enter the United States. Unable to do so, she returned to Japan on 31 March 1936. Only three friends saw her off as she departed Vancouver for her home country. In contrast, over one hundred people had seen Etsu off when he departed for Japan five years earlier. See Kudō 1982, pp. 218 – 228.

¹⁰ See Maruoka 1977, p. 169.

¹¹ Tamura participated in several round-table discussions about international issues sponsored by literary magazines such as *Chūō kōron*, *Kaizō* 改造, and *Fujin kōron* 婦人公論 (Women's Forum). She also wrote more than fifty articles during the three years she was back in Japan. Typically the topics were the status of women, educational reform, and the quality of Japanese journalism. In all of these discussions, Tamura offered opinions based on her experiences in Canada and the United States. Her attitude toward the social situation in North America was usually more positive than her posture toward conditions in Japan. For example, Tamura criticized the nihilism and decadence of Japanese students in comparison to what she perceived to be the more positive attitude of Canadian and American students. She also was critical of Japan's militarism, and the failures of the Japanese feminist movement to make the same inroads that Western feminism had made regarding suffrage, as well as improvements in education and employment opportunities. The roundtable talks she was involved in are: "Sekai no josei seikatsu o kataru" 世界の女性生活を語る (A Discussion of Women's Activities Around the World), published in *Shinjoen* 新女苑 (Anthology of New Women) (June 1937); "So-Bei-Shi josei o kataru" ソ・米・支女性を語る (Speaking about Russian, American, and Chinese Women), published in *Fujin bungei* 婦人文芸 (Women's Arts) (July 1937); "Daigakusei jikyoku seikatsu: zadankai" 大学生時局生活座談会 (A Round-Table Talk about the Situation of University Students), published in *Chūō kōron* (August 1938). Articles Tamura wrote comparing Japan to Canada and the United States include: "Jānarizumu no kaikaku" ジャーナリズムの改革 (Journalism Reform), published in *Bungei tsūshin* 文芸通信 (Literary Correspondence) (December 1936); "Shinjosei sen: dōsei o mamoru" 新女性線：同性を護る (The New Women's Line: Protecting Homosexuality), published in *Fujin kōron* (January 1937); "Bei-Ka no oshōgatsu" (米加のお正月 (New Years in America and Canada), published in *Fujin bungei* (January 1937); "Nihon fujin undō no nagare o miru" 日本婦人運動の流れを観る (Looking at the Currents of the Japanese Women's Movement), published in *Miyako shinbun* 都新聞 (June 1937); "Otoko o korosu onnatachi" 男を殺す女たち (Women Who Kill Men), published in *Chūō kōron*

(January 1938); “Gakusei ni okuru sho” 学生に贈る書 (A Letter to Students), published in *Chūō kōron* (April 1938); “Onna gakusei ni okuru sho” 女学生に贈る書 (A Letter to Women Students), published in *Chūō kōron* (May 1938); “East is East” (イースト・イズ・イースト), published in *Kaizō* (August 1938); “Atarashiki bosei kyōiku to wa?” 新しき母性教育とは? (What Is New Mother’s Education?), published in *Fujin kōron* (August 1939).

¹² Her first published work after she returned to Japan in March 1936 appeared in the journal *Kagayaku* 輝く (Shine). The piece, titled “Go aisatsu” ご挨拶 (Greetings), a single short paragraph, was printed on the first page of the paper. Tamura writes:

I have returned to Japan after more than ten years away. Though Japan has probably changed in a variety of ways, what has not changed are my friendships. I wonder if this Japan, which I have not seen for a long time, will hurl my body away coldly. Yet, as I am greeted by the warm hearts of my old friends, I notice that Japan is slightly grinning at me. As for this poor wanderer, I think only of the sweetness of my friends’ warm hearts, as my own heart wants to rest quietly for a while.

See Satō Toshiko, 17 April 1936, p. 151. In reference to Tamura’s quickly placing pieces in major publications upon her return to Japan, Maruoka Hideko, a friend of Tamura’s who was involved in socialist activities, notes that Tamura enjoyed high name-recognition: “Basically if she wrote something, it was bought immediately. This was because of the reputation of her name.” See Maruoka 1977, p. 123.

¹³ In *Tamura Toshiko sakuhinshū*, “Yama michi” 山道 (Mountain Road), which is in volume 2, is the only story included from her writings of the years 1936-38. Just four essays from the 1930s are included in the *sakuhinshū* (in volume 3). They are “Uchida Tamino san e ohenji” 内田多美野さんへお返事 (A Response to Uchida Tamino), “Nihon fujin undō no nagare o miru” (see note 11), “Futsukakan” 二日間 (Two Days), and “Atarashiki bosei kyōiku to wa?”. A collection of Tamura’s fictional writing is also available in paperback. See Tamura 1994. “Yama michi” is the only story from the 1930s included in this anthology, also.

¹⁴ See Watanabe and Muramatsu 1990, p. 213.

¹⁵ Robert Tierney discusses how postwar Japanese literary critics have ignored Nakajima Atsushi’s Micronesian stories titled *South Sea Tales* and *Atolls*, which, he argues, shed light on the complex and paradoxical nature of Japan’s colonization process. See Tierney.

¹⁶ See Suzuki 1994, p. 55.

¹⁷ The works of this period include the trilogy “Chiisaki ayumi” 小さき歩み (Little Steps), which appeared in the October 1936, November 1936, and March 1937 issues of *Kaizō*. The title of the second installment is “Hakkō no kage ni yoru: Chiisaki ayumi” 薄光の影に寄る一小さき歩み (In the Shadow of the Faint Light), and the third installment, “Ai wa michibiku” 愛は導く一小さき歩み (Love Leads). Other short stories include: “Mukashigatari” 昔がたり (A Past Tale), which appeared in the January 1937 issue of *Bungakkai* 文学界 (Literary World); “Nokosaretaru mono” 残されたるもの (Leftover Things), which appeared in the September 1937 issue of *Chūō kōron*; “Kōfuku no itteki” 幸福の一滴 (One Drop of Happiness), which appeared in the March 1938 issue of *Shinjoen* 新女苑; “Karihorunia monogatari” カリホルニア物語 (California Story), which appeared in the July 1938 issue of *Chūō kōron*; “Yama michi,” which appeared in the November 1938 issue of *Chūō kōron*; and “Bubetsu” 侮蔑 (Scorn), which appeared in the December 1938 issue of *Bungei shunjū* 文芸春秋.

¹⁸ In the text, when a character such as Jimmy is speaking, the character Mari (Mariko) is referred to as “Mari,” written in katakana: マリイ. When it is the narrator’s voice, the kanji spelling of her name is used: “Mariko” 萬利子.

¹⁹ The United States imposed a series of exclusion acts against people emigrating from Asian countries. The Chinese Exclusion Act was imposed in 1882, the Asian-Indian Exclusion Act in 1917, the Japanese Exclusion Act in 1924, and the Filipino Exclusion Act in 1934. These immigrant groups were also barred from citizenship and ownership of property through the Alien Land Laws of 1913, 1920, and 1923. These laws prohibited Asian immigrants from owning property because they were viewed as aliens ineligible to become citizens. There were also laws against miscegenation, thus creating, as Lisa Lowe writes, “an environment extremely hostile to Asian settlement.” See Lowe 1996, p. 14.

²⁰ See the entry “nation” in *The American Heritage Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1991), p. 831.

²¹ Anderson 1991, pp. 6-7.

²² Ibid.

²³ Batten 2003, p. 58.

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 62–63.

²⁵ All quotes from this story are taken from Satō Toshiko, “Bubetsu,” *Bungei shunjū* 16:21 (December 1938), pp. 376–93.

²⁶ According to Yoshida Tadao 吉田忠雄, who refers to the *Gendai yōgo* 現代用語 definition, the word *imin* 移民 (immigrant) was not an expression used before World War II. The idea of naturalizing in another country was not common and people who did naturalize elsewhere were considered unfaithful to Japan. It was considered acceptable to live a short time in another country to earn money, but to live permanently in another country was not socially condoned. See Suzuki 1994, p. 49.

²⁷ Hall 1990, p. 225, as quoted in Lowe 1996, p. 64.

²⁸ Bhabha 1994, pp. 1–2.

²⁹ The 1932 Summer Olympics, the tenth modern Olympics, were held in Los Angeles from 30 July to 14 August. The games were nearly cancelled because of the worldwide economic depression. The number of countries represented declined from forty-six to thirty-seven. In the previous Summer Olympics, held in Amsterdam in 1928, about three thousand athletes participated. In the Los Angeles Olympics, only about one thousand athletes were able to take part. Japan sent 200 athletes as part of its Nationalism policy. Despite the unfavorable world economic conditions, records were set. Most notable was men’s swimming, which was “dominated” by the Japanese who won four of the five races. The Japanese men’s swim team set a world record on 8 August when it won the 800 meter relay race, thus beating the United States. The Japanese men’s swim team won gold medals for the 100 meter free, 1500 meter free, 100 meter back, and 200 meter back events. As for women, Maehata Hideko won the silver medal in the 200 meter breast stroke event. For a detailed analysis of these Olympic Games see Yamamoto 2000.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 400.

³¹ Ibid., p. 401.

³² Ibid., pp. 402–403.

³³ As in her treatment of personal names, Tamura drops a hint about the complex problem of Japanese American identity by representing the young men’s cry of “Nippon” in katakana: ニッポン. Coverage of the Japanese swimmers during the Los Angeles Olympics in the *Rafu shinpō* appeared on a daily basis from the time they arrived on 9 July 1932 to their departure 15 August 1932. A picture of the Olympic swimmers’ arrival shows the Japanese immigrants on the dock waving Japanese flags as the boat arrives in Los Angeles. See *Rafu Shinpō*, 9 July 1932. Another article praises the Japanese players for their patriotism as they raised their flag everyday, while other team members from other countries

did not. “Patriotism was best illustrated by members of the Olympic team of Nippon who have been the only group in the Olympic Village who properly raised their flag every morning.... This was made more impressive due to the fact no other group in the Village observed the ceremony. Some raised their flags at no regular time without ceremony; others completely neglected to raise them.” See “Japanese Athletes are Moral Winners of the Olympic Games,” *Rafu shinpō*, 22 August 1932.

³⁴ Muto 1935.

³⁵ Suzuki 1994, p. 48.

³⁶ Said 1979, p. 40.

³⁷ Hardt and Negri 2000, p. 106.

³⁸ In her discussion of Chinese Occidentalism, she notes a difference between the “official” Occidentalism, which made the West out to be bad to support Communist China’s policies over its people and “anti-official” Occidentalism, which is the one she argues has a liberatory effect for the oppressed in China. See Chen 2002.

³⁹ Komori 2001, pp. 18 – 19.

⁴⁰ Hasegawa 2002. I want to thank the anonymous reviewer who suggested that I read *Manshū roman* to get a more varied sense of Japan’s nationalist project and the response of non-Japanese intellectuals in a Japanese-influenced (controlled) domain. This book is a compilation and reprint of essays, stories, and poems written by Manchurian writers in the 1930s; it is a cooperative effort by scholars in China, Japan, and Korea.

⁴¹ “Good society” (*ii shakai*) is placed in quotes in the original text as 「いい社会」.

⁴² Ching 1998, p. 67.

⁴³ Suzuki 1994, pp. 52 – 53.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁴⁵ Dower 1993, p. 101.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 102

⁴⁷ Beasley 1963, p. 256.

⁴⁸ Kurashige 2002, p. 35.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁵⁰ In the Japanese text, the word *Nisei* is purposely written in English as “Nisei,” not in kanji or kana.

⁵¹ At this point the narrator is speaking, so the reference to Mariko puts her name in kanji.

⁵² Suzuki 1994, p. 55.

⁵³ Satō 1937, p. 406.

要旨

故郷と呼ぶ場所は無し—田村俊子の『侮蔑』における
「三番目の場所」を希求する帰国日系二世たち—

アン・ソコルスキー

田村俊子（1884-1945）は日本における「新しい女」の代表であると多くの文学者や研究者から評価されている。「新しい女」とは、日本で1900年代に見られた西洋に影響された文学・文化現象のひとつであり、田村が「新しい女」であるという定説は、彼女の作品の重要なテーマであったジェンダーの問題が前景化されたことによる。しかしながら、田村の著作のテーマはジェンダー問題だけではない。1930年代の著作やエッセーで田村は人種、社会階級などの問題にも取り組んだ。それにもかかわらず、これらの作品は今まで日本や西洋の研究者に軽視されてきた。

田村は1918年から1936年まで北米に滞在し、その体験を踏まえて9つの短編小説と五十編以上の随筆を書き上げ総合雑誌に出版した。これらの作品で田村は、反アジア気風に満ちた当時の北米における日系移民労働者の苦闘を描き、また、帰国後彼女自身の日本の軍国主義への反発を記している。本稿では、この時期の田村の作品から小説「侮蔑」を取り上げ分析する。

「侮蔑」は、ロサンゼルスで育った日系二世の若者とその恋人の苦悩を描いた物語である。

1930年代初頭のアメリカの人種差別に失望した二人は、自らの文化と人種的なアイデンティティを求めて日本へ向かう。しかし、彼らは日本にもアメリカにも「家（home）」と呼べる場所が無いことを実感する。二人はアメリカ人から見れば白人の範疇に入らず、日本人からすればあまりにも「白人的」であり過ぎた。ゆえに日本でもアメリカでも、二人は侮蔑の対象になってしまうのである。

本稿ではホミ・ババの「Third Space」（三番目の場所）を理論的枠組みに、いかに田村俊子が「文明」と「文化」、「侮る」と「侮蔑」を並置し、その並置によって「文明人」と自称する人々が実際には「非文明」的に振舞うかを検証した。ジェンダーと人種の観点から、「われわれ」と「彼ら」という二項対立を逆転させ、その境界を破壊した田村は、「文化的優越」「純粋な人種」「ナショナリズム」などの考えの間違った前提とパラドックスを明らかにした。そしてそれらの観念がいかにある集団が他の集団を抑圧する際の修辭的な破壊兵器となり得るかを示したのである。