

に朝鮮側に収斂するのではなく、日本側に還元されるものであると言っている。また南富鎮氏は、このような現象が植民地時代だけではなく、戦後にも植民地的な文化構造が依然として続き、それが韓国の戦後的な文化現象としてディアスポラの内面的心理を形成していると指摘し、日韓における朝鮮人のディアスポラ現象にはこうした植民地的な文化現象が大きく介在していると解釈した。文学の作品に表れた韓国朝鮮人のディアスポラの構造を診断したユニークな発表であったと思われる。

金仁徳氏の発表「在日朝鮮人の民族運動における文化闘争と闘争文化」は、1920年代から1930年代初め頃までの在日朝鮮人における文化闘争や闘争文化について扱ったものである。金仁徳氏は、戦前在日朝鮮人の文化は「民族」・「共生」・「同化」という概念を中心にみると、「民族」と「同化」的な要素が重畳されていると言っており、また支配と被支配の文化的様相が個別的に活動空間に現れたというよりは混在していたと指摘している。また彼は朝鮮村に注目し、朝鮮村を「抵抗的文化空間」でありながら同時に日本社会へ出て行く在日朝鮮人の準備空間としても捉えている。金仁徳氏の発表は、これまで注目されなかった在日朝鮮人の文化闘争に対する意味をみんなに考えさせられる発表であったと思われる。

(李漢燮)

The Possibility and Impossibility of *Zainichi* in *GO*

H. Richard OKADA

Princeton University

“No soy coreano, ni soy japonés, yo soy desarraigado” (I am not Korean; nor am I Japanese; I am a rootless weed)

Sugihara’s father, in *GO*

As I began thinking about the issues relevant to my topic of the possibility of an “identity” referred to in Japan by various terms—*zainichi chōsenjin* 在日朝鮮人, *zainichi kankokujin* 在日韓国人, *zainichi korian* 在日コリアン, or simply *zainichi* 在日 (literally, “residing in Japan”)—I realized, first, the presence of a more general question: namely, what is the status of so-called *zainichi* matters outside of Japan and Korea? To what extent, for example, can the “*nichi*” or “Japan[ese]” of *zainichi* be put into question, and why is it necessary to do so? How “global,” to put it bluntly, can one make the issues? In other words, how can the topic be discussed in a manner that will allow it to participate in the debates surrounding ethnicity in a global, planetary, or even ecological, context? In what way can it be negotiated so that it can matter to the world at large, the very world that the father of *GO*’s protagonist, as we shall see, will urge his son to look towards?

One way of effecting such a negotiation would be to discuss the works in the context of certain critical attempts to dis-locate, dis-articulate, or otherwise ex-pose our normal assumptions of culture, selfhood, and identity; assumptions that most often remain trapped within ethnic or national parameters. Since such “remaining caught” is the de facto condition, it often appears to be a state from which one ought to try to extricate oneself. The very act of trying, however, in most cases involves a continuous reinscription of that condition. What sorts of relations should

we be striving to create, then, that might achieve, rather than any direct (and illusory) extrication, what I would argue is a more effective dis-location, dis-articulation, or ex-posure? In other words, it seems that the issues surrounding the nagging question of “culture” will always remain before—and I take “before” not only in its temporal sense—the question of globalization or interpersonal relations and eternally haunt them.

One general way, then, to begin to dis-locate, dis-articulate, or ex-pose our normal assumptions might attend to the conundrums that surround and are powerfully constitutive of the notion of “culture.” It is important to do this because questions of ethnicity or nationality, of which the term *zainichi* is a prime example in Japan, are inextricably tied to notions of culture. Initial questions, then, would seem to include the following: To whom does culture belong? Or, What does it mean to have a culture?

GO, both the novel by Kaneshiro Kazuki 金城一紀, who is Korean Japanese, and the film directed by Yukisada Isao 行定功, who is not, deals with issues concerning *zainichi* Koreans. The novel ostensibly does this, first of all, through a self-proclaimed (by the narrator-protagonist Sugihara) “story of love”: “this is a story about my falling in love” 「これは僕の恋愛に関する物語だ」. As it tells the tale of Sugihara, a Korean Japanese man, and Sakurai, a Japanese woman (both in their teens), however, we shall see that it incorporates incidents and discussions that touch on the larger contexts of ethnicity and discrimination in Japan. Such incorporations will suggest further that “love” 恋愛 can never simply be “love”; in other words, it will support the view that “love” cannot be portrayed or discussed apart from politics⁴ here a politics of inclusion and exclusion, a politics of protest, a politics of rage, a politics of a kind of global multiculturalism, a politics of the Korean diaspora—no matter how inviting the disclaimer. For after the “story of love” quote, Sugihara goes on to assert that this “love” has absolutely nothing to do with any “isms” 主義, like communism 共産主義, democracy 民主主義, capitalism 資本主義, pacifism 平和主義, or one-item conspicuous consumptionism 一点豪華主義. Here lies one level of irony, or dis-location, in the novel. The more Sugihara tries to limit his story to one of love the greater will this story be intertwined with politics, whether explicitly, as implied in these

“isms,” or not.

A fundamental question both versions of *GO* raise is one of culture and/or national boundaries. They replay the oft-told story of a marked and excluded member of a culture and society who faces innumerable obstacles as he makes his way through life (here his life into his teenage years) and happens to fall in love with a member of the so-called dominant culture. In fact, Kaneshiro places a quote from Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* as an epigraph to his novel: “What's in a name? That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet” 「名前ってなに？バラと呼んでいる花を別の名前にしてみても美しい香りはそのまま」。Although the two works deal with the specific case of a Korean Japanese teenager, the scenario is one that is familiar far beyond the boundaries of Korea or Japan. In fact, the novel, through Sugihara 杉原, Sakurai 桜井, and Sugihara's friend, Jong-il 正一, frequently invokes and interconnects with figures—in Sugihara's case, several figures who arose out of working class or minority backgrounds—of Western culture.

Since the problems surrounding culture are far too complex to deal with at length here, I will confine my remarks to a few observations triggered by the two works. Let us begin first with the term culture itself as it relates to the possibility of autonomy. Despite our commonsensical attitudes towards it, culture is a term and notion beset by stubborn, if not impossible to resolve, contradictions; we can call them aporias, those contradictions that are beyond, or before, the realm of logical contradictions or paradoxes. In fact, it may be said that culture would not be culture without such contradictions. One such contradiction involves the idea of universal values versus specific individuals or, in our case, “Japanese” culture versus the specific category of “Korean Japanese.” If in a cultural realm, for example, the aim or ideal is to guarantee each of the members of that realm freedom of self-determination, then each member, whether marked as minority or not, must be granted some sort of autonomy to be him- or her-self.

In the case of *GO*, Sugihara struggles desperately to find a self that he can be, meaning an autonomous self, not someone beholden to or

confined within any particular categorical (national, racial, etc.) description. But such true autonomy must then, to be faithful to the notion of autonomy, precede any imposition of authority or law that is already given since if it does not it would not be true autonomy but merely a regression into the realm of the already given, in other words, the condition we know as the status quo. Thus, we have a complex and even hazardous situation in which a culture, in order to guarantee freedom for each of its members, must continually erase the very moment of the granting of true autonomy. The constitution and laws of a nation are excellent testimony to such erasures. What ends up happening is that the playing field is never level for the various members of society, whether “minority” or not, precisely because neither the universal nor the specific can provide the actual freedom needed to alter the given terms of the debate. That is also why attempts at inclusion, however well-intentioned they may be, will always already reinscribe the uneven field of play. In this case, then, the field of play can only become a battlefield.

Minority-mainstream battles, then, are simply one example of the much more general condition of culture. What is often difficult to grasp is that in addition to the distinctions and differentiations required for its maintenance, culture also involves a fundamental differentiation from itself, from its avowed aims. The problem with attempting to resolve the situation lies in the fact that, rather than living with or within the aporia—which would create potentially a highly productive situation, despite causing pain and severe stress—culture becomes merely and primarily a term used to distinguish, to demarcate, to mark itself from, and to compare itself to others, other persons and/or other cultures. The situation gives rise to common designations like the cultured and the uncultured, culture and nature, or advanced versus barbarous or primitive cultures; culture thus easily becomes a weapon one wields in a struggle against other cultures—much like the situation in the Middle East today—whether within or outside of the borders of one particular nation. In this sense, we can say, on the one hand, that national-local culture is always already global culture and, on the other, that multiculturalism is always monoculture. As it happens, monoculture is a term crucial to many who work on ecological issues as well, with the position of “nature” being

analogous to that of a “minority” (see below). This is also the situation in which it can be said that “culture is always also a declaration of war.” What is particularly important and interesting, though not easy to grasp, is that it is also a declaration of war on itself.¹

Let us now continue our discussion of *GO*, the novel, published in the millennial year 2000 and awarded a prestigious literary award, the Naoki Prize. The film version was made in 2001. I find the novel to be politically savvy and engagingly cosmopolitan, and even at times quite powerful and moving. It is also marked by a kind of wry humor that disarms the reader and helps makes the strong anti-nation-state sentiments palatable.

As noted, the novel *GO* is narrated by the main character, Sugihara, who tells us early on that what he will relate is his love story, ostensibly the romantic relationship that will transpire between him and a Japanese woman named Sakurai (a name suggestive of a preeminent symbol for Japan: the cherry blossom). That love story, however, turns out to be deeply embedded in the tale of an ethnic minority, and indeed aspects of Sugihara’s life as a Korean Japanese continually end up taking center stage to the extent that readers may wonder what exactly the main point of the story might be. As Sugihara recounts his story of love, the narrative continually takes detours through the highly politicized social situations in Sugihara’s life, the life of someone whom people in Japan mark as *zainichi*. In taking the detours, the novel actually enacts the very process of talking about culture, which is through detours, distances, indirections, comparisons, etc.

The novel actually begins with the Sugihara’s father’s words: “Hawaii?” 「ハワイか・・・」. Disillusioned by the way he has been treated by the *sōren* 総連, the Korean organization in Japan that maintains ties with North Korea, the elder Sugihara decides to take a trip to Hawaii. In order to do so he decides to change his nationality from North to South Korea in order facilitate movement in and out of Japan. This is normally difficult if not impossible to do in a timely fashion but the father is able to do so because he has connections with someone in the *mindan* 民団, the

Korean Japanese organization which preserves ties to South Korea. The narrator also gives the reader background information on the *sōren* and the *mindan*. Yukisada, on the other hand, chooses to begin the film not with the Hawaii remark, but with a scene on the basketball court where Sakurai first sees Sugihara, thus highlighting the “story of love.” He also omits the *soren-mindan* discussion, further effecting the erasure of important political elements included in the novel.

An important scene tied to globalization occurs when Sugihara’s father takes him to a beach. The father’s remarks suggest an awareness of the larger context for their *zainichi* lives.² Sugihara fears that he is going to get a beating, as he often does, by his father, but the father’s purpose here is to teach his son a lesson. He tells Sugihara as they look out over the ocean, “Look at the broader world...then decide for yourself” 「広い世界を見ろよ・・・。あとは自分で決めろ」。 In a comment related to his decision to change his nationality, Sugihara’s father had occasionally told him: “Nationality is something you can buy if you have the money ; which country do you want to buy?” 「国籍は金で買えるぞ。おまえはどの国をかいきたい?」。 The line is kept in the film. Seen in terms of the interest in going to Hawaii, the father’s words seem to show that he is aware of the changes happening to him and to Japan in an increasingly global world.

His parents take their trip to Hawaii when Sugihara is in the third year of middle school. Disappointed by his father’s capitulation to what he feels is decadent capitalist behavior, Sugihara agrees to the change to South Korean nationality but refuses to go with his parents to Hawaii. Rather than become an activist for the Korean Japanese cause, however, he opts to go to a Japanese high school with the money that was put aside for his portion of the Hawaii trip. For Sugihara, looking at the broader world means first trying to address and transcend the imposition of his *zainichi* identity through an assimilation mode often adopted by minority or immigrant individuals.

Later, towards the end of the novel, when Sugihara sharply criticizes his father for being sentimental after the father receives news that his brother, Sugihara’s uncle, Dong-gil 東吉 (Te-hyon in the film,) had died in

North Korea, the father gives Sugihara another beating. Upon further reflection, the father displays once again an awareness of the larger issues at stake when he states, “This country [Japan] is gradually starting to change. There will surely be more changes from now on. Being *zainichi* or Japanese won’t matter any more, I’m sure. That’s why your generation should live with your eyes towards the outside world.” 「この国もだんだん変わり始めている。これからもっと変わって行くはずだ。在日だとか日本人だとか、そういうのは関係なくなっていくよ。きっと。だから、おまえたちの世代は、どんどん外に目を向けて生きてくべきだ」 216. At that point, Sugihara comes to a sort of epiphany and realizes that the reason his father changed from North to South Korean nationality was not for the purpose of going to Hawaii but in order too make it easier for his son to succeed in Japan. It is here that Sugihara utters the borderless, anti-identitarian line: “One day, I will erase national borders for you.” 「いつか、俺が国境線をけしてやるよ」 217. The father represents the older generation but is clearly showing the way to a better future for Sugihara.

Obvious from the above is the importance of Sugihara’s relationship with his father—as I noted, the father’s character combines violent behavior and sage advice. Like many first generation immigrants, he is a self-made man. Not only has he read his Marx, he has also read his Nietzsche, all on his own. He was a professional boxer and now runs several shops where pachinko winnings are exchanged for prizes. The father’s violence is often directed at his son, who ends up bloody and occasionally gets a tooth knocked out. We also witness other examples of violence and destruction of property, violence being viewed, perhaps stereotypically, as a common element in the *zainichi* community. As is the case of many recent Japanese films, from *Suicide Club*, to *Battle Royale*, to *Ichi the Killer*, *GO* the film contains several scenes where blood freely flows.³

As it takes its detours, the novel and film focus on various aspects of Sugihara’s life-style, cultural tastes, acquaintances, and educational situations. We see him hanging out with other *zainichi* students and indulging in delinquent behavior, often getting in trouble with the police. We see him having meals at a Korean barbecue restaurant run by a

classmate of his mother's. His mother takes refuge there when she leaves her husband after an argument, a frequent occurrence in the novel. The classmate, Naomi-san, becomes a different woman in the film where her part is played by a stylish young Korean actress with no avowed connection to the mother and, as part of a general cinematic cleansing, the husband-wife arguments are greatly downplayed.

Sugihara attends a *sōren*-sponsored elementary and middle school 民族学校. He is disillusioned by the Korean school because of its regimented ways, especially its regularly scheduled assemblies 総括 and practice of self-criticism 自己批判. His attitude earns him the title "The biggest dunce at the Korean school since its founding." 民族学校開校以来のバカ. When his teacher finds out he intends to enter a Japanese high school and that he's changed his nationality to South Korea, the teacher starts giving him a beating, calling him a anti-nationalist 民族反逆者 and a traitor 売国奴; at this point, one student comes to his aid, uttering the words: "We have never ever had a nation of our own" 「僕たちは国なんてものを持ったことはありません」. This student is Jong-il.

Besides his father and Sakurai, Jong-il is the other main character in *GO*. Jong-il's father is a South Korean national, but his mother is Japanese. The novel presents different ways of being Korean Japanese, thereby showing that the *zainichi* community is not a monolithic entity. Jong-il's father left home when he was three; his mother, who does not speak Korean, takes multiple jobs and manages to put him into the *Sōren*-run Korean school. In contrast to Sugihara, Jong-il is considered to be "the brightest student at the Korean school since its founding" 開校以来の秀才 and in him, Sugihara finds a classmate whose interests serve to inspire him to studious endeavors. He receives from Jong-il a copy of *Romeo and Juliet*, and they often discuss artistic, intellectual, and political matters. Jong-il's fate is to be stabbed to death by a Japanese student on a train platform when he tries to help a Korean Japanese woman who is being harrassed by the student. We discover afterwards that Jong-il had loaned several other books of fiction and art and also music CDs to Sugihara.

In addition to Jong-il, other characters that appear are Tawake [goof-

off]-sempai, an exceptionally fast runner given to delinquent behavior, Katō, not *zainichi* and the son of a yakuza boss, Motohide, who is always quick to seek revenge, and Miyamoto, who organizes an exclusive *zainichi* Korean club (Miyamoto does not appear in the film) that Sugihara refuses to join.

After giving up his own delinquent behavior and devoting himself to his studies, Sugihara manages to enter a low-ranking Japanese high school. As we are shown it, his main activity at the school consists of aggressively accommodating the Japanese students who individually challenge him to fights. He easily defeats all of them. One of the challengers is Katō, the son of a yakuza, who turns out to be the link to his encounter with Sakurai and the beginning of his “story of love.”

Sugihara’s relationship with Sakurai begins when she approaches him at Katō’s birthday party, which is held at a disco. After a few minutes of small talk, they leave the disco without dancing and walk to the grounds of an elementary school where they talk. They then kiss for the first time before parting—the kiss is omitted in the film. After the initial encounter, they date regularly discovering as they do so that they share many interests, such as a love of music and films, the main path through which their relationship develops. The novel in fact lists the many names of the singers and titles of films, all Western, the two recommend to each other: for example, Lou Reed, Jimmy Hendricks, Bob Dylan, Tom Waits, John Lennon, and Eric Clapton (Sugihara), and Miles Davis, Bill Evans, Oscar Peterson, Dexter Gordon, Milt Jackson, Ella Fitzgerald, Mozart, Debussy, and Richard Strauss (Sakurai). Sugihara confesses that the only one of her favorites he didn’t like was John Coltrane. Sakurai particularly liked one of his favorite films, Bruce Lee’s “Fists of Fury,” while he liked “One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest.” They also eagerly “dig up” 発掘 new cultural objects, especially new writers, songs, and films, all of foreign origin: Dashiell Hammett, Raymond Carver, Elvis Costello, R.E.M., Chronos Quartet, Egon Schiele, Andrew Wyeth, etc. The impressively varied list attests, of course, to the Kaneshiro’s own extensive and discriminating knowledge of Western culture.

Their relationship develops much more slowly in the novel than in the film, even though the space devoted to it is relatively short in terms of the novel as a whole. The film consistently omits mention of specific items and, by collapsing, in this case, the moments the two spend together, over-emphasizes the spontaneous and sexual aspect of their relationship. The majority of their dates, in the novel, take place at Sakurai's home, where her father has built an AV room in the basement. Their activities consist of spending the whole day watching film, like the "Godfather" trilogy, or listening to music, or just petting (without intercourse) while listening to music. When Sugihara shows a keen interest in the immigrant story that underlies Coppola's epic films, Sakurai laughs him off with a comment that such matters are beyond her.

After Jong-il's death, Sakurai seeks to comfort Sugihara, tells him she will spend the night with him, goes with him to a hotel. As they are about to make love for the first time, Sugihara feels compelled to reveal to her his *zainichi* identity. Sakurai, surprised by the sudden confession, instinctively recoils and tells Sugihara that she can understand intellectually that nationality doesn't matter but is afraid at the thought of him entering her body. She tells him that her father had warned her not to date Korean or Chinese boys because their "blood was dirty" 「血が汚い」. Sugihara leaves the hotel and doesn't hear from Sakurai for about half a year, when she calls him on Christmas Eve. During the interim, we get further detours through Sugihara's daily activities. On Christmas Eve, they meet at the same elementary school playground as they did earlier and both novel and film end with the two of them walking off into the snowy night, uncertain of their future. The last line of the novel is Sakurai's voice saying, "Let's go" 「行きましょう」。

As has occasionally become the case in recent times, the film was partly a joint venture between Tōei and a Korean company and it was released in Japan and Korea at the same time. As I have noted, the director is Japanese, but the major parts are played by Japanese actors. The film received many cinematic prizes and is notable for its use of two rising young stars, Kubozuka Yōsuke and Shibasaki Kō, who play Sugihara and Sakurai, and two popular older actors, Yamazaki Tsutomu and Ōtake

Shinobu, who play Sugihara's parents. In this respect, the film is no different from other Japanese films that use currently popular young actors—Shibasaki has appeared in films like *Battle Royale* 『バトル・ロワイヤル』 and TV *dorama*, and Kubozuka has likewise played in several recent films, like *Laundry*, and TV *dorama*.⁴ A few Korean actors are given minor roles in the film but the casting seems to have been clearly designed with an eye to marketability and profit.⁵ Kubozuka possesses a wild, raw quality that makes it is easy to believe that he is foreign (yet not too foreign) and Shibasaki also looks unlike your typically *kawaii* Japanese idol.

Also in the interests of marketability, perhaps, or due to the director's inclinations, much of the political aspects of the novel are erased or commodified, as are its globalizing or cosmopolitan aspects. I have noted the omission of the lists of items that Sugihara and Sakurai discover or like but other similar items are omitted. Of course, a film cannot be completely faithful to a novel; as with any reading, it will select certain elements and omit others. The choices in this case seem to have been based on a concerted effort not to be faithful to politicizations or complications in the novel but rather to create a chic, hip, technologically sophisticated film that can be enjoyed by contemporary audiences used to watching anime and playing video games. In producing such a product, the choices ultimately compromise what I am calling the through-going irony and possibility for dis-location of commonly held assumptions about culture and ethnicity in the novel. The cameo appearance of Hirata Mitsuru at the Korean barbecue *yakiniku* restaurant is an example of some of the choices—a gratuitous in-joke scene that has absolutely nothing to do with the novel or the storyline. What the film does effectively, however, is create a sense of energy and movement as the director frequently uses jump cuts and flashbacks and scenes of running, running away, and other kinds of rapid movement. The sense of motion, of “go,” or “going,” is central to the novel and film, and if extrapolated to a theoretical level might provide a metaphor for a new concept of culture; that is, continual movement without a destination specified in advance. Also, while the novel is very specific as to geographical location, the film de-localizes places by eliminating geographical markers. The change may have been made to produce a more “global” film, but another by-product is that it strengthens

the novel's allegorical aspects.

If the film engages wholeheartedly in a systematic de-politicization, does the novel then do a better job of promulgating a political message, if there is indeed a political message to promulgate?

Yes and no.

As my comments at the beginning of this essay suggest, without what might be called a rigorous politics of autonomy and respect for the other (neither an ethnicized other nor a non-“foreign” other, both of which would participate in an identity politics of the self-same) that brings with it a concomitant erasure of self-centeredness, or self-love, the heretofore mentioned cultural aporia cannot be addressed. As long as the discourse remains staunchly within the framework of the nation-state, as long as there can be talk about erasing borders, or selling nationalities, no opening up to the other, *without* being, as it were, already given to the other, can occur. The cooptation of the novel by the film in several ways becomes, then, merely a more visible example of the cooptation of the novel by preconceived notions of culture. Sugihara makes the following remark at the end of the novel when he meets Sakurai at the playground:

“At times, I really feel like killing every one of you Japanese. How can you guys call me *zainichi* without questioning it at all? I was born in this country; I was raised here. Don't call me with a name you use for those resident American soldiers or resident Iranians who came from outside the country. Calling me *zainichi* means that you guys expect me to get out of this country one day. Do you get it? Have you thought of that even once?” 「俺は、おまえら日本人のことを、時々どいつもこつもぶっ殺してやりたくなるよ。おまえら、どうしてなんの疑問もなく俺のことを在日だなんて呼びやがるんだ？俺はこの国で生まれてこの国で育ってるんだぞ。在日米軍とか在日イラン人みたいに外から来てる連中と同じ呼び方するんじゃねえよ。在日って呼ぶってことは、おまえら、俺がいつかこの国から出てくよそ者って言ってるようなもんなんだぞ。分かってんのかよ。そんなこと一度も考えたことあんのかよ。」 234.

The remark does not appear in the film. Sugihara then makes a more extreme comment, greatly abbreviated in the film:

“I’m neither *zainichi* nor South Korean nor North Korean nor Mongolian...I’m me. No, I even hate being me. I want to be free from being me...You assholes will die trapped in your nation, your land, your titles, your inheritances, your traditions, your culture. Shit, shit, why am I saying this?” 俺は在日でも韓国人でも朝鮮人でもモンゴロイドでもねえんだ。。。俺は俺なんだ。いや、俺は俺であることも嫌なんだよ。俺は俺であることから解放されたいんだ。。。おまえらは国家とか土地とか肩書きとか因襲とか伝統とか文化とかにしばられたまま、死んでいくんだ。。。ちくしょう、ちくしょう、俺はなんでこんなこと言ってんだ？。。。」 234-235.

The “Shit, shit” 「ちくしょう、ちくしょう」, which the film retains, is quite effective. No matter how much Sugihara screams, no matter what he says, nothing will fundamentally change. At this point, Sakurai comes to his rescue and delivers a long account about the time she first saw him playing in a basketball game—this crucial utterance, of course, is also omitted in the film. Yukisada makes the scene she describes the opening sequence of the film. What her speech does is change the register of Sugihara’s speech from the political to the personal and sexual. She wants to tell Sugihara how much he touched her physical being. Her speech, however, ends up echoing the way that certain minorities are stereotypically portrayed. Sugihara becomes an example of one of Yamada Eimi’s black or ethnicized men who can turn-on dominant-culture women in a way that men of their own culture cannot. The incident happened when Sakurai happened to be passing by and Sugihara had given her the look of a wild, raging beast as he was being escorted off the basketball court for his violent behavior. Sakurai now confesses: “when you glared at me, a chill ran down my spine, like worms were crawling at the center of my being; then I realized that I was wet...that was a first for me.” 「背筋がぞくっとして、体の中心がもぞもぞする感じがあって、気がついたら、ぬれてたの。。。わたし、そういうの初めてだった」 238.

Sakurai’s lines suggest that sexual forces are powerful enough to

transcend questions of nationality. They form a pair with Sugihara's assertions at the beginning of the novel that this will be the story of his love affair. While the appeal to sex, as always, constitutes a dynamic moment—Sakurai's speech is cut from the film—it does not directly address the cultural aporia that I have been noting and merely plays to the expectations of the novel's readership or the film's viewing audience.

Given the youthfulness of the characters, a certain opening up of one to the other does in fact take place. And, given the highly uncertain future of their relationship, we are at one of those liminal moments when fundamental changes could very well occur. At its best moments, *GO*, through Sugihara, initiates an opening up, not only of Japanese culture, but also of Korean Japanese culture, and not in a simply pluralistic or multicultural way. But it is also certain, given the events that transpire, that this highly productive uncertainty will be ultimately coopted and resolved for the two lovers by the regime of Japanese culture.

To bring this essay to a close, we can suggest that an implicit domination of nature, as of cultural others, lies at the foundation of the notion of culture. Culture tied to the nation-state, like the farms operated by agribusiness conglomerates, can only be a monoculture where forces of diversity are continuously blunted. In the playing out of cultural formations, nature is mercilessly objectified and effectively de-naturalized. Within the resulting nation-state context of culture, the necessity of making reparations for its brutal acts is duly recognized and nature gets re-naturalized. This "nature" is elevated into an ideal (rustic, idyllic, magical, etc.) that can be further commodified and marketed. At the moment of idealization, "nature" can only be a horribly disfigured ghost of what it is or might have been.

The above is similar to what is made of Sugihara, in both the novel and the film. First, he is othered into an object, a minority object, of domination. Then, for the dominant culture to consider itself cultured, it needs to reclaim that other into its smothering embrace. Here, Sugihara is once again "naturalized," but now twice over. First, he will be "cultivated" by the educational system, a process through which he can attempt to erase