

Body Text

Volume 2, Issue 1

2012-2013

“Heavyweights: An Interpretive Boxing Match of Freud & Foucault’s Theories of Sexuality” by **Ryan Rebel** ’14. “Imperial Ephemerality: Passing the Burden” by **Neilay Shah** ’14. “Is the Past the Future? 20th Century Historicism & the Philosophy of Music” by **Micah Walter** ’14. “Intimate Occupation: Constructing the ‘Official’ Story of Japanese War-Brides” by **Lizzie Douglas** ’13.

*John B. Hurford '60 Center for the Arts and Humanities
Haverford College*

Body Text → Volume 2, Issue 1

Formerly the Haverford Journal, founded 2004

Published by the Body Text Editorial Board

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Jacob Horn '13

BOARD MEMBERS

Sydney Jones '15

Emma Lumeij '16

Mary Clare O'Donnell '14

Emily Starace '13

Samuel Warren '16

PRODUCTION

Jacob Horn '13

DESIGN

Duncan Cooper

ADVISOR

James Weissinger

John B. Hurford '60 Center for the Arts and Humanities
Haverford College

Body Text is published annually by the *Body Text* Editorial Board at Haverford College, 370 Lancaster Avenue, Haverford, PA 19041. Formerly the *Haverford Journal*, which was founded in the spring of 2004 by Robert Schiff in an effort to showcase some of Haverford's best student work in the humanities and social sciences, the publication was renamed in 2012 but still holds true to this original mission.

Student work appearing in *Body Text* is selected by the Editorial Board, which puts out a call for papers at the end of every semester. Entries are judged on the basis of academic merit, clarity of writing, persuasiveness, and other factors that contribute to the quality of a given work.

All works cited as in the original text.

© 2013 Body Text

Table of Contents

Editors' Introduction	4
Heavyweights: An Interpretive Boxing Match of Freud & Foucault's Theories of Sexuality	
Ryan Rebel '14	7
Imperial Ephemerality: Passing the Burden	
Neilay Shah '14	22
Is the Past the Future? 20th Century Historicism & the Philosophy of Music	
Micah Walter '14	48
Intimate Occupation: Constructing the "Official" Story of Japanese War-Brides	
Lizzie Douglas '13	66
Acknowledgments	93

Editors' Introduction

⋮ bod•y text

⋮ noun (usu. **the body text**)

⋮ the main part of a printed text; excluding
⋮ items such as headings and footnotes

(New Oxford American Dictionary 2nd edition © 2005 by Oxford University Press, Inc.)

After *Body Text*'s phoenix-like rise from the ashes of *The Haverford Journal* last year, the board has spent the better part of the past two semesters soliciting and reviewing essays from the student body. Committed as we are to promoting a sphere for interdisciplinary academic conversation, we are excited to have compiled a series of essays that we hope will speak to new understandings of what academic work on our campus is and can be.

With the arrival of two new freshman voices, and one board member off enjoying literary culture in Berlin for the spring, we set about the task of gleaning from a promising virtual pile of Google Docs essays that worked in creative ways, with an eye-opening take on their discipline. In the never-ending battle between style and clarity however, essays that refused to compromise one for the other emerged as clear favorites. Content-wise we seemed collectively in favor of essays that sought to unite disparate histories, past and present, theory and intimate life, in innovative ways.

Though we work through an anonymous review process—and thus can't claim credit for being able to start our issue with a writer who has the most publishable name on campus—Ryan Rebel's philosophical boxing match between Freud and Foucault demanded an audience. In the one corner we have Postmodernist Michel, in the other, the "libidinal lumberjack," "incredible, Oedipal" Sigmund Freud, each with their theories of sexuality at the ready. While modernism and postmodernism duke it out, on the global stage, Americans are busy taking up the white man's burden at the waning of the British Empire in Neilay Shah's *Imperial Ephemerality*. Delving into the hidden and partially forgotten history of a U.S. immigration act passed in 1946, the expansion of citizenship serves as a tool in larger power plays for imperial influence. This untold history is further refracted through the intimate lives of the politician, diplomat, and businessman who orchestrated it.

From the history and politics of intimacy we move to *Is the Past the Future?* with Micah Walter's reading of American composer George Rochberg. Variouslly seen as modernist, neoclassicist, regressive, neo-conservative, progressive, historicist and modern, Rochberg placed his music in conversation with the past in order to reorganize and shape the present and future. To end the issue, we chose a final twist of the politics of the past, returning again to the fraught relationship of race and intimacy in United States history. In *Intimate Occupation*, Lizzie Douglas sheds light on the acts of American soldiers in Japan following World War II, previously silenced by the official narrative of post-war fraternization.

With a new year upon us, we, the Editorial Board finds itself preoccupied with the prospect of new members and the launch of a new zine. Online and in physical reality, the campus can look forward to swimming in mind expanding musings. You can find us expanding the space for student thought beyond classroom discussion and the confines of the double-spaced, 12-point font page. Now, read on—and remember, as you sit, sleep-deprived and curled over a keyboard, that somewhere beyond the caffeinated haze, you could be seeing your words in print.

Now, read on—and remember, as you sit, sleep-deprived, curled over a keyboard in Magill Library in the last days of finals, that somewhere beyond the caffeinated haze, this time next year you could be seeing your words in print.

Cheers,
Body Text's Board of Editors

Jacob Horn '13

Emily Starace '13

Mary Clare O'Donnell '14

Sydney Jones '15

Emma Lumeij '16

Samuel Warren '16

Heavyweights

An Interpretive Boxing Match of Freud & Foucault's Theories of Sexuality

Ryan Rebel '14

ABSTRACT

My essay "Heavyweights" pits the theories of Sigmund Freud and Michel Foucault against each other. The analysis attempts to parse out which of these seemingly contradictory theories is more solid and useful, if either. The essay also attempts to understand, and perhaps reconcile, the differences between the two theories—that of the structuralist psychoanalyst and that of the post-modern historicist. This is accomplished through an exploration of both theories, and how each theory deals with the claims raised by the other.

This competition between these two theorists is actualized within the essay as a heavyweight boxing match between Freud and Foucault, narrated by a period-specific and enthusiastic announcer. The interspersal of this narration attempts to push the boundaries of what can be considered an "essay", as well as explore what it means to pit two theories against each other in the hopes of finding which is "better."

Here it is, ladies and gents, the match you've all been waiting for. For those of you listening at home, I'm broadcasting this year's annual Thrashin' Theorists Heavyweight Tournament from Sexuality Stadium. Tonight's fisticuffs smackdown is gonna be gonzo! Grade- A! Gangbusters! The contestants are taking their places in the ring now.

In the challenger's corner, we have a young upstart whipper-snapper fresh off his triumph over Chargin' Chomsky in the semifinal round. This fella's been dealing discursive regimes of smackdown against all odds. Standing at five foot six inches, two hundred thirteen pounds, sharp-eyed and fleet-footed: The Subjugated Soldier, Prince of Power, Hegemon of History, the Postmodernist Menace Michel Fooouuuuuu-caaault!!!!

In the defending champion's corner, standing at five eight, a staunch two hundred seventy-nine pounds, the grandest of the theorists: The Libidinal Lumberjack, The King of Cathexis, The Sultan of Psychoanalysis, The Incredible Oedipal Sigmund Freeeeeeuuuddd!!!

We all know Sigmund Freud. Despite countless challengers, he has maintained his position at the top of the totem pole through a rigorous regime of Therapy and Technique. None can compare to the strength of his body of work—or the work of his body.

Michel Foucault has been the surprise of this competition, ladies and gents. This young French lad tells us his fists are named Discipline and Punish, and so far they have lived up

to those monikers. Despite his wiry frame, this fellow's got power—though nobody really knows where it comes from! Here's the bell...!

Foucault's book *The History of Sexuality* acts in many ways as a direct challenge to Sigmund Freud's work with psychoanalysis. Freud's theory is structuralist, all-encompassing, and explanatory; these are the qualities, among others, that Foucault objects to. He claims that "the attempt to think in terms of a totality has in fact proved a hindrance to research" (Foucault, *Power* 81). Foucault's work instead errs on the side of caution. He provides historical analysis, with the barest of theoretical structures knotting his narratives together. These two theorists' methods are often taken as directly opposed to each other, and indeed Foucault spends much of *The History of Sexuality* attacking Freud's work explicitly and implicitly. What if, instead, these theorists were placed in conversation with each other? Could any of their ideas be reconciled? Or would one prevail over the other? This essay tracks the blows that these two theories exchange, and suggests who, if anyone, "wins" the theoretical dogfight.

Sweet Siggy Freud comes out swinging! He appears to be using the recently-adopted Dora fighting form that he established while in an apprenticeship with a young pugilist of the same name. The form has major weaknesses, but it carries the element of surprise. Competitors have cited difficulties with interpreting his movements the same way every time!

Foucault, meanwhile, dodges and parries Freud's haymakers with ease. He's as slippery as a madman! He appears to be

waiting for just the right historical window to launch a counterattack...

Dora: An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria is one of Freud's most famous published case studies. Rather than explicating his theory, Freud provides a retrospectively cobbled-together account of a series of psychoanalytic sessions he carried on with a young woman named Dora. Throughout the book, Freud continually makes surprising and, in his reckoning, insightful interpretations of Dora's psychic state. He does this through dream interpretation and therapeutic analysis sessions. His belief in his own analytic capabilities and the feats they can accomplish are evident in his attitude. After he makes a particular interpretation about some dream imagery Dora has provided, he claims:

There is a great deal of symbolism of this kind in life, but as a rule we pass it by without heeding it. When I set myself the task of bringing to light what human beings keep hidden within them, not by the compelling power of hypnosis, but by observing what they say and what they show, I thought the task was a harder one than it really is. He that has eyes to see and ears to hear may convince himself that no mortal can keep a secret. If his lips are silent, he chatters with his finger-tips; betrayal oozes out of him at every pore. And thus the task of making conscious the most hidden recesses of the mind is one which it is quite possible to accomplish. (Freud, *Dora* 69).

This vivid imagery amounts to a privileging of Freud's own expertise as analyst, although the language of the analyst being able to "convince himself" that no mortal can keep a secret is a curiosity that this essay will return to. At any rate, the truth of

the individual seems to be always beneath the surface, ready to emerge, but totally hidden from the individual's conscious mind. This is why the analyst must make an interpretation from the material he is given—in essence, he reads the text of the patient: “It is easy to learn how to interpret dreams, to extract from the patient's associations his unconscious thoughts and memories, and to practise similar explanatory arts: for these the patient himself will always provide the text” (Freud, Dora 107). An individual is constituted by his sexual drives, and Freud as psychoanalyst is well-versed in navigating these winding drives, such that he is qualified to construct a narrative that explains the individual's maladies, and establish a transference relationship that allows the seeds of that “truth” to germinate and expel the neurosis.

Foucault critiques Freud's ideas by situating them historically and thereby explaining why Freud's theories were less discoveries of the truth, and more products of a peculiar historical moment. Foucault's *The History of Sexuality* is a historical-theoretical analysis of the post-eighteenth century change in perspectives about sexuality, a phenomenon which he calls the incitement to discourse. Instead of couching his theory in the ways that human beings have supposedly always functioned, Foucault frames specific historical moments, and shows the effects of certain historical trends and tendencies. “The society that emerged in the nineteenth century—bourgeois, capitalist, or industrialist society, call it what you will—did not confront sex with a fundamental refusal of recognition. On the contrary, it put into operation an entire machinery for producing true discourses concerning it. Not only did it speak of sex and compel everyone to do so; it also set out to formulate the uniform

truth of sex” (Foucault, *Sexuality* 69). Here Foucault dismantles the myth that sexual repression used to be less present in times past, a myth that had allowed Freud to construct a convincing theory of the repression of sexuality as the constituting factor of all the social-biological drives of the individual. Instead, Freud is the prime example for Foucault’s point that in lieu of the purported modern emphasis on repression, discourses on sex actually proliferated in a covert form. As Freud himself puts it, “It is possible for a man to talk to girls and women upon sexual matters of every kind without doing them harm and without bringing suspicion upon himself... The best way of speaking about such things is to be dry and direct; and that is at the same time the method furthest removed from the prurience with which the same subjects are handled in ‘society’” (Freud, *Dora* 41). The incitement to discourse about sexuality took the form of confession, or scientific observation, or religious discourse, or many others, and they all sought to uncover some hidden truth about sex, just as Freud attempts to find for Dora in *Dora*. This truth about sex, however, is historically constructed just like the incitement to discourse. Foucault argues that the truth was never there to be repressed—rather, the idea of it was created as a red herring, the impetus for a perpetual cat and mouse game that generated tension and pleasure in both those who were hiding their deepest “secrets” and those who were seeking to uncover them. Foucault’s historical analysis is damning for Freud’s psychoanalysis, which is in essence a tool for uncovering buried truths about the sexuality of individuals.

Foucault further connects his theory of incitement to discourse with Freud by articulating a *scientia sexualis* that arose in the nineteenth century, and how it differs from the *ars erotica* from

other societies and other times: “our civilization possesses no *ars erotica*. In return, it is undoubtedly the only civilization to practice a *scientia sexualis*; or rather, the only civilization to have developed over the centuries procedures for telling the truth of sex which are geared to a form of knowledge-power strictly opposed to the art of initiations and the masterful secret: I have in mind the confession” (Foucault, *Sexuality* 58). Rather than finding truth in pleasure, as is the case with *ars erotica*, the *scientia sexualis* transfers truth into discourse about pleasure, or the truth separated from pleasure. No longer is pleasure directly desirable, but it is a system of smoke and mirrors designed to obfuscate the actual and simple truth of humans’ sexual natures. Foucault connects this historical phenomenon to not only the rise of science and rationality, but also the rise of capitalism: “All this garrulous attention which has us in a stew over sexuality, is it not motivated by one basic concern: to ensure population, to reproduce labor capacity, to perpetuate the form of social relations: in short, to constitute a sexuality that is economically useful and politically conservative?” (Foucault, *Sexuality* 36-7). For Foucault, there is no “normal sexuality” that is under assault by repressions and neuroses for which psychoanalysis has the curative key; sexuality is an ever-changing function of power systems and discursive regimes. The modern conception of genitally-focused “normal sexuality” arose with capitalism in order to ensure the replication of the labor force, and it became associated with science via Freud in order to lend the view credence, as well as an efficient avenue through which to be disseminated socially. Foucault’s theory sees Freud as less of a visionary and more of a convenient product of his historical circumstances.

Freud's opponents have called him pain-al retentive, and we're seeing that tonight as his fists fling forward with the weight of a blunderbuss—but none of the blows are landing! Foucault's system of movement is inscrutable, and any time Freud commits to a new course of action, Foucault just rolls with it! It's as if Foucault knows Freud's strategies before he does.

Tired of swings and misses, our defending champion is getting impatient, reckless... and Foucault scores a punishing right hook to Freud's iron jaw. The champ shrugs it off, but he's on the defensive now. Foucault sends a flurry of blows from all directions; Freud is unable to escape this historically-constructed combative moment!

And the bell rings to end the round. The judges, after some deliberation, award this round to French philosopher extraordinaire, Michel Foucault. Defending champion Sigmund Freud is on the ropes, ladies and gents, and I can assure you that his ego has taken a beating. Can he recover from the hysteria of his situation?

Rested, rehydrated, and well-read, the competitors return to their corners. There's the bell for round two. The opponents circle each other, and Foucault slides in for another volley of inscrutable attacks. But Freud blocks, dodges, and finally lands a punch! He seems to have revamped his approach to this fight...

Foucault does not dismiss Freud entirely, but he dismisses many aspects of Freud's theory as a product of his nineteenth

century sociohistorical environment. Foucault would argue that Freud is stuck, and that he cannot transcend his time period (in fact, Foucault would argue that about anyone). Invoking Freud's earlier claims about those who have "eyes to see and ears to hear", Foucault argues that, "The important thing, in this affair, is not that these men shut their eyes or stopped their ears, or that they were mistaken; it is rather that they constructed around and apropos of sex an immense apparatus for producing truth, even if this truth was to be masked at the last moment" (Foucault, *Sexuality* 56). Foucault does not dismantle all of Freud's claims, but rather relinquishes some ground on whether Freud is correct, and only argues that Freud is not self-aware, or historically variable. Although much of Freud's work is a structural description of his sociohistorical moment, which leads him to many claims about sexuality and family structure that seem ridiculous to readers today, this does not mean that his core theory is not adaptable to different sociohistorical moments. Freud's theory is not so different from Foucault's as Foucault might like. In fact, in *Three Essays on Sexuality*, Freud uses a footnote to describe an aspect of historical variability that sounds suspiciously like Foucault's distinction between *ars erotica* and *scientia sexualis*:

The most striking distinction between the erotic life of antiquity and our own no doubt lies in the fact that the ancients laid the stress upon the instinct itself, whereas we emphasize its object. The ancients glorified the instinct and were prepared on its account to honour even an inferior object; while we despise the instinctual activity in itself, and find excuses for it only in the merits of the object. (Freud, *Sexuality* 15).

Although Freud's historical language here is far less precise, this footnote is crucial in demonstrating that he does not assume his theory holds fast in its articulated form for all historical moments. Although the terminology of instinct and object still applies to the "ancients", the construction of the sexual being was once different than it is now—focused more, as Foucault argued, on pleasure/instinct than the nature/truth of the object-choice.

A careful reading of Freud's theory can also resist Foucault's argument that the will for knowledge and truth constituted the creation of a discourse of the truth of sexuality, instead reversing that dynamic. Freud argues that sexual drives constitute the instinct for knowledge: "Its activity corresponds on the one hand to a sublimated manner of obtaining mastery, while on the other hand it makes use of the energy of scopophilia... the instinct for knowledge in children is attracted unexpectedly early and intensively to sexual problems and is in fact possibly first aroused by them" (Freud, *Sexuality* 60). Children are not born with the instinct for knowledge. Rather, they internalize this instinct at a young age. These drives are not purely biological; they are socially constituted as well. This means that instead of arguing that the historical moment allowed Freud to espouse his theory, Freud argues that his theory must be variable depending on the historical moment. In other words, his idea of "normal sexuality" is not static, and therefore not normative or reductive. His "normal sexuality" is a sort of social status quo, one that is unachievable, always changing, and unallowing of drastic deviations that would undermine the coherence of society. Although Freud's core theory remains the same through history, aspects such as the instinct for knowledge and

normal sexuality vary depending on the historical moment. Foucault's reading of Freud as stuck in his time and reductive is actually a reductive reading of Freud's theory.

Folks, I can't believe my eyes! Freud has made a remarkable transference between rounds. His strategy and move-set are as technically tight as they ever were, but he is adapting to each and every new challenge and difficulty that Foucault is creating for him. Freud's even-hovering attention lets him select the surest strategy, but also lets him realize that the surest strategy depends on the context of the moment! This stupendous display of foresight is too much for Foucault, and it's all he can do to remain on his feet.

The bell saves the young challenger just in time, and I think it's clear who this round will go to. Sigmund Freud is back in the match! Now the competitors take their places for the third, the final, the deciding round. They've seen each other's games. Now how will they adapt? Here's the bell!

Freud's and Foucault's theories attempt to describe the same phenomena using two different theoretical vocabularies, each of which presses back against the other. How can one determine which of them takes precedence, or if either of them can? Foucault attempts to validate his own theory by situating it within the power system he describes: "I believe that what this essentially local character of criticism indicates in reality is an autonomous, non-centralised kind of theoretical production, one that is to say whose validity is not dependent on the approval of the established régimes of thought" (Foucault, Power 81). Foucault pegs Freud's theory as a dominant knowledge, one

which attempts to restrict the flow of discourse and put down subjugated knowledges. Foucault's criticism is just such a subjugated knowledge, one which this particular historical moment calls for. Moreover, it attempts to dismantle the psychoanalyst as the dominant, infallible observer: "More than the old taboos, this [scientia sexualis] form of power demanded constant, attentive, and curious presences for its exercise; it presupposed proximities; it proceeded through examination and insistent observation" (Foucault, *Sexuality* 44). Foucault argues that this observation is not as objective and scientific as it purports to be, and that even if it were, science and objectivity are merely dominant knowledges that have no claims to ultimate truth, and restrict useful and generative criticism.

Freud can only respond by explaining why his theory is correct, and why it is useful. To return to Dora, a careful reading shows that Freud's theory is not so resistant to Foucault's brand of criticism as Foucault imagines. A simple reading would indicate that Freud is simply using his power as analyst to put words in Dora's mouth. Adding Foucault's theory of incitement to discourse actually reveals the nuance of Freud's theory. "An attempt must first be made by the roundabout methods of analysis to convince the patient herself of the existence in her of an intention to be ill" (Freud, *Dora* 38). Freud does not claim to discover the absolute truth within the patient. Instead, he only claims to convince the patient of the truth about herself. Once the patient is convinced of the interpretation, does it matter whether the interpretation is correct or not? Or rather, does not the interpretation become correct when the patient is convinced? Freud's goal as analyst is to create a narrative, one which he recognizes cannot be absolutely True (no subject nar-

rative can), but one which can be functional. Foucault's incitement to discourse may have given rise to psychoanalysis, but that does not mean that psychoanalysis is an illusion, or that it has nothing to say about the state of humanity, both across time and in certain specific historical moments. Psychoanalysis is a base from which to make social scientific truth claims, whereas Foucault's theory is a wavering, baseless criticism. Foucault may try to tear down the primacy of the figure of the psychoanalyst, but ultimately as the critic of history, Foucault's privileged position is even more precarious than that of Freud's. Freud's theory is scientific, and thereby falsifiable, whereas Foucault's is not. These two theories that seemed to stand diametrically opposed can actually be interpreted as surprisingly similar, and indeed, complementary. Foucault's attempts to take down Freud reveal the difficulties surrounding Foucault's own theory—that it is neither provable nor disprovable, but subject to the ever-changing interpretive whims of a historical analyst.

This final round is a doozy, a real smash-bang affair! Freud looks a hundred years younger as he adapts and incorporates movements from all stages of his training, and by all appearances, even adopts some of Foucault's own tricks! Foucault attempts to grapple his opponent with relative success, but the champ gives him the Freudian slip! They're going tit for tat, toe to toe, id on id. Foucault is exhausted; he's holding on for dear life against the champion's relentless ontological onslaught. Somehow though, despite his theoretically and technically superior technique, Freud is unable to land the winning blow. Foucault's form is unfalsifiable!

The bell ends the round, and the combatants return to their corners to await the results. Foucault sits, exhausted, a pool of sweat. Freud leans back, composed and inscrutable. Freud outplayed Foucault this round, but was it enough for the victory? He couldn't land a decisive hit...

The judges have declared this match a draw! Freud didn't have enough gumption to dismantle Foucault despite fighting a superior match. The fans are going nuts! Freud's supporters cry foul, and set about repressing the memory that this match ever happened. Indeed, in the event of a draw, the championship title technically stays with Freud. Foucault's fans don't seem to mind, though. They're rabid, energetic, and act as if this tie will go down in the annals of history as the greatest victory of all time.

Whichever camp you fall in, folks, you must admit that this was a fight to remember. Tune in for our next heavyweight match as The Deontological Destroyer, The Metaphysical Monarch, Immaculate Immanuel "It's Clobberin' Time" Kant takes on The Terrible Totality, The Demon of Dialectic, Jazzy Georg Wilhelm Friedrich "Hellfire" Hegel!

WORKS CITED

- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Vintage, 1990. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund, and Steven Marcus. *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. Trans. James Strachey. [New York, NY]: Basic, 2000. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Dora: An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria*. Ed. Philip Rieff. New York, NY: Collier, 1963. Print.

Imperial Ephemerality

Passing the Burden

Neilay Shah '14

ABSTRACT

This paper reads the Luce-Celler Act of 1946 as a performance of imperial transition. It focuses on the actions of merchant-cum-lobbyist J.J. Singh, congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce, and media magnate Henry Luce, and understands their intimate interactions and public demonstrations as the 'acting out' of America's rise to global preeminence. This paper argues that, by granting an immigration quota of 100 to people of Indian origin, the Luce-Celler Act served as America's re-articulation of the 'white man's burden,' and made tangible the gradual transfer of empire from Britain to the U.S. against the backdrop of the 'American Century.'

At the close of World War II, what had been gradual changes in the international balance of power came fully to fruition. The U.S. emerged as the world's lone super-power—officially replacing Great Britain as the globe's hegemon. Great Britain was losing—even relinquishing—control over its colonies, completing a process the United States had started in 1776. India, formerly the jewel of Great Britain's imperial civilizing project, was finally rising to strike the final blow to the old world order. Within this global context, the U.S. passed a progressive immigration bill against decades of conservative precedent: the Luce-Celler Act of 1946.

On July 2nd, 1946, President Truman signed the Luce-Celler Act into existence. This legislation, a response to nearly fifty years of legal contest over the status and rights of Indian immigrants in the United States, authorized the naturalization of Indian immigrants and granted an immigration quota of 100 to people of Indian origin. Considering the population of Indians in America totaled under 5000 in 1946, no Congressperson could have expected to gain the support of critical constituencies by passing this act. The act concerned a miniscule, non-citizen portion of the population, and a people only on the fringe of most Americans' awareness (as a *Time* magazine article asserted, some congress members thought the bill was about Native Americans). The impetus for the Luce-Celler Act was not domestic, but international.

The Luce-Celler Act was a performative bill that flagged the ascent of America to global stewardship and singular ownership of the 'white man's burden.' Although transnationally driven, the Luce-Celler Act could not have come to fruition if it were not for

the key characters in its production: Clare Boothe Luce, Henry Luce, and Jagjit Singh. Their acting out of the supra-individual forces of international politics through their intimate relationships made possible America's performance of hegemonic ascension in the Luce-Celler Act of 1946.

The great question facing American policy makers of the 1940s revolved around U.S. foreign policy. Should the U.S. intervene to stop Hitler's aggression in Europe? Or should the U.S. remain neutral and isolated? In other words, should the U.S. enter into an imperial battle for territory and hegemony? After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, America gave the world a resounding answer: It was in the war, and it was in it to win. Of course, the U.S. had already established itself as a pseudo-empire, having chased its 'manifest destiny' across the continent from sea to sea, and then across the seas to Puerto Rico, Cuba, Hawaii, the Philippines, and elsewhere. What separated these acts of imperialism from the Luce-Celler Act of 1946 was their intent. Prior to WWII, U.S. imperialism was an exercise in asserting U.S. relevance in the global balance of power. The U.S. was not challenging the world's empires (besides the Spanish Empire), but was establishing its place among them. During and after WWII, though, U.S. interventions abroad laid foundation for U.S. hegemony.

While most Americans were hardly aware of the presence of Indians in their own country, the presence of Indians in international politics was becoming hard to ignore as Indian independence drew nearer. On October 17th, 1940, Mahatma Gandhi initiated his individual *satyagraha* campaign, sending his top disciples to proclaim non-violent resistance to the British war

effort and to subsequently submit to arrest. By mid 1941, near twenty thousand *satyagrahis* had been convicted. In addition to this highly visible dissent was the intense violence in Bengal precipitated by the arrest of Subhas Bose in 1940. British mismanagement of the Indian independence movement became highly visible in the media. As *New York Times* book reviewer summarized it,

Hardly have the Bombay mutiny and the bloody riots following upon that historic event subsided into a temporary troubled quiet when this book of short stories about India comes off the press...[these] stories enrich our comprehension of the ominously charged emotional atmosphere in which India today lives.

Americans in 1946, finally enjoying the ultimate fruits of their independence, looked on to India's independence movement with fascination, as if seeing their own historical legacy in the India of "today."

As war with Germany, and, more importantly, Japan, became increasingly inevitable, Britain and the U.S. made new attempts to appease Indian independence fighters. FDR and Winston Churchill delivered the Atlantic Charter in August of 1941, which, in part, promised U.S. and British commitment to protecting every peoples' right to self-determination. Hardly a month later, though, Churchill made clear that the Charter did not apply to sub-continental possessions of Great Britain. Still desperately needing the support of India in the war against Germany, and soon Japan, Great Britain made another attempt at reconciliation. In 1942, Churchill sent Sir. Stafford Cripps to propose that Britain would continue to control India for the

remainder of the war, and that each state would have the option to opt out of the union after the war. Gandhi rejected such a plan outright, and began the “Quit India” movement. The movement quickly fomented into riots as Gandhi lost control of his protestors and the British Raj lost control of its soldiers. Tumult in British India would frequently flood American headlines for the remainder of the independence movement. As this tumult undermined the American War efforts against Japan, British mismanagement of India became a topic of significance for U.S. newspapers.

American interests in British India increased as WWII progressed, considering its strategic importance in the war against Japan. In 1942, FDR assigned William Phillips to be his personal representative to India, and gave him the mission of understanding the “India Problem.” To understand the “India Problem” was to understand the divisions among Indians on the topic of post-independence planning—the subtext to this investigation was an attempt to discern which Indians the U.S. should be interested in. As Phillips spent more time in India, his letters to the Secretary of State began to assign more blame to Great Britain’s mismanagement of the subcontinent. On May 14, 1943, Phillips suggested that the solution to the “India Problem,” or the outcome most advantageous to American interests, would be an India unified behind the War Effort—an outcome that could only be reached if Britain were to grant India independence.

While India is broken politically into various parties and groups, all have one object in common, eventual freedom and independence from British domination.

There would seem to be only one remedy to this highly unsatisfactory situation in which we are unfortunately but nevertheless seriously involved, and that is to change the attitude of the people of India towards the war, make them feel that we want them to assume responsibilities to the United Nations and are prepared to give them facilities for doing so, and that the voice of India will play an important part in the reconstruction of the world...Even though the British should fail again it is high time that they should make a new effort to improve conditions and to reestablish confidence among the Indian people that their future independence is to be granted.

A prophetically telling piece of evidence, this personal letter from Phillips to the Secretary of State, released in the Diplomatic Papers of Foreign Relations of the United States yearly digest, clearly outlines the narrative of U.S. imperialism. The old hegemon, Britain, has lost control over its subjects, and has jeopardized the global balance of power. To rectify the situation, America must step in, pick up the reigns of empire and lead a “reconstruction of the world.”

While Americans knew almost nothing of the Indians living within their borders, they did know that the Indians of India were reminiscent of young America circa 1776, and American imperialists knew that the fight for independence in India was synonymous with the fight for a new world order—an order that would be led by the U.S.. American internationalists felt these imperial impulses during and immediately preceding WWII. Upon the completion of WWII, the U.S. found itself in a novel position. It no longer had to aspire to hegemony, for it had as-

cended to hegemony. The Luce-Celler Act of 1946 was an attempt to materialize the nascent and abstract U.S. imperialism into relationships between individuals, to make real the concept of empire through felt emotions and experiences. To understand what exactly the Luce-Celler Act hoped to materialize, though, we must understand what was at stake for the U.S.'s claims to empire in 1946.

Prior to the Luce-Celler Act of 1946, the status of Indians in America was restricted under racially discriminatory legislation. Indians, grouped with Chinese and Japanese immigrants, were tacitly denied the right to immigrate under various Chinese and Japanese exclusion acts. In the Immigration Law of 1917, India was included in a "barred zone"—along with most of western and central Asia and the Middle East—which meant it could send no emigrants to the United States. By this time, though, there were already Indians present in the U.S., some of whom were seeking naturalized citizenship.

In the *Ozawa Case* of 1922, the Supreme Court established that only people of the "Caucasian" and "Negroid" races were eligible for citizenship. Following such logic, some Indians applied for citizenship under the argument that Indians were also descendants of the Aryan race, and were therefore "Caucasian" and eligible for citizenship. This rationale was put to the test in 1923 in the watershed case *U.S. v. Bhagat Singh Thind*. Ultimately, Justice Sutherland found that Indians could not be considered "free white peoples." As the Court held, Indians "are alien to the white race and part of the 'white man's burden.'... Whatever may be the white man's burden, the Hindu does not share it, rather he imposes it." On the basis of being the *objects*

of the white man's burden, rather than the bearers, Indians remained prohibited from the right to immigrate or naturalize. Interestingly, race was not delineated by skin color, but by imperial obligation—the ruling in this court case speaks to the impulse underlying the Luce-Celler Act. To pick up the mantle of the white man's burden in 1946, the U.S. had to redefine the 'white man' for the new era. By deciding to acknowledge Indians' rights to citizenship, the U.S. effectively redefined access to the white man's burden. By claiming authority over the construction of imperial morality, the U.S. expropriated the white man's burden, redrawing it along an American imperial morality.

As the U.S. began to size up the threats of fascism and communism in the 1940's, it became more acutely aware of the international implications of domestic racial discrimination. After all, how could the U.S. expect to win friendship abroad in the emerging nations of Asia and Africa while racial discrimination ran rife within its law codes? As historian Mary Dudziak explains, "the diplomatic impact of race in America was especially stark" considering that the "international perceptions of American democracy were thought...to ensure that democracy would be appealing to newly independent nations in Asia and Africa." American anxiety over such concerns was well warranted. After WWII, Soviet anti-American propaganda repeatedly criticized the U.S. for failing to eliminate domestic racial discrimination, a message that resonated in nations just beginning to cast off the yoke of the 'white man's burden.' The U.S. could not make a convincing sell to emerging nations if its freedom, capitalism and democracy came tainted with racism and inequality. With eyes directed outward, the U.S. developed a new interest in re-

ducing the racial discrimination of its immigration codes in the 1940's.

The allure of the Indian market for American goods, as well as the role India had played in WWII, also contributed to America's interest in revising its immigration policies toward India. In an anonymous brief Congresswoman Luce received on American interests in India, India's large, even if poor, market was cited as a chief interest. "America needs to export. America needs friendly nations who will welcome American exports. India is a cash customer and we must do all we can to be on good terms with such a good and substantial customer." Considering the U.S.'s boom in production after WWII, finding new markets to unload American goods in was a concern of critical importance, and the U.S. could not afford to lose a market of "400 million human beings." Furthermore, some Indian battalions had fought alongside British and American troops in WWII, so the U.S. felt some obligation to honor India's wartime support. Perhaps more significantly, some Indian troops, particularly those from Bengal, such as the Indian National Army, had fought *against* the Allies in WWII, siding with Germany and Japan. This animosity, in addition to the fact that Bengal had a history of communist leanings, meant the U.S. had to make extra efforts to keep the eastern arm of India from falling to the Communists, for the sake of maintaining containment strategies. These impetuses—aspirations to economic, political, and social hegemony—were the stakes of Luce-Celler Act.

With the goal at hand and the stakes set high, the necessary transnational forces were in place to catalyze the rise of U.S. hegemony—enter Sirdar Jagjit Singh, Clare Boothe and Henry

Luce. These three individuals were critical mediators of transnational forces impelling U.S. hegemonic ascension. While transnational forces may exist in the abstract, they can only become real once embodied in individuals, for they can only be expressed through the actions of those individuals. After all, perpetually preventing any change to the status quo are real anxieties, apathies, and ignorances. It takes individuals to translate abstract forces into words and actions, which carry people over these impediments to change. In the case of the Luce-Celler Act, Jagjit Singh, Clare Boothe and Henry Luce were three such individuals.

Sirdar Jagjit Singh was a “6-ft. handsome Sikh from Kashmir, [and] a confirmed bachelor.” Jagjit, more commonly known as “JJ,” had immigrated to America in 1926 and had subsequently set up an importing business by the name of Singh, Singh & Co. Singh quickly established himself as a businessman and socialite in New York City’s popular society. As a Macy’s advertisement for “The Famous Sirdar Kumar J.J. Singh Collection!” sale suggests, Singh’s importing business and name were also well established by 1939. Although Singh’s income came from the importing business, his interests were in political advocacy.

J.J. took on the mission of building a “friendship” between the United States and India—a mission he accomplished through developing a warm and charismatic public persona, as well as through cultivating personal relationships with many influential Americans. In 1938, J.J. Singh founded the India League of America, which operated as a lobby for Indian and Indian-American interests. A recent immigrant himself, he was no professional lobbyist. As *Time* described it, Singh “organized no

letter campaign, deluged no Congressmen with telegrams, threw no Scotch & soda parties in a plush hotel room. Instead he padded up & down corridors of the Congressional office building, calling on members.” Observers often noted the charisma of the “swarthy,” “handsome” bachelor, a charisma that captivated his interlocutors during intimate interactions. In 1939, Singh worked to negotiate commerce treaties with the U.S. acting as the President of the India Chamber of Commerce. These negotiations were a result of diminishing British control over Indian trade—this would not be the last time Singh would mediate the supplanting of British imperialism by U.S. imperialism. Through his career as a lobbyist, Singh developed personal connections with various Congressmen, connections that can be credited for giving momentum to the Luce-Celler Act.

Among the powerful contacts Singh established was publisher Henry Luce. Henry Luce, a widely influential periodical publisher, had a reputation for being gruff, overbearing, and impregnably austere. His influence stemmed from the influence of his periodicals: *Time*, *Fortune*, *Life*, and *Sports Illustrated*. As publisher of the four magazines that essentially shaped public opinion in his time, when Henry had an opinion, he made it heard around the world. One such opinion was his deep conviction in the ascent of American internationalism. Two months after the U.S.’s declaration of war against Japan, Henry published an article titled “The American Century” in his *Life* magazine. For the next three decades, and arguably many thereafter, “The American Century” would serve as a sort of manifesto for American internationalism. In “The American Century,” Henry expressed his conviction that America had the uniquely noble obligation to “accept wholeheartedly [its] duty

and [its] opportunity as the most powerful and vital nation in the world and in consequence to exert upon the world the full impact of [its] influence for such purposes as [it sees] fit and by such means as [it sees] fit.”

Although his essay was specifically a response to American debates over involvement in the war, its import stretched much further than that, and extended to the establishment of “*American* internationalism.” American internationalism, Henry declared, meant, “a sharing with all peoples of our Bill of Rights, our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, our magnificent industrial products, our technical skills.” Essentially, in his idea of American internationalism, Henry laid out a framework for U.S. imperialism, and a new ‘white man’s burden.’ Henry was not directly involved in politics, but he was tightly connected to many important politicians—for example, his wife, Clare Boothe Luce.

Prior to her election to Congress in 1942, Clare Boothe Luce was already an acclaimed journalist, playwright, and world traveler. A young, beautiful, and self-made woman, Clare was a highly visible public figure of her time. Even before marrying Henry Luce, Clare had made a name for herself as an ambitious journalist. In 1930, Clare weaseled her way into an open position at *Vogue* by pretending to be a new hire while *Vogue* publisher Condé Nast was out of the country. In fewer than two years, Clare had risen from illegitimate assistant to managing editor of *Vanity Fair*. In 1936, Clare published “The Women,” which was amazingly popular and garnered much acclaim. “The Women” revolves around “the infidelities, divorces, and remarriages” of an all-female cast of forty-four characters, and was the first play

to portray “a side of women’s lives that up to then had never been shown in public.”

Having established herself as an editor and a playwright, Clare branched out into world of journalism. In 1940, Clare was able to use her connection to *Life* to secure passage to Europe, then to Asia in 1941, and to Burma in 1942, as a war-reporter. Clare’s arrival in Europe was somewhat propitious—not only was she present to witness the situation of the continent immediately before the outbreak of war, she was also present during the first German air raid of England. After quickly returning to the U.S., Clare compiled her experiences and observations in Europe into a book titled *Europe in the Spring*, a pro-interventionist criticism of American and European appeasement policies. *Europe in the Spring* would be widely circulated in the years following 1940, and would inform the isolationist vs. interventionist debate of the following years. For this work, Clare earned respect as a journalist with keen insight into foreign affairs.

Clare’s insight into foreign affairs was not simply founded on her experiences in reporting on the war; it was also founded upon her unique ability to solicit information from important international figures. As biographer Joseph Lyons put it, Clare had the “uncanny ability to remain unruffled in the presence of dignitaries,” which “enabled her to earn their confidence and dispense with the formalities observed by the awestricken.” In 1933, Clare took a break from editing to tour Europe, where she met many acclaimed writers and political figures (including Winston Churchill). On her journalistic tour of Asia in 1941, Clare met Jawaharlal Nehru, whom she thought had “the greatest mind, along with that of Buckminster Fuller, she had yet

encountered.” It is possible that Clare’s encounter with Nehru would inform her involvement in the Luce-Celler Act; after all, Clare “admitted finding Nehru ‘beautiful’ and said she had fallen ‘a bit in love’ with him after their first meeting.” Everywhere she went, it seems, Clare was able to make useful friendships. Her ability to immediately dissolve professional relationships into intimate ones was perhaps Clare’s greatest political asset.

Clare served as a Congresswoman from 1942-1946, but her political career began earlier. When she was 17, Clare met Alva Etskin Belmont, “one of the richest women in America and a prominent figure in...national politics.” Belmont recognized Clare’s charisma, and offered her a job with the Women’s National Party. Although she only worked there briefly, during her time as Belmont’s assistant, Clare served to dispel “the notion that feminine activists had to be rich, chesty, old matrons or disgruntled, plain spinsters” and to provide “youth and sex appeal” to the feminist movement, as Clare’s biographer Stephen Shadegg noted.

Clare would return to politics in 1942 as the Republican Representative of Connecticut—her sex appeal remained a fascination of the media. In *Time* magazine’s coverage of Clare’s nomination to represent Connecticut in the House of Representatives, she was described as “a Congressional candidate like no other the U.S. has seen.” She was “the 3-B candidate (blonde, beautiful, brilliant)” and had a “cool certainty of poise that tongue-ties men.” Also noteworthy was the fact that she “[liked] milkshakes, and often [wrote] in bed.” The media’s attention to Clare’s corporeal presence and the intimate details of her life

were recurring impediments to her political career. Clare was often treated as a celebrity rather than a politician, as she was a conspicuous presence among the “bald, baggy and bumbling” men of Congress. The media refused to separate Clare’s gender from her politics—as a result, it is impossible to talk about her politics without mentioning the influences and impacts of her gender. Regardless, Clare was able to make her political impact felt: in addition to submitting the Luce-Celler Act, Clare voted against the poll tax, introduced bills to allow profit sharing between owners and workers in industry, disapproved of the Dies Committee (even though she was an ardent anti-Communist), and was involved in the development of the Marshall Aid Plan and the restructuring of Europe.

These three characters—JJ, Henry, and Clare—would make possible the performance of U.S. imperialism via the Luce-Celler Act by embodying and signifying shifts in larger transnational forces. Regardless of the propitious positioning of international forces in the 1940s, J.J., Henry, and Clare had serious impediments to overcome before they could perform U.S. imperialism through the Luce-Celler Act. To begin with, there were gendered and sexualized American concerns with permitting Indians to immigrate into the U.S.. Perhaps more importantly, there was also indifference among the American Congress and public alike regarding the issue of Indian immigration, for most Americans did not even know it was an *issue* to begin with. To initiate imperial momentum, J.J., Henry and Clare had first to overcome this impediment and inertia.

American anxieties over Indian immigration followed sexualized and gendered discursive lines. In the article “The West and

the Hindu Invasion,” columnist Agnes Buchanan demonstrates his fascination with Indian male bodies:

In appearance, they are striking, well-built fellows, many of them with features of Europeans. They are all born soldiers and they look it. Indeed, the bearing of our own military compare but poorly with their erect and soldierly appearance.

Two Hindus stood one day at the Ferry Building in San Francisco watching the crowds coming and going. A number of soldiers from one of the posts around the bay passed them. The foreigners laughed. “What are these?” said one in his native tongue. “I suppose they are ‘gorah logu’ (soldiers),” answered the other. Whereupon they both laughed so derisively as to convince the hearer without further argument of the estimation in which our soldiery were held.

Clearly, the presence of Indian males meant more than economic competition for Pacific Coast whites; it meant a challenge to the manhood of those whites, to their courage and strength. Interestingly, the translation offered for ‘gorah logu’ is incorrect—in this context, this phrase simply means ‘white people,’ not ‘soldiers.’ This mistranslation betrays that this anecdote is probably a fictitious account, which testifies to a deeply felt sub-cerebral American anxiety. The language of Indian immigrants subverted American power at home by escaping American understanding. Anxieties over the unmaning of American white males by Indian immigrants were accompanied by anxieties over the alleged sexual profligacy prescribed by the Hindu Vedas, which supposedly called for Hindus to “cover the earth.” In the article titled “Tide of Turbans,” a later article concerning the ensuing “Indian invasion” noted the fact that “the

Hindoos who come to the far west to work are usually bachelors or widowers. There are no women among them.” Given the superior masculinity and sexual profligacy of Indian men, and the absence of women among their camps, how could American men allow for their immigration to go unchecked?

Furthermore, popular notions of sati, or bride immolation, fed American opinion that Indians were inassimilable. As early as 1893, when Vivekananda toured the United States giving lectures on Indian spirituality, Americans consistently confronted him on the issue of *sati*. Vivekananda notes that Americans, most notably Christians, would confront him on the issue and talk of *sati* as if it were a cultural mainstay of India, when really it was a marginal and outdated tradition. As most Americans came to encounter India for the first time through their encounters with Vivekananda, his observations have a significant salience. American Christians defined their superior morality against the inferior morality of the East, which condoned egregious mistreatment of women. For this reason, the stakes of allowing Indians to assimilate were high, for doing so meant compromising a superior American morality.

Most importantly, Congress and the public were largely unaware of the issue of Indian immigration. After all, in post-war America, the Civil Rights movement, rolling back the public welfare, reconstructing an impoverished Europe, and fighting communism were Congress’s top priorities. In fact, as a result of its low priority, the Luce-Celler Act was repeatedly postponed from reaching debate. Having been tabled in 1944, the bill still had not even cleared the Senate Immigration Committee by April 17th, 1946, and was in danger of being tabled again if it did

not reach the floor “before the bills for appropriations.” Even more illustrative of the bill’s low priority was its absence in the media coverage of Congress’s dealings immediately after its passage. In the *Time* magazine issued June 17th, 1946, the Luce-Celler Act hardly received lip service. It only received a three-paragraph article titled “100 Indians,” located at the very end of the section “National Affairs.” It did not even get included in the “Work Done” article, which covered the accomplishments of Congress for the week. As the article “100 Indians” summarized it, J.J. Singh had to battle “Congressional apathy” to get this bill passed. Most Americans did not care to know about Indian immigrants, and what they did know, they did not like.

To actualize U.S. imperialism through the Luce-Celler Act, J.J., Henry and Clare had their work cut out for them. As the process of overcoming American anxieties and apathies while redefining American imaginaries was complex and multi-faceted, neither J.J., Clare, nor Henry could expect to accomplish it alone. Integral to the passage of the Luce-Celler Act were the personal relationships among its movers—relationships that could not have been so effective were it not for the charismas of J.J., Clare, and Henry.

To get the Luce-Celler Act rolling, J.J. Singh needed first to enlist political support—a mission for which his charisma would be instrumental. For his purpose, J.J. sought to enlist the political support of an ideologue—Henry Luce—and of a practitioner—Clare Boothe Luce. Enlisting the support of Henry Luce was instrumental to Singh’s cause because of what Henry represented. Henry, after having published “The American Century” in 1941, came to represent American internationalism. For this

purpose, J.J. invited Henry to be an honorary member of the India League's Board of Directors. By making Henry a member of the League, J.J. co-opted his support for the League's initiatives. By co-opting Henry's support, J.J. effectively reframed the issue of Indian immigration rights as in the interest of U.S. imperialism and hegemony.

J.J. also used his charisma to secure a political, and personal, relationship with Congresswoman Luce. Although their relationship was premised on a political agenda, a close reading of the personal correspondence between J.J. Singh and Clare Boothe Luce indicates that their relationship was far more friendly than professional. After receiving Luce's response to his brief letter of introduction, Singh responded with a letter addressed "Dear Clare," immediately dissolving the pretensions of professional titles. Speaking in the first person—though speaking on behalf of the India League—J.J. conveys his "[terrible]" disappointment that Clare will not be able to join the India League for its banquet. He goes on to express his faith in Clare, asserting that he is "counting on [her] to carry the fight for India and China...in the Foreign Affairs Committee," obliging her to act on his interest after having only just introduced himself to her in the previous letter. J.J. concludes the letter by imploring Clare to meet with him, for he "just must see [her], for more than one reason." In his letter to "Clare," J.J. primarily focuses on flattering her, and covers little business. His words work to dissolve the professionalism around their political correspondence, and to coax Clare into meeting with him physically. J.J. defers discussion of business until he can meet with Clare personally to establish an intimate, mutual understanding.

A year later, after their relationship had further developed, the nature of the relationship between Singh and Luce became no less intimate—if anything, any airs of professionalism in the relationship had dissolved all together. Consider J.J.’s letter to Clare on September 2nd, 1943, sent soon after he had met with Clare to introduce her to Jawarlal Nehru’s niece’s:

Dear Clare,

Please accept belated thanks for a delightful and most enjoyable afternoon and evening. The girls fell in love with you. I am not saying a word about myself—that is an old story.

-JJ

P.S.: Girls have left your coat with me. I would like to hold it and give it to you only if you would have breakfast-lunch-cocktails-dinner or supper with me.

-JJ

J.J.’s *handwritten* letter to Clare thanks her for a “delightful” evening. He does not allude to any business conducted during the meeting, and, in fact, makes it quite clear that the meeting was purely for entertainment. Elucidating his ability to endear, J.J. flatters Clare, unashamedly professing his plutonic love for her, and signs off as “JJ.” Furthermore, in his post-script statement, J.J. compels Clare to meet with him once more, refusing to return her coat otherwise. In her response, Clare reciprocates JJ’s affection, signing off with “It was great fun seeing you.” J.J. and Clare’s relationship quickly became something much more than professional. The two would even meet during Clare’s summer vacations in “Greenwich” to play “[games] of tennis”;

for all the business it facilitated, J.J. and Clare's relationship was "fun." Such an amicable relationship, though, facilitated the necessary exchange of political information between J.J. and Clare to make possible the Luce-Celler Act of 1946.

The intimate relationship between Singh and Clare served as the foundation for the Luce-Celler Act in two ways. Through their relationship, J.J. was able to retain Clare's attention to the topic of Indian immigration, and was able to network her into the information sources and political alliances critical to the production and passing of the Luce-Celler Act. Their intimacy also yielded dividends to the progress of the bill in the form of speeches and political favors J.J. could solicit and secure from Clare.

As Clare was personally connected to J.J., she was also intimately connected to the Indian immigration rights movement *through* J.J. As the president and chief lobbyist of the India League, J.J. sat amidst a far-reaching network of Asian immigrants with interests in pushing forward Asian immigration law reform. Furthermore, J.J. was known for making personal acquaintance with Congress members, so he served as an effective political nexus. It was J.J. who initially suggested to Clare that the topic of Indian immigration be discussed as beneficial to U.S. military interests. Alluding to his connections to high-ranking sources of knowledge and authority, J.J. wrote to Clare: "Somebody very important told me this the other day—'We must have friendly populace around American bases.' This could be the theme of your talk." As Clare put it, J.J. often sent Clare "notes, suggestions, facts or fancies on a case from America's own self-interested point of view" for why America should

support the interests of Indian immigrants, and often shared his opinions on the political strategies that surrounded the bill's progress.

Furthermore, J.J. was even responsible for putting Clare and Congressman Celler in touch. After providing some constructive criticism on a draft of Clare's bill, J.J. goes on to explain that "on Monday, the 27th, I had a long talk with Congressman Celler and gave him a copy of your bill. I asked him to get in touch with you." Sure enough, a telegram from Congressman Celler soon arrived at Congresswoman Luce's office. J.J., who had developed personal and intimate connections with various Congressmen, authorities, and experts, was able to network Celler and Luce, and was able to connect both of them to the information they needed to back their bill.

With their intimate relationship as leverage, Singh was also able to solicit various speeches and statements of support from Clare successfully. Luce rarely, if ever, performed these speeches herself—in fact, she was not even present during the hearing before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization for her own bill, and as the Chairman noted, "[Luce has been] called several times. She never comes here"—but the speeches she wrote per Singh's request were still circulated and read, and contributed largely to the bill's progress. J.J. persistently invited Clare to speak at meetings and hearings on the bill. Clare, however, would repeatedly cite prior-commitments or last-minute obligations preventing her from attending, and would send written statements in her stead. Although this flightiness could be read as insincerity on Clare's part, it is more likely that Clare was simply struggling with the sudden and tragic death of her

daughter. Regardless, when Clare would fail to make an appearance at his assemblies, J.J. would have her statements read and would circulate excerpts from them through the press. In a time before the proliferation of television, Clare's disembodied support was about as effective as her corporeal presence. Clare was a gendered celebrity; her name was enough to imbue her speeches with her corporeal feminine presence.

Although J.J. developed personal relationships with many Congress members, his relationship with Clare was particularly important, for Clare's signature on the Luce-Celler Act validated the bill's niche on Congress's docket by gendering its purpose. As a woman, Clare was expected to promote soft-power foreign policy that would extend America's sphere of influence via friendship, rather than aggression. As she put it herself, Clare was following in the wake of female political figures past, the likes of the "mild little missionary woman, Mary Elizabeth Wood" who "won the passage of a resolution restoring the American indemnity for the Boxer Rebellion," which helped establish the "friendly relationship between the United States and China." Clare saw Wood's "master stroke of diplomacy," as well as the "the great record women had made in [their] past support of progressive and enlightened legislation" as crucial to the success of U.S. foreign policy—a view she shared with the public. The woman's touch was understood to domesticate, whether in homemaking or empire building, and such a touch was necessary to situate emerging nations comfortably within America's sphere of influence. Clare's gender, which enveloped the bill as it did to all things she touched, justified the Luce-Celler Act's relevance to U.S. foreign policy interests; it transformed the bill's purpose, making it less about the claims of

Indian immigrants and more about America's imperial claims to India.

Clare's gender also worked to ameliorate American anxieties over the Indian threat to American masculinity by transferring attention from American males at home to American males overseas, and by transforming the Indian from man to boy. Clare not only described America's relationship with India as integral to America's strategic military geography (for how could the U.S. contain communism without bases in South Asia?), but also inscribed her discourse with implications of a father-son relationship. Clare described the Luce-Celler Act as facilitative of American "troops...[exhibiting] American products to young India," for "this rising generation of Indians has been greatly impressed by the efficiency of our railroad rolling stock, our automotive transport, and the speed with which we can establish ground facilities for aircraft." Clare redirected attention from the unmanning of men at home to the attractive masculinity male soldiers could portray in India. Furthermore, her description of America as in a position to provide guidance to coming-of-age "young India" also deflected fears of India's superior manhood by demoting India from robust manhood to adolescence. By patronizing Indian men and glorifying the possibilities for American manly exhibition abroad, Clare Boothe Luce effaced the emasculating aspects of Indian immigration.

Interestingly, while Clare's gender removed the emasculating implications of the Luce-Celler Act for the common American man, it concurrently served to challenge the masculinity of her fellow Congressmen. As Clare's gender was diametrically opposed to that of Congress, her political moves were read as af-

fronts to the manhood of timorous Congressmen. Take, for example, reactions to Clare's "maiden" speech as a congresswoman: "It was a pity," said Scripps-Howard columnist William Philip Simms, "that it had to be left to a pretty woman to make the most needed he-man speech on foreign policy that has been heard from either floor of the House since the war began." Clare's speech, which concerned U.S. interests in nationalizing American airspace, was read as an indictment of the idleness of Congressmen, and a challenge to their courage. Clare's speech was also read, however, as betraying her lack of "any awareness that the rights of innocent passage and free landing...must and would be reciprocally agreed as between sovereign nations." In this way, her gender fired back upon her, disqualifying her from claims to the masculine knowledge of international relations and bringing criticism to her expertise. Regardless, though, Clare's gender worked to polarize and excite, making it an issue upon which Congressmen were forced to assert their manhood. By instigating attention around the Luce-Celler Act, Clare's gender ameliorated Congressional apathy about the bill, and justified the bill's position on Congress's agenda.

Essentially, Clare, J.J., and Henry served as vectors for larger international forces. Henry, of course, represented the new U.S. imperialism; he was arrogant, overbearing, and unfeeling. Clare, on the other hand, represented the other side of U.S. imperialism—the side driven by a sense of moral obligation, shared humanity, and self-righteousness. J.J. served as a metaphor for America's new interest in India. He was a wealthy cosmopolitan businessman, and a self-made man at that. His image replaced the image of backwards Indian savage. By embodying and speaking life into international forces, these three indi-

viduals were able to make America's ascension to hegemony a reality within the domestic sphere of America.

Approaching the 1940s, the transnational forces were poised propitiously for the ascent of U.S. hegemony. These forces became real in the Luce-Celler Act of 1946, once embodied by J.J. Singh, Clare Boothe Luce, and Henry Luce. As mediators of international forces, these three players moved to expropriate the 'white man's burden,' and, thereby, make real American claims to global hegemony. Upon the passage of the Luce-Celler Act in 1946, the process of empire transferal had finally come to fruition; the old hegemon, Great Britain, lost its title to its own creation, the U.S. In some ways, this was the end to an arc begun in 1620—perhaps, though, it was the preamble to an arc begun on August 15, 1947. As the U.S. allowed Indians the right to become citizens, it also invited them to pick up the mantle of the 'white man's burden,' to join the imperialists. Considering increasing Indian economic significance, cultural influence, and political involvement in international affairs, perhaps what seemed like a token gesture to 100 Indians in 1946 will soon have new historical meaning.

Is the Past the Future?

Twentieth-Century Historicism and the Philosophy of Music

Micah Walter '14

ABSTRACT

The twentieth century saw the abandonment of traditional tonality in music. Later in the century, the American composer George Rochberg controversially used passages of tonality in such works as his String Quartet No. 3. This raises the question: Is Rochberg regressive in using historical forms of music? Or is he, rather, himself a modernist in his originality? The answer to this is unclear. From the musical compositions themselves, as well as the other writings of the composers, it becomes evident that musical style is not what determines modernism so much as the composers' philosophy of the development of music.

GLOSSARY

ars combinatoria—the intentional use of styles from all historical periods in making new music

functional tonality—the dominant method of musical composition in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, functional tonality makes use of a key note or chord (the *tonic*) and assigns different chords functions. For example, in the key of A minor, the E major chord acts as a point of tension, and is used to “lead” towards the tonic chord. Modern music in folk, pop, rock and other genres still largely makes use of this system.

parody—rather than implying “mockery” as in colloquial usage, a parodic piece is simply one that imitates an older form or composition.

serialism—a technique of musical composition that makes use of a set series of musical elements (such as tones); when a note is used, it is not used again until the rest of the series has been used in order. This results in complete equality among the twelve notes of the scale, rather than centering the notes around a tonic pitch. Extreme use of serialism results in an almost mathematical system of composition. Pioneers in serialism include Schoenberg, Webern, Berg, and Boulez.

tintinnabulation (or *tintinnabuli*)—a technique of musical composition (literally meaning “bells”), developed by Arvo Pärt, that makes use of two main voices. One voice plays notes in a single triad (chord of three notes), while the other voice plays a melody using stepwise motion (that is, there are no skips or

leaps in the melody). The effect is a mystical and meditative sound distinct from functional tonal composition; unlike serialism, however, it retains the idea of a key note.

tonality—see *functional tonality*

* * *

Schönberg est mort—“Schoenberg is dead.” With these words, written in 1952 soon after Schoenberg’s death, the French composer Pierre Boulez expressed his position on the late innovator in modern music—arguably one of the most important figures in the development of music in the twentieth century.

Before the twentieth century, musical works were heavily rooted in the concept of functional tonality: all tones found their meaning with reference to a central tonic chord. The basis of twentieth-century modernism lies in the rejection of this system (Salzman 5), and Schoenberg was at the forefront of this rejection; having devised an entirely new composition process (the twelve-tone method), he was among the first to create serious works that did not revolve around any particular tonal center. To give all the notes of the chromatic scale equal weight was a novel idea, and the music that Schoenberg composed using his new technique turned out to be revolutionary.

How is it, then, that Boulez could call Schoenberg and his music dead, when Schoenberg was in fact at the forefront of modernization—a composer who tore down the conventional tonal landscape to make way for the new? It is not that Boulez rejected Schoenberg’s innovations; on the contrary, he felt that

Schoenberg did not go far enough. “There is no point in denying that the ‘case’ of Schoenberg is primarily annoying for its flagrant incompatibilities,” he wrote (Boulez 147). Claiming that the composer’s classical-based forms conflicted with his novel “tonal system,” he elaborates, “This could hardly be called a valid way of working, and it yields results which can simply be discounted: the worst kind of misconception, a sort of lopsided “romantico-classicism” whose well-intentionedness is not its least repellent feature” (Boulez 149).

If Boulez’s statements offer insight into anything beyond his own polemicism and advocacy of purely modern music, they reveal that it is impossible to make certain generalizations and categorizations. For many, Schoenberg is revolutionary—after all, his work was ground-breaking in its rejection of tonality. Boulez, on the other hand, strongly disliked Schoenberg’s work because it contained many traditional structures and forms. And Boulez is not alone in this opinion. Music scholar Eric Salzman writes that “[w]e can expect [...] to comprehend a great deal of what has happened in the twentieth century in terms of the past” (Salzman 3), and traces the breakdown of tonality to the chromaticism and dissonance used freely by late Romantic composers. Perhaps most telling, Schoenberg himself sees the development of music in *evolutionary*, rather than revolutionary, terms: “This evolution can only move slowly and gradually. Its goal can only be approached by small steps and roundabout ways; briefly stated, such works cannot be created overnight because the laws of comprehensibility will not allow it” (Schoenberg, “New and outmoded music” 99).

Because of his belief that musical development occurs gradually—the composer took a Hegelian view towards music (Salzman 34)—Schoenberg rejected the idea that music rooted in historic styles and methods of composition could serve as new art, and instead praised innovators. He respected those few composers who were ahead of their time, whose work pushed (even slightly) the boundaries of their day. This progressive view of music, however, becomes ironic in light of Boulez’s reception of his work. Schoenberg doubtless considered his evolutionary contribution to the development of music in a very positive light, perhaps even seeing himself as one of the great, timeless developers of music. Boulez, however, viewed Schoenberg’s work negatively precisely because of his less-than-revolutionary approach—Schoenberg just didn’t go far enough for him. “Paradoxically,” Boulez writes, “the central experiment of his work is premature precisely in so far as it lacks ambition” (Boulez 147). Premature, not ahead of his time; unambitious, not progressive: This is how Schoenberg was perceived by the avant-garde of the next generation.

* * *

If Schoenberg’s innovations fell short of Boulez’s high expectations, the composer’s method and works still had a significant impact on the musical landscape later in the twentieth century. Several decades later, while the field of music was still under the influence of Schoenberg’s method, “a new cy[c]le of avant-garde experimentation began again” (Salzman 124). The germ Schoenberg planted had sprouted, and taken over classical music in the mid-twentieth century: Serialism, sparked by Schoenberg, became the norm for musical composition in the

1950s (Salzman 183), and remained entrenched in the Europe into at least the 1980s (Salzman 210).

This trend, dynamic and varied as it was, became the new status quo. Boulez's harsh reaction to Schoenberg (written in 1952, and revised in 1966)—especially in the context of the latter's recent death—is indicative of a hostile attitude towards “non-progressive” composers in this era. Some critics implicitly dismiss traditionally-minded music as primitive; among these critics was Milton Babbitt, whose 1958 article “The composer as specialist” (often printed with the title “Who cares if you listen?”) was especially notorious. “[...] I am concerned with stating an attitude,” he says, “toward the indisputable facts of the status and condition of the composer of what we will, for the moment, designate as ‘serious,’ ‘advanced,’ contemporary music” (Babbitt 153–154). By referring to modernist music as “serious” music, Babbitt removes traditional music from the musical landscape altogether.

It was in this context that an American composer, George Rochberg, published his String Quartet No. 3—a piece which has been the subject of much scholarly writing since its publication. In contrast to the “serious” works of the day, Rochberg's quartet contained extended passages of tonality. For instance, the third movement is marked with a key signature in its entirety, A minor. As a result of this turn away from the serialism of the day back to traditional composition techniques, terms such as “neo-Romanticism” (Salzman 220) have been attached to Rochberg's work. In making this bold move, Rochberg did not receive the praise of his contemporaries. *Is the quartet worthless as a regressive piece of unoriginal writing?* music critics asked.

After all, just twenty years before the publication of his string quartet, Boulez had declared that “since the discoveries of the Viennese School, all nonserial composers are USELESS” (Boulez 150).

Before answering this question about the “validity” of Rochberg’s work, we must look at historicism before Rochberg. After all, Rochberg’s use of historical musical styles is not new in itself; many composers before him also made reference to earlier works and styles. However, not all historicism is created equal, and the reasons for which (and ways in which) composers allude to the past are varied. A prime example of twentieth-century neoclassicism before Rochberg’s time is Stravinsky. In particular, the suite for orchestra entitled *Pulcinella* is entirely based on eighteenth-century music; it is subtitled “after J. B. Pergolesi” in reference to the composer who, Stravinsky claimed, wrote the original material. One musicologist calls this strand of historicism “modernist neoclassicism”—a style which makes use of historical forms, “but also calls attention to the distance between the eighteenth century and the twentieth, and thus demonstrates the pastness of the past” (Albright 276–277).

Stravinsky’s version of neoclassicism, then, represents a kind of modernism; though it makes use of the past, it does not belong to the past. Salzman writes that while *Pulcinella* might be considered tonal in that the pitch material is borrowed from tonal eighteenth-century sources, “[...] Pergolesi has been transformed at every moment into something quite new. The Baroque progressions are no longer representatives of a musical direction and motion [i.e. traditional functional tonality]; they are literally sound objects or blocks of sound which gain new

meanings from new contexts” (Salzman 47–48). Modernist neoclassicism thus forms a kind of “post-modernism,” as it moves beyond contemporary musical forms to generate something new.

This view of historicism’s potential (though contested by writers like Boulez) was recognized fairly early in the century. In 1934, Lambert wrote about how borrowing styles from the past (and combining them in new music) surpasses atonality as modernist music. He writes: “Unlike the experimental period of the seventeenth century the pre-war period has led to a psychological cul-de-sac. [...] Wyndham Lewis has pointed out that when speed and familiarity have reduced traveling in space to the level of the humdrum, those in search of the exotic will have to travel in time; and this is what has already happened in music” (Lambert 299–300). According to this view, musical development does not end with atonal serialism, nor is it strictly Hegelian, as Schoenberg believed. Past styles and methods can be used progressively; they can be “modern” in their own way.

Albright contrasts parodic commentaries on past styles, exemplified by *Pulcinella*, with neoclassical compositions like Grieg’s *In Holberg’s time*—a piece that, while open about its use of a past style (the work’s subtitle is “Suite in the olden style”), is not a comment on such historical forms. Because Grieg does not transform the old style as Stravinsky does in *Pulcinella*, his work is fundamentally different from modernist neoclassicism; it is not modern music (Albright 276). Based on this dichotomy of “modernist” and “non-modernist” uses of historicism, then, the question of Rochberg’s historicism becomes: into which category does the Third Quartet fall? Given that Rochberg was

“quite explicit about the neo-conservative nature of his recent music” (Salzman 220), it is tempting to see his work as having more in common with Grieg than Stravinsky; Rochberg does not claim novelty as his aim.

Historicism, however, contains variety beyond merely these two categories. Just as it is impossible to divide composers objectively into “revolutionary” and “traditional” camps—as we have seen in the case of Schoenberg—it is simplistic to dichotomize historicist works. One music critic writes:

Typically, Rochberg’s quartet is described as a “neoconservative” type of postmodernism whose use of a tonal art music genre and stylistic allusions to past historical styles indicates a nostalgic yearning for an imagined cultural golden age in Western civilization. Scholars contrast the “reactionary” neoconservatism of Rochberg with a “radical” strand of musical postmodernism that juxtaposes different styles and genres in an attempt to criticize accepted cultural standards. Although it has gained a degree of currency within musical circles, this binary model of postmodernism is not without problems, and the characterization of Rochberg’s Third Quartet exemplifies its limitations. (Berry 235)

Berry continues his argument by noting Rochberg’s own advocacy of *ars combinatoria*—the intentional use of styles from all historical periods in making new music. According to this approach, the use of historical styles is “not a regression into the past but rather an expression of contemporary historical concepts” (ibid.). In other words, Rochberg is a post-modernist, if one defines “modernism” as the atonal serialism that was the norm of twentieth-century practice. This “modernism” had be-

come the new status quo; like the traditional tonality that preceded it, it was no longer on the forefront of musical innovation. Though Rochberg looks to the past for inspiration, his backwards glance does not imply a backwards journey; on the contrary, his vantage point gives him the ability to move forward, away from the constraints of the musical norms of his day.

Unlike Stravinsky's *Pulcinella*, Rochberg's Third Quartet is not parodic, and does not juxtapose older and newer forms merely to make a commentary about one or the other. Nor is the quartet like Grieg's *In Holberg's Time*, which uses an historical style more-or-less consistently throughout. Indeed, Rochberg had previously written atonal music; his transition to the use of tonality was a process, and he never completely abandoned any musical style. "The move to reclaim tonality," Reise writes, "was not a dismissal of all aspects of atonality; rather it was a reaction against the ever-increasing limitations on expression in atonal music" (Reise 397).

Berry and Reise are not alone in seeing Rochberg as a serious composer of original music. Musicologist Jonathan Kramer, who disagrees with Rochberg about the future of musical development and the necessity of tonality, nevertheless considers Rochberg's Third Quartet in itself to be an original work—not despite its historicism, but rather because of it. He writes:

Despite what Rochberg says, to come to serialism in the 1950's was hardly modernist. Rochberg has donned many fashionable styles, but rarely—despite what he says—as a modernist: he came to each modern style long after it was innovative. But in one instance he really did act as a mod-

ernist, and, paradoxically, that was when he began his return to tonality. (Kramer 350)

Kramer continues to analyze the Third Quartet specifically: the work's originality ("modernity," so to speak) stems from the tension arising between atonality and tonality in the work. "We almost forget, we try to forget, that the quartet lives in the expanded world of atonality-plus-tonality [...], but the comfortable associations of tonality [...] are never quite as comfortable as they would be in a real quartet, because the language of the variation movement can never completely erase that of the two earlier movements [...]" (ibid.). While Rochberg (unlike Stravinsky) is not using the material of the past as a meta-level comment upon the past, he is using a variety of styles for a musical effect. Rochberg plays atonality off against tonality, using the different (and seemingly conflicting) techniques of composition to provide tonal structure and contrast. It is this innovative mixing of styles that Kramer calls "modern"—not the mere use of a single, recently-discovered technique of composition.

* * *

The paradoxes abound. Kramer refers to "modern" styles that are no longer innovative—does it then still make sense to apply the term "modern" to them? What is modernism, after all? Neo-tonality historically developed in response to atonality; the question then arises, "Is neo-tonality a regressive movement or is it forward-looking?" (Salzman 211). As we have seen, even Rochberg—a man opposed to the "modernism" of his day—is a progressive in his own way as a proponent of *ars combinatoria*.

It would seem that musical collage is the new modernism—one might say post-modernism.

And yet not even *ars combinatoria*, as thoroughly modern as it may appear, cannot lay exclusive claim to the title “modernism.” Rochberg may be vindicated in his use of past styles; but even if his works that incorporate such styles can be considered “modern,” it is still possible for modern music to make use of truly innovative compositional techniques. If works looking to the past can be progressive, how much more can compositions using novel musical techniques—compositions that push beyond both the current modernism (in the twentieth century, atonal serialism) and the old styles of composition!

Such innovation does continue to happen, if infrequently. One example of true innovation in compositional technique is the Estonian-born composer Arvo Pärt. More recently than Rochberg (Pärt’s music dates from the late twentieth century, and the composer continues to write new works) Pärt developed his own technique of composition, known as *tintinnabulation*. The resulting works have received not only popular but also critical acclaim. Shenton puts Pärt’s work into the context of twentieth-century modernism and post-modernism thus:

At the time Pärt’s mature works were composed, musical modernism had left composers with the possibilities of myriad techniques at their disposal, but with no prevailing style. Composers found many solutions to the dilemma, including turning to music of the past, fusing music of different styles, mixing different styles into collages, randomizing music with aleatoric procedures, and by resorting to minimal use of materials. [...] Far from being simple, tintin-

nabulation is a process that affords a large and subtle range of consonance and dissonance [...]. With this innovative technique Pärt has managed to create an authentically contemporary music. (Shenton 2–3)

Today, there is no “modern style”: tonality and atonality, historicism and the avant-garde, innovation and pastiche, chance procedures and minimalism—all of these, when original can be called “modern” in some sense. Kramer defines modernism (and specifically, Rochberg’s relationship to it) not by any specific technique, but by referring to the “attitude” or philosophy of the composer:

Rochberg the composer achieved modernism only when he forewent his tendency to adopt the next-to-latest fashions in favor of a deeply felt originality. Modernism today is not a style, not a texture, not a sound—it is an attitude. And Rochberg’s Third Quartet is a splendid instance of this attitude. (Kramer 352)

Indeed, though it is difficult (and perhaps fruitless) to categorize works by style—especially in determining whether a work is modern—it is more illuminating to read composers’ philosophies on the purpose and development of music.

Schoenberg’s Hegelian view of musical development prompts him to state that all progressive music is stylistically innovative in some way, and that once written, such music remains timeless: “New music is the music of new musical ideas. New ideas are revealed in new external guises. But music that is truly new can never become outmoded” (Schoenberg, “New and outmoded music” 106). With respect to historicism, however,

Schoenberg refuses to admit the concept of an original (or “timeless”) work written in an old and accessible style. He draws analogies to chess and mathematics: “No chess master can use a strategy that is popular or generally understood, because his opponent will also understand it and it won’t lead to a win. No mathematician can discover new mathematics understood by those who lack the necessary special training” (Schoenberg, “New and outmoded music” 107). In keeping with this philosophy of musical development, Schoenberg treats music like a science: “Justified already by historical development,” he writes, “the method of composing with twelve tones is also not without aesthetic and theoretical support. On the contrary, it is just this support which advances it from a mere technical device to the rank and importance of a scientific theory” (Schoenberg, “Composition with twelve tones” 198–199). For Schoenberg, an original work had to push the boundaries of compositional technique.

Musicologist Jonathan Kramer, though he disagrees with Rochberg’s conclusions about the necessity of tonality, makes an astute remark relating to Schoenberg’s philosophy. For Schoenberg, novelty *was* originality: a work could not be original, or “timeless,” without an innovation in style. Kramer, however, distinguishes the two, declaring novelty irrelevant to the more important question of originality: “The Third Quartet is original; it is also novel. Novelty arises simply from being among the first to do something. Originality is a more substantial, more elusive value. It has to do with presenting a unique vision of the world, whether with new or old means” (Kramer 352). This view, which is different from Schoenberg’s, is reflected in Rochberg’s writings: music does not develop linearly

and scientifically, but emotionally; this means that original music does not necessarily need to be novel, but can legitimately make use of historical techniques of composition.

Schoenberg's philosophy of a linear development of music is reiterated by later music critics, including Babbitt. Throughout his article "Who cares if you listen?" Babbitt expresses the view that music is directly analogous to the natural sciences: "Advanced music, to the extent that it reflects the knowledge and originality of the informed composer, scarcely can be expected to appear more intelligible than these arts and sciences to the person whose musical education usually has been even less extensive than his background in other fields" (Babbitt 156). And it is this philosophy that Rochberg reacts so violently against. "Schoenberg probably suffered more from a sense of ongoing linear change and the pressure of historical consciousness than any other major composer of the twentieth century," he writes (Rochberg 193). Against the belief of Schoenberg and Babbitt that the progress made in music is scientific and objective, Rochberg dismisses the idea as antithetical to what he considers the foundations of music. "There can be no justification for music, ultimately, if it does not convey eloquently and elegantly the passions of the human heart," he writes (Rochberg 195), in a bold move that counters the academic atmosphere of music in the mid-twentieth century.

It is not that Rochberg rejects the idea of musical development in a regressive move towards tonality only. On the contrary, he comes close to expressing nearly the same view as Schoenberg on this point. Schoenberg said that "the force of music's evolution [...] plainly consists in exploiting musical space in all of its

dimensions so that the greatest and richest content will be brought into even the smallest space” (Schoenberg, “New and outmoded music” 99). On the surface, Rochberg’s statement about the fruit of musical development is quite similar to Schoenberg’s: “Translated into practice, this would mean the use of every device and every technique appropriate to its specific gestural repertory in combination with every other device and technique until theoretically all that we are and all that we know is bodied forth in the richest, most diverse music ever known to man, *ars combinatoria*” (Rochberg 197). But there is an important difference: Rochberg denies Schoenberg’s underlying assumption of linear progress; instead, he believes that looking back at the past, rather than undoing progress, actually enhances development. “There is no virtue in starting all over again,” he writes. “The past refuses to be erased. Unlike Boulez, I will not praise amnesia” (Rochberg 192). The two men’s philosophies of the development of music are fundamentally different and irreconcilable; and it is this difference which makes Schoenberg “modern” and Rochberg “traditional”—not the content of their music.

WORKS CITED

- Albright, David. *Modernism and music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Babbitt, Milton. "Who cares if you listen?" Simms, Bryan R. *Composers on modern musical culture*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1999. 153–159.
- Berry, Mark. "Music, postmodernism, and George Rochberg's third string quartet." *Postmodern music/postmodern thought* (2002): 235–248.
- Boulez, Pierre. "Schoenberg is dead." Simms, Bryan R. *Composers on modern musical culture*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1999. 147–151.
- Kramer, Jonathan D. "Can modernism survive George Rochberg?" *Critical inquiry* 11.2 (1984): 341–354.
- Lambert, Constant. "The age of pastiche." Albright, Daniel. *Modernism and music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004. 297–300.
- Reise, Jay. "Rochberg the progressive." *Perspectives of new music* (1980–1981): 395–407.
- Rochberg, George. "Reflections on the renewal of music." Simms, Bryan R. *Composers on modern musical culture*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1999. 191–197.

- Salzman, Eric. *Twentieth-century music: An introduction*. Fourth edition. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education, Inc., 2002.
- Schoenberg, Arnold. "Composition with twelve tones." Albright, Daniel. *Modernism and music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004. 194–201.
- . "New and outmoded music, or style and idea." Simms, Bryan R. *Composers on modern musical culture*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1999. 89–107.
- Shenton, Andrew. *The Cambridge companion to Arvo Pärt*. Cambridge: University Press, 2012.

Intimate Occupation

Constructing the “Official” Story of Japanese War Brides

Lizzie Douglas '13

ABSTRACT

One of the last new colonial projects in the 20th century began on September 2nd, 1945. The American forces arrived in Japan ready to subdue a conquered nation. In 1952, the Americans left behind Japan, their new ally in the region and bulwark against the spread of communism. During the American Occupation of Japan, the military authorities rehabilitated the defeated enemy. A key element of this reconstruction was the depiction of Japan as a feminine, junior ally to the masculine United States. Reimagining the role of war brides—Japanese women who married American servicemen—and creating a narrative around fraternization enabled American authorities to construct a gendered relationship between the two former enemies.

From 1947 to 1965, approximately 50,000 Japanese women entered the United States as war brides. In total, there may be as many as 100,000 Japanese women who married American servicemen after WWII. These women occupied an unusual space in American controlled Japan; although they were citizens of the defeated nation they chose to marry soldiers of their former enemy. Although initially disparaging, American media, novels, and military guides created a popular image of Japanese women and war brides. They were seen as both beautiful and dutiful females: the paragon of femininity as constructed by male American authors. These purposefully produced representations contributed to the overall gendering of Occupied Japan as part of the reconfiguration of the relationship between Japan and the United States; Japan went from being America's enemy to its feminized, junior ally in the Cold War. Thus, the image of the war bride represented how America thought the newly defeated Japan should act: subservient, docile, and eager for opportunities that America could provide. At the same time, the narratives surrounding these women not only reflected this new relationship between Japan and the United States but also reinforced it as a "natural" power dynamic. In other words, there was a positive feedback loop between the image of the war brides and the newly reimagined geopolitics between America and Japan.

The general narrative of the Japanese war bride is situated in the overall feminization of post-war Japan. The relationships that developed between American soldiers and Japanese women were embedded in the overall context of Occupied Japan. During this time, the United States promoted the idea of a new, gendered, relationship with Japan. Simultaneously,

SCAP Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (SCAP) created a narrative about Japanese war brides. Faced with soldiers who wished to formalize their relationships with Japanese women, SCAP first attempted to prevent them. When this proved impossible, SCAP created an idealized narrative about these marriages in order to utilize these relationships to reinforce the overall gendering of Japan. Where this narrative “breaks” is the moments when it encounters the unspoken but integral truths about the occupation: racism, economic deprivation, and exploitation.

The American occupation of Japan lasted from 1946 to 1952. After the surrender, the people of both sides had very distorted impressions of how the other would act. Before the American troops landed in Japan, most G.I.s had only ever encountered Japanese soldiers, not civilians. Therefore many expected the Japanese people to be the same kind of “aggressive militarists” that Japanese soldiers were perceived to be; instead, American troops found a war-weary people whose main concerns were about surviving in their devastated country.

Similarly, the Japanese were also surprised by the attitude of the victorious American troops. During the war, members of the Japanese Imperial Army had shown little mercy to the civilians in the areas they conquered. Japanese soldiers gained infamy “for the brutal rape of women and girls and ruthless destruction of the land. Subsequently, many Japanese believed that such practices were the norm for occupying armies.” Because of their previous experiences with their own military occupations, the Japanese believed the Americans would initially perpetrate a campaign of terror. Rumors spread among the civilian popula-

tion that once the Americans arrived all the men would be killed and all the women would be raped. The national Japanese media gave credence to these rumors as they warned the populace to be prepared for the violence the occupying army would commit. When the American forces actually landed on the main Japanese islands in late August 1945, however, none of the feared mass violence occurred.

All of the U.S. forces in Japan were under the control of the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers. SCAP referred to both the person in charge of the occupation, initially General Douglas MacArthur, and, more generally, to the office he ran. Ostensibly, the Allies controlled the occupation; in reality, the Americans alone were in charge. In order to run the country, SCAP decided not to dismantle the Japanese bureaucracy. Instead, Japanese civil servants received instructions “from parallel agencies, or sections, within the Allied Powers General Headquarters (or, more commonly, GHQ)” which was staffed by Americans. The occupation of Japan required a large American presence; in 1946, roughly 500,000 American soldiers were posted around Japan and approximately 5000 bureaucrats worked in GHQ.

The historian John Dower, among others, argues that this occupation of Japan was an imperial exercise by the United States and should be examined as such. The occupation marks a period when Japan was under the military tutelage of the Americans. The United States had three stated goals at the outset of the occupation: demilitarization, decentralization, and democratization. On the ground, this democratization process looked like a foreign military power that had set itself up as a colonial

government enacting a forced governmental restructuring. In Ann Laura Stoler's words, the Japanese were "coerced to be free." This coercion was situated in the facts of an imperial project that the colonial power tends to downplay: racism, economic deprivation and exploitation, among other things. SCAP formed the head of a neo-colonial apparatus that sought to remake Japan after World War II and dramatically redefine the relationship between it and the United States.

During World War II, Japan and the United States were sworn enemies; the two countries vilified each other to a far greater degree than the United States and Germany did towards one another. The war in the Pacific was a race war "that sometimes bordered on genocidal rage." Dower remarks that it is remarkable that after such "merciless fighting" that "the defeated Japan and victorious Allies, predominantly Americans, worked together so amicably and constructively" during the occupation. One of the main reasons that this happened was that America recast the roles both countries played. During World War II, Japan and the United States were each other's feared enemy; both countries were roughly equal players in the global fight for military dominance. After Japan's surrender, American discourse about Japan changed: Japan became feminized and infantilized. The role of the United States towards Japan was that of a "'natural' or universally recognized hierarchical relationships –man over woman and adult over child." This gendered reframing of Japan cast the country as a valuable junior ally of the United States, rather than its feared enemy, and "an American responsibility."

The message of American “responsibility” was reproduced in literature given to individual G.I.s. The Office of the Secretary of Defense prepared “A Pocket Guide to Japan” for use by the American troops stationed in Japan. The guide exhorted the troops to be the “salesmen” for the United States and prove to the Japanese people that the country was not the terrible enemy that they feared. The attitude with which the U.S. decided to treat the defeated Japanese can be seen in the last section of the guide. The booklet concludes with some helpful pointers for the troops:

It might be a good idea to remember these Occupation Tips:

1. Act normally, always remembering that you are doing an important job.
2. Treat people with respect, and not as though they belonged to an inferior race or group.
3. Respect strange customs and traditions.
4. Dress neatly.
5. Put all your effort and ability into your work so that other people will see that when men are free they are also efficient.
6. In short, BE AN AMERICAN!

This list demonstrates how American troops were told to act towards the Japanese. Rather than abusing the defeated people, the occupying troops were explicitly told to respect them. The entire guide echoes the tone of the above quote and tells the soldiers that they are doing important work in Japan and thus must comport themselves appropriately.

The “Occupation Tips” also reveal the implicit attitudes held by the American writers of the guide. In the second tip, SCAP is ordering the occupying soldiers not be racist, although the statement does tacitly admit that the Japanese have been considered “an inferior race” and does not deny the potential validity of this statement. The word choice in the third tip, “strange” rather than “different,” implies that the authors still considered Japan and the Japanese to be Other in some ways. The fifth tip is extremely patronizing and reinforces the idea that the Americans have the duty to teach the Japanese the “proper” (or American) way to live. The racial superiority reflected in these “Occupation Tips” is fairly subtle, but there were also ways in which SCAP was also blatantly racist. From the beginning of the occupation, “SCAP enforced racial apartheid with Jim Crow-like regulations that ordered the Japanese to use different doors, ride on second-class rail cars, and keep out of certain areas – a system that did not exist in Occupied Germany.” Although the occupation’s goals included democratizing Japan and teaching the Japanese about the American value of equality, SCAP did not see any contradiction in enforcing Jim Crow-like regulations at the same time.

In addition to SCAP’s enforcement of racial segregation, Occupied Japan was a place characterized by economic desperation and great deprivation. Faced with very few job opportunities, many women were forced to become sex workers in order to survive. War bride Sanwa Brooks recalls the economic struggles women faced: “After the war...everyone who sees a Japanese woman with a GI they think she’s a street woman. But you know, even though many of them were hookers it was because after the war there was no food, no one had jobs. So many of the

women had to work as dancers, many of them went to the movies with a GI just so they could eat.” Despite the official story SCAP spun about the romantic relationships between soldiers and Japanese women, many of these relationships were simply economic. A homeless widow later described how she ended up trading sex for survival: “There were three consecutive days when I went without eating... [then a] man I did not know gave me two rice balls. I devoured them. The following night he again brought me two rice balls. He then asked me to come to the park because he wanted to talk with me. I followed him.” The young widow’s story demonstrates the darker side of Occupied Japan. Whilst SCAP talked about democratizing the defeated country and providing opportunities to its citizens, many women were forced to make desperate choices in order to survive. On this level, the image of America as the protecting husband to the feminine Japan is stripped of its softer edges; in the Occupied Japan that many Japanese women experienced, sex was domination.

In order to reduce the saliency of the highly promoted hatred between the Japanese and Americans during World War II, as well as gloss over the continuing racism, domination, and exploitation of the Occupation, SCAP reimagined the relationship between the two countries in a gendered framework. Naoko Shibusawa argues that Americans were attracted to the idea of a feminized Japan as femininity symbolized “a vulnerability, dependence, and naïveté that made them [the Japanese people] accessible and malleable.” The imagined gendered relationship between America and Japan was literally duplicated in the marriages between American soldiers and Japanese women. Stoler argues that the intimate is a nexus of power: “matters of the

intimate are critical sites for the consolidation of colonial power...management of those domains provides a strong pulse on how relations of empire are exercised, and...affairs of the intimate are strategic for empire-driven states.” As much as the narratives of war brides reflect the gendering of the relationship between the defeated country and the victorious party, their stories are also part of this restructuring process. Stoler writes, “demasculinization of colonized men and the hypermasculinity of European males are understood as key elements in the assertion of white supremacy.” In the post-war discourse, Japan was feminized and the United States masculinized in order to naturalize the neo-imperial relationship between the countries. This same gendering was simultaneously duplicated among the citizens of the two countries; in comparison to malnourished Japanese men, American soldiers appeared to be very healthy and, therefore, more attractive to many young Japanese women. Furthermore, Japanese veterans “found themselves stigmatized [by Japanese civilians] as losers who had failed their nation.” Stoler argues that sexual submission in the private sphere “substantiates” colonial control in the public sphere. Consequently, the submission of many of these brides to their husbands in patriarchal marriages reinforced the unequal relationship between the United States and Japan during the occupation.

Furthermore, the war brides not only reproduced this narrative on an intimate scale, but also buttressed it on a macroscopic scale. The story of the Japanese war bride follows a basic arc from racial hatred, to sexualized and racialized eroticism, to acceptance, and finally love. This love is expressed in the form of a “traditional” marriage in which the husband is the breadwinner and the wife is the caregiver. The ultimate product of

this narrative, a picture-perfect marriage, was an image used by SCAP to “naturalize” the relationship between the United States and Japan. This official story, however, is a posteriori narrative. SCAP initially tried to discourage relationships between American G.I.s and Japanese women, although it always tacitly admitted that prostitution would occur. When American men did want to marry the Japanese women they had met, SCAP tried to prevent the marriages. Eventually, however, those within SCAP realized that they could not prevent these relationships so instead formed an official narrative around them in order to subdue the intimate sphere for colonial purposes. According to Stoler, the “habits of the heart and comportment have been recruited to the service of colonial governance but never wholly subsumed by it.” The story of war brides described below was certainly constructed and used by SCAP, but there are definitely moments when the women’s biographies are not “wholly subsumed” by this created gendered framework and instead resist the constructed narrative.

In Occupied Japan, Japanese women and American G.I.s encountered one another in many different spaces, both socially and professionally. At the time, the Japanese economy had been devastated by the war and SCAP was a large source of employment within the country. “By 1949, out of a total population of over eighty million, more than four million Japanese males and over 500,000 Japanese females worked in some capacity for the occupation forces.” With such high levels of interaction, many relationships between the women and the troops developed. Although SCAP officially had a strict anti-fraternization policy it was almost impossible to enforce, as there were hundreds of thousands of troops, nearly all-young males, stationed

across Japan. Additionally, Japanese women outnumbered Japanese men because of high war casualties and, therefore, there were large numbers of single women in the country. Japanese women were culturally expected to marry a man and the lack of eligible men presented a real problem.

One of the chief reasons the army leaders instituted an anti-fraternization policy was concern about sexually transmitted diseases. In the guide to Occupied Japan for American troops, there is a section entitled "V.D. Rates are High." The guide informs its reader: "Prostitution is widespread in Japan...The best rule in the Orient is a rule that makes sense anywhere: Keep away from prostitutes and pickups. That is the best way to avoid a venereal disease. The next best way is to use prophylaxis properly and promptly." Although the military authors of the guide start by instructing troops not to solicit prostitutes, they tacitly admit that G.I.s will ignore this command by cautioning them to use prophylaxis afterwards. Stoler argues that in colonial settings, the interactions between Europeans and prostitutes were very problematic for the colonial architects, as sexually transmitted diseases reduced the number of able-bodied Europeans. Thus, colonial authorities preferred concubinage to prostitution because concubinage "was considered to stabilize order and colonial health." SCAP also realized that longer-term relationships between Japanese women and American soldiers were preferable to liaisons with potentially diseased prostitutes, so it began to relax its policy against such relationships.

Proof that SCAP tacitly accepted fraternization can be seen in both military produced materials and popular media. In a Japanese phrase book issued in 1950 specifically for occupation

troops, sections include “2.9 Dating” and “2.10 Compliments.” Example phrases include “How about a date?” and “You have a nice figure.” Clearly, if the military handed out phrase books to troops written by GHQ that told the men how to ask out a woman in Japanese, they were not enforcing a ban on fraternization. Even as early as the latter-half of 1946, SCAP had limited itself to just banning certain types of behavior between soldiers and Japanese women. Eighteen months after the occupation began the official response to fraternization became one of grudging acceptance. SCAP realized that if it could not stop relationships from developing it might as well try and frame them as wholly positive for the occupation as G.I.s did their own part in the intimate sphere to democratize Japanese women and Japan on the whole.

Even though SCAP began to condone fraternization, it, and the general public, were generally bemused by the soldiers’ decision to marry their Japanese partners. Marriage hinted at something beyond a sexual relationship; it suggested that there was a true emotional connection between the couple. Stoler argues that this same tension existed in other colonial settings as well. The authorities promoted concubinage as it limited the spread of sexually transmitted diseases to Western men, but did not understand when these “unions became sustained and emotionally significant relationships. Such affective ties defied the racial premise of concubinage as no more than an emotionally unfettered convenience.” SCAP, like colonial authorities before them, also disapproved of formalizing the relationships between American men and Japanese women. They deliberately made marriage between G.I.s and Japanese women difficult in order to discourage formalizing these interracial relationships.

To try and prevent these interracial marriages, a man's commanding officer and the chaplain would try to discourage him from marrying his Japanese partner and, if that did not work, would present him with a gauntlet of paperwork specifically designed to discourage him. In the novel *Fusako and the Army*, Bob Smith, an American G.I. asks his commanding officer, the Major, for permission to marry a Japanese woman named Fusako. When challenged by the officer about his decision, Smith argues that Japanese women are just as suitable for marriage as American women. In response, the Major exclaims: "You know what that there is, [Smith]?" he roared. "What you just said, that's treason and sedition and -and disrespect for Amurrican womanhood!" The Major, like others in the military and the general American public, could not understand why G.I.s wanted to marry Japanese women when they could marry "superior" American women. The Major denied Smith permission to marry Fusako and transferred him to a distant base to prevent contact with his fiancée. In addition to military objections to interracial marriage, until the Immigration and Nationality Act was passed in 1952, it was nearly impossible for Japanese war brides to immigrate to the United States because of the 1924 Oriental Exclusion Act.

Despite these obstacles, marriages between G.I.s and Japanese women were possible and did happen. Once SCAP realized that it would be nearly impossible to stop these relationships, it made attempts to change the image of Japanese women. "Since MacArthur could not stop the momentum of fraternization, he made attempts to soften the public image of Japanese women by permitting American journalists and others to photograph kimono-clad, innocent-looking, feminine Japanese females

looking up to their masculine, conquering heroes.” Whereas initially the only representation of a Japanese woman was an exotic, sexually available, morally lax person, the media—at MacArthur’s request—began to portray her as the “‘yellow-skinned girl-next-door.’” By recreating the Japanese woman as a naïve young lady in need of a male protector, journalists made fraternization more acceptable. MacArthur even went so far as to say that the G.I.s who dated Japanese women were “democratizing” them and therefore reinforcing the mission of the occupation, and, indeed, of America’s efforts during the Cold War in general. SCAP quickly saw the connection between the occupation as a whole and the relationships between American men and Japanese women and sought to capitalize on that.

Initially, many of the images that Americans produced of the Japanese women they encountered were highly sexualized. In 1945, the popular military tabloid, *Pacific Stars and Stripes*, published a series of cartoons featuring American troops and Japanese women. Throughout these cartoons, “the dominant image was of the sexualized and available Japanese woman.” In the Far East edition of *The Navy Times*, an American sailor, Bill Hume, published a “tremendously popular, semi-pornographic, weekly cartoon series,” later published in a book, about the interactions between American troops and a stereotypical Japanese woman called “Babysan.” The character was portrayed as a “beautiful sex kitten” who fulfilled any heterosexual man’s desires. Hume depicted Babysan as childlike as well as “blunt and coy.” In one picture, Hume drew Babysan as a beautiful young woman leaning against a wall and smoking a cigarette (see Appendix A). She has one hand on her Western-style dress lifting the hemline to expose her upper thigh; on her feet are tradi-

tional Japanese shoes. Three American military personnel are ogling her from a doorframe. In the graphic, Babysan represents a sexualized and racialized woman who is clearly the object of Western men's desires. Babysan is a mixture of an Americanized Japanese woman and an erotic Other. This combination of traits is depicted throughout Hume's cartoons. For example, in a caption in the 1953 book collection of his drawings, Hume describes her character:

Babysan is typical of the revamped, Americanized Japan. Even her name reveals the startling blend of the two countries. San may be assumed to mean mister, missus, master, or miss. Babysan, then, can be translated literally to mean 'Miss Baby.' The American, seeing a strange girl on the street, can't just yell, 'hey baby.' He is in Japan, where politeness is a necessity and not a luxury so he deftly adds the title of respect. It speeds up introductions.

This description also shows the casual ease with which men fraternized with Japanese women, despite SCAP's anti-fraternization policies. Hume depicts a scene where an American is yelling out to a Japanese woman on the street. He adds "san" to her name to be more polite and "speed up introductions." After looking at the body of Babysan cartoons, there is no doubt that Hume's "introductions" refer to the beginning of a sexual relationship between the Japanese woman and the American man.

The word Babysan, due to the enormous popularity of Hume's cartoon, became part of the common language of the occupation. As well as the name of Hume's character, Babysan was also

used to refer to any young Japanese woman, though not necessarily in a hypersexualized way. Lucy Crockett, an American nurse who worked in Occupied Japan, later wrote about the young women she worked with during her time in the country. “By lavishing ‘overwhelming affection’ on whomever she served with ‘loyalty, sweetness, and untiring efforts to please,’ Babysan helped ‘break down the indifference of the most bitter Jap-hater.’ Her ‘winning personality,’ asserted Crockett, ‘brought unexpected understanding and sympathy from Americans.’” In Crockett’s description of Babysan, she lists the ubiquitous Japanese woman’s endearing qualities: all of these traits are typically associated with American notions of femininity. Crockett argues that the women she worked with helped facilitate the relationship between the victorious occupiers and the defeated nation. Babysan’s (American) femininity transcends her race and allows American observers to interact with her not as the former enemy but as a dutiful woman. Yet, to Crockett, all Japanese women she meets are the same Babysan; in some ways, this attitude is rather dehumanizing. Babysan represented a Japan that Americans placed under their tutelage and democratized; although the Japanese did not get to dictate the terms under which this occurred.

After about a year into the Occupation, SCAP began to utilize the image of war brides to reinforce its greater narrative about the new gendered relationship between America and the United States. Both of these relationships, intimate and geopolitical, utilized the notion of “traditional” gender roles. The man was the protector and breadwinner and the woman was seen as the caregiver. Descriptions of a Japanese wife in *Sayonara*, a novel by James Michener, a WWII Pacific Theater veteran himself,

also depict the traditional roles the Japanese women played in these marriages. The protagonist remarks that he “has never seen a more satisfactory wife than Katsumi Kelly. She organized her house to perfection and kept it immaculate...She could cook, she could sew, she could talk on many subjects and as her pregnancy advanced she gave promise of being an even finer mother than she was wife.” The characters in *Sayonara* value Katsumi Kelly as a mother and a wife: the traditional Western roles of a woman.

While fiction portrayed the relationships between Japanese women and G.I.s as very traditional, this was also an accepted norm by many of the war brides themselves. One woman who emigrated to America with her husband, Kinko Iimura Kirkwood, described her relationship in an interview with an oral historian: “I may be different from young people today since I believed that housework was a woman’s responsibility. Andrew [her former serviceman husband] was just like a Japanese husband and he couldn’t even boil hot water.” In Kirkwood’s marriage, both she and her husband fully expected her to remain in the private sphere and take care of her husband’s domestic needs. The expectations that Japanese women, although not American, would still fill the extremely heteronormative and traditional gender roles of an ideal American marriage played out on two levels.

Firstly, in the intimate sphere, relationships between servicemen and Japanese women broke down individual racial hatreds. For example, in Martin Brofeybrenner’s book, *Fusako and the Army* (1946), the protagonist “Bob was barely out of his teens, but Fusako made him feel important, like a man. And

because of his relationship with Fusako, Bob tried to think of the ‘Japs’ as ‘Japanese.’” Here, MacArthur’s hope that G.I.s would “democratize” their Japanese girlfriends is working in reverse; Japanese girlfriends are teaching American servicemen that the Japanese were not actually this terrible race that American war propaganda had portrayed.

Secondly, the narrative of traditionally gendered marriages between Japanese and American people reinforced the script that was being written about the new relationship between the United States and Japan. This connection between the intimate and the political can be seen in the novel *Sayonara*, which was later turned into a popular movie of the same name. Although *Sayonara* is a work of fiction, it can be read as a primary source of Occupied Japan because a serviceman, James Michener, who actually married a Japanese woman himself, wrote it. Jodi Kim argues that in *Sayonara* “the U.S. occupation is allegorized as an interracial romance between an American air force major and a Japanese woman.”

The attitudes towards the Japanese of the protagonist, Lloyd Gruver, follow a trajectory in the book that starts from hatred of the Japanese to love of a Japanese woman. At the beginning of the novel, Gruver cannot understand why American troops are marrying Japanese women: “They’re all so dumpy and round-faced. How can our men—good average guys—how can they marry these yellow girls? In ’45 I was fighting the Japs. Now my men are marrying them.” Gruver cannot grasp the idea that Americans would marry their racialized enemy. However, as the novel moves forward, Gruver begins to see the attraction of these marriages. After observing the relationship between one

of his men and his new wife, Joe and Katsumi Kelly, Gruver muses: “I had never witnessed a marriage where two people loved each other on an equal basis and where the man ran his job on the outside and the woman ran her job at home and where those responsibilities were not permitted to interfere with the fundamental love that existed...” Gruver is clearly jealous of such a love match and is realizing that true love can exist between former enemies. What is also significant about his observation is his definition of an “ideal” marriage: the man works in the public sphere and the woman works in the private sphere. No matter how unorthodox an interracial marriage may be, the “traditional” gender roles are never questioned. Gina Marchetti, in her analysis of the film version of this story, argues, “*Sayonara* seems to be saying that just as it is natural for men to love and dominate passive women, it is natural for America to take a similarly dominant posture toward Japan.” The story does question this archetype, but in the end “white, male American hegemony is ultimately upheld.”

Gruver’s changing attitudes towards marriage to a Japanese woman reflect the official narrative that SCAP came to adopt. These marriages were seen as all part of the occupation process: they both reflected and reinforced the relationship America was actively producing with Japan. Individual lives, however, are rarely as “neat” as the official narrative requires them to be. In Stoler’s words, women’s biographies are not “wholly subsumed” by colonial authorities’ desires and instead show moments of resistance. Across many of these women’s individual stories there are three fairly common “breaks” within the narrative of these marriages between American soldiers and Japanese women. Some of these flaws in the official story occur when the

narrative encounters the unpleasant truths of Occupied Japan: economic deprivation, racism, and sexism.

For one thing, post-war Japan was a place of great economic hardship. As mentioned before, women in dire financial circumstances often traded sex for survival. Even some of the women who did not resort to prostitution looked to relationships with G.I.s as economically advantageous. America was seen as the land of plenty and opportunity by some Japanese women. War bride Mary Shizuka Bottemley already decided she wanted to go to America before she had even met an American serviceman: “I wanted to go to the U.S. Japan in those days was like a Third World country; food was scarce, and there was really nothing. Since I worked in the PX with Americans for six years, I had seen American goods...I learned that America was such a wealthy country.” Bottemley’s statement does not mention why Japan was “like a Third World country.” The economic deprivations that the Japanese suffered were a direct result of the war. Bottemley desired the wealth of the victorious country because her own country had suffered so badly.

A second “break” in the idealized narrative of Japanese war brides is the blatant racism that these women, and their American partners, faced. This underlying racism meant that interracial relationships were fraught with complications. Although SCAP’s official story about war brides glossed over any racial differences, the majority of both Japanese and American citizens disagreed with mixed-race marriages. In 1947, a survey found that “only 10% of Japanese polled found mixed-race marriages acceptable.” In the United States, a survey conducted in the 1950s, found that “the vast majority of Americans –92 per-

cent in the North and 99 percent in the South –approved of laws banning marriage between whites and nonwhites.” Even worse than the interracial relationships themselves, in the opinions of both countries’ citizens, were the couples’ mixed-race progeny. In Occupied Japan, officials refused to discuss the issue at all. When the Institute of Population Problems of the Japanese Ministry of Welfare suggested counting the number of mixed-race babies “Col. Crawford Sams, the chief of the Public Health and Welfare Section of SCAP, prohibited them from officially gathering statistics because it would be unwise to ‘probe so serious a wound.’” This “wound” is a result of the tension that racism creates around the concept of biracial children. Norma Fields, a mixed-raced child of the occupation, writes, “the biracial offspring of war are at once more offensive and intriguing because they bear the imprint of sex as domination.” The racism implicit in both countries’ attitudes towards these relationships indicates that the racial hatred that was so strongly felt during World War II was far from over. Although many contemporary fictionalized and autobiographical accounts of war brides tend to make light of this racism, it was in fact deeply pervasive. This explains why SCAP preferred to ignore the issue of biracial children, as they did not fit within the official narratives about Occupied Japan.

The third major discrepancy in the narrative of war brides is the proof that not all Japanese women were willing to be docile or subservient to their husbands. Traditional Japanese society was just as patriarchal, and perhaps more so, than American society at the time. During the war, however, young women had been forced to work outside of the domestic sphere in order to support their families whilst the men-folk were away fighting. Once

the war was over, many women refused to submit to their traditional role as dutiful daughter and then obedient wife. The results of the devastation of WWII and the subsequent occupation challenged traditional patriarchy as women, once forced to be independent for economic survival, now refused to give up the agency they had gained. Japanese women's refusal to submit to traditional gender hierarchies was expressed in very blatant ways, such as refusing a traditional arranged marriage, as well as in small ways. War bride Midori Porter recollects how she and her husband first started dating. After going on one date with the Sergeant Porter, she told him she would not consider seeing him again unless he shaved his moustache and stopped smoking cigars since she did not like either of those things about him. Three weeks later, he showed up at her door clean-shaven and having quit cigars. With this small act of resistance, Midori Porter demonstrated that not all Japanese women would accommodate their American partners in every degree.

These "breaks" in the constructed narrative of the war brides change ideas of how these relationships connected with the occupation as a whole. SCAP's official narrative described these relationships as the reproduction of the newly gendered relationship between the United States and Japan. SCAP wanted the image of the American serviceman and his Japanese war bride to endorse its efforts to reconfigure the relationship between the United States and Japan during the occupation. However, the narrative of Japan as the feminized junior ally of the masculine United States reveals its flaw on the intimate level. The war brides were literally the reproduction of this narrative; their experiences with racism and economic exploration reveal the problematic aspects of Occupied Japan. These characteristics of

the occupation were integral to what Dower argues “was the last immodest exercise in the colonial conceit known as the ‘white man’s burden.’” SCAP was the colonial authority in Japan and it, like colonial governments before it, sought to control the intimate relationships between Western men and colonized women. It asserted this control by producing a narrative about the relationships that developed between Japanese women and American servicemen that reinforced as well as reproduced, the new relationship between the United States and Japan that the occupation of Japan created.



An example of Bill Hume's cartoon "Babysan." (From: Bill Hume and John Annarino. *Babysan: A Private Look at the Japanese Occupation* (Columbia, MO: American Press, 1953), 19.)

WORKS CITED

- A Pocket Guide to Japan* Washington, D.C.: Armed Forces Information and Education Division, Office of the Secretary of Defense, 1950.
- Bronfenbrenner, Martin. *Fusako and the Army: An Episode of Occupation*. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1952.
- Busch, Noel F. "A Report on Japan " *LIFE*, 3 Dec, 1946, 105-27.
- Crawford, Miki Ward, Katie Kaori Hayashi, and Shizuko Suenaga. *Japanese War Brides in America: An Oral History*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Praeger, 2010.
- Dower, John. "The Bombed." In *America's Wars in Asia: A Cultural Approach to History and Memory*, edited by Philip West, Steven I. Levine and Jackie Hiltz. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1998.
- Dower, John W. *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1999.
- . *War without Mercy: Race & Power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1986.
- Field, Norma. *In the Realm of a Dying Emperor*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.
- Hume, Bill, and John Annarino. *Babysan: A Private Look at the Japanese Occupation*. Columbia, MO: American Press, 1953.

- Japanese Phrase Book: Designed Especially for Use of Allied Occupation Forces* Information and Education Section, GHA, AFPAC, 1950.
- Kim, Jodi. *Ends of Empire: Asian American Critique and the Cold War*, Critical American Studies Series. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- Koshiro, Yukiko. *Trans-Pacific Racisms and the U.S. Occupation of Japan*, Studies of the East Asian Institute. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Lark, Regina F. "They Challenged Two Nations: Marriages between Japanese Women and American GIs, 1945 to the Present." University of Southern California, 1999.
- Marchetti, Gina. *Romance and The "Yellow Peril:" Race, Sex, and Discursive Strategies in Hollywood Fiction*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2008.
- McClain, James L. *Japan: A Modern History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002.
- Michener, James A. *Sayonara*. New York: Random House, 1953.
- O'Reilly, Hugh F. "Our East-West Marriage Is Working." *The American Mercury*, 1955.

- Shibusawa, Naoko. *America's Geisha Ally: Reimagining the Japanese Enemy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. "Intimidations of Empire: Predicaments of the Tactile and Unseen." In *Haunted by Empire: Geographical Intimacy in North American History*, edited by Ann Laura Stoler, 1-22. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Stoler, Ann Laura, and Carole McGranahan. "Introduction: Re-figuring Imperial Terrains." In *Imperial Formations* edited by Ann Laura Stoler, Carole McGranahan and Peter Perdue. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press, 2007.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.

Acknowledgements

The Editorial Board owes special thanks to...

Haverford College's student body, whose essays always make for some quality reading.

Ryan, Neilay, Micah, and **Lizzie** for letting us publish their papers and for eagerly working with us on the revision process.

James Weissinger, Muse of Scholarly Journals, who was always there to offer sage advice and guidance when we needed it.

Amy Abolafia for helping with the printing and production process.

Haverford's faculty and librarians, whose support makes student research possible.

The John B. Hurford '60 Center for the Arts and Humanities for providing us with the resources necessary to produce this publication.