

UC Berkeley

Working Words: New Approaches to Japanese Studies

Title

記憶 / Kioku / 思い出 / Omoide / Memory

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9535h2sn>

Author

Tamanoi, Mariko Asano

Publication Date

2012-04-20

## 記憶 / **Kioku** / 思い出 / **Omoide** / **Memory**

Mariko Asano Tamanoi

“Wanted: Your memories of (what happened on) August 5<sup>th</sup>” (*hachigatsu itsuka no kioku motomu*). Some time in early September of 2004, while walking near the train station in suburban Tokyo, I caught this phrase, written on a poster pasted to a glass window of a small police box (*kōban*). Apparently, a mother and her daughter were gruesomely murdered on August 5<sup>th</sup>, yet the suspect had not been apprehended: hence, the reason that local police officers were still in search of witnesses who could provide their *kioku*—memories—to them. Imagine that a witness responds to this poster and visits the police station to be interviewed. His or her narratives will appear most probably fragmentary. Nevertheless, the one who hears this witness, a police officer, and eventually a prosecutor or a lawyer, will record his or her memories in quite a different language from the one that the witness used—definitive and causal statements that have claim for truth. *Kioku*, then, are more likely the fragments of the witness’s memory in this case, the reason why the term generates such combined words as *kioku yōryō* (the amount of *kioku* to keep), *kioku sōchi* (the device for keeping *kioku*), or *kioku jutsu* (mnemonics).

*Kioku*, however, represents only one term that suggests “memory.” Another is *omoide*, which usually presents a seamless narrative of the person who remembers in an open-ended manner. *Omoide* belongs to this person even though he or she can share it with his or her audience. Yet, both *kioku-suru* (a verb form of *kioku*) and *omoidasu* (a verb form of *omoide*) signify “to remember.” English too has terms other than

“remembering” that mean more or less the same, such as “recollecting,” “recalling,” “reminiscing,” “memorizing,” “memorializing,” “reminding,” or “retrieving.” Andrew Lass thus argues the following, relying on the distinction made between “recollection” (*Erinnerung*) and “remembrance” (*Gedächtnis*) by Hegel.

Recollection is a personalized act that involves the presence of the past. Yet the recollected may be “placed in memory” only as a meaningless string of names, faceless and available to all to call upon and repeat as fact, like a poem that we “know by heart” but which need not mean anything at all in order that it may be remembered. In the act of committing violence upon recollection, memory rescues the thought from the self.<sup>1</sup>

Lass, however, writes between English and German, the language that has also many words for “remembering” and “memory,” while I write between English, Japanese, and German (via Hegel and Lass). Furthermore, the meanings of *Erinnerung* and *Gedächtnis* seem to have been still debated among the philosophers of Hegel.<sup>2</sup> I will later return to the above quote, but note, very briefly here, that one cannot make clear distinctions between *Erinnerung* and *Gedächtnis*, between recollection and remembrance, or between *omoide* and *kioku*. Rather, the meanings of and the relationship between the two seem to shift depending on the specific spatio-temporal context in which one recalls or remembers.

That said, the purpose of this essay is to think *kioku*, *omoide*, and the relationship between them while discussing the memory of the Japanese, who tried to remember “the sexual violence committed by Japan’s enemies on Japanese women” in the aftermath of Japan’s defeat in Northeast China (Manchuria). Since Japan created the puppet-state of

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrew Lass, “From Memory to History: The Events of November 17 Dis/membered,” in *Memory, History, and Opposition under State Socialism*, ed. Rubie S. Watson (Santa Fe, NM, 1994), 92.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Inwood, Michael, *A Hegel Dictionary* (Oxford, UK, 1992).

Manchukuo in 1932 and the Soviet Union invaded shortly before Japan's capitulation, "Japan's enemies" were the local people of Manchukuo, mostly Han Chinese and the Korean, and the Soviet (Russian) soldiers. Nonetheless, "the enemy" whom the Japanese remembered in the postwar era is only one group—the Russian men. Thus, describing the sexual violence committed against Japanese women by Russian soldiers in the Soviet occupied areas—Northeast China included—Wakatsuki Yoshio writes:

What word can possibly describe the violence committed by the Soviet soldiers on Japanese women? I can only think of the word "hideous" (*susamajii*). The victim could be a girl of twelve or thirteen years old or an old lady of almost seventy years old. These soldiers did not choose the sites where they raped them, in public, in broad daylight, even on snow-covered roads.<sup>3</sup>

While it is hard to get a sense of the numbers of Japanese women assaulted by Russian soldiers, Lori Watt, citing the fictionalized account of Takeda Shigetarō, estimates the number at "30,000 to 40,000." What Watt emphasizes, however, is not this number; rather, it is the "lurid interests" of the Japanese who were themselves not victims but somehow remembered the victims.<sup>4</sup> Wakatsuki, for example, was a young soldier who returned from the southern part of China not occupied by the Soviets, yet remembered "the Japanese girls and young women who were raped by hairy men, whose weight was more than three times theirs," described in the almost pornographic accounts published by Hiramoto Naoyuki.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Wakatsuki Yoshio, *Sengo hikiage no kiroku* [The records of postwar repatriation] (Tokyo, Japan, 1995), 125.

<sup>4</sup> Lori Watt, *When Empire Comes Home: Repatriation and Reintegration in Postwar Japan* (Cambridge, MA, 2009), 111, 113.

<sup>5</sup> Wakatsuki Yoshio, *Sengo hikiage no kiroku*, 126. Hiramoto's accounts were published in yet another book *Saredo, waga Manshū* [Yet, Manchuria was ours] published by Bungei Shunjū in Tokyo in 1984, in which he claimed that, during the hospital stay in Xinjing for about a week, he daily witnessed about ten raped Japanese women transported to the hospital.

What happened to the *kioku* and *omoide* of the Japanese who tried to recall the sexual assaults of Japanese women in the vanquished empire of Japan? What shall we call their memories: *kioku* or *omoide*? What happened to the memories of the victims themselves? What was involved on the way from memory to history, that is, the dominant discourse in postwar Japan of the end of empire? And finally, how shall we understand the difference, if any, between *kioku* and *omoide* and the relationship between the two? I therefore present this essay in light of the increasing interest, particularly among historians and anthropologists, in “the history of the present.” The latter has emerged in the context of (post-)colonial studies, in which scholars explore the legacies of past colonial relations of power, embedded in architecture, memorials, archives, as well as practices and memories of ordinary people. Ann Stoler and Karen Strassler, however, have pointed out, “what remains surprisingly absent from ethnographic histories written ‘from the bottom up’ and elite histories viewed upside down is an explicit engagement with the nature of colonial memories—not only with what is remembered and why, but with how the specifically ‘colonial’ is situated in popular memory at all.”<sup>6</sup> This essay is a small contribution to this question.

\*\*\*\*\*

With space being limited, I must begin this section with the end of the Japanese Empire, for those who remembered for us in the following section were the Japanese civilians who had immigrated to Manchuria in the age of empire, and were forced to repatriate themselves to Japan after Japan’s capitulation in August 1945.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Ann Stoler and Karen Strassler, “Castings for the Colonial: Memory Work in New Order’ Java,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42 (2000), 4.

<sup>7</sup> For the history of Japan’s empire making in Northeast China, see, for example, Louise Young, *Japan’s Total Empire: Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism* (Berkeley, CA, 1998), Yoshihisa Tak

By 1943, Japan's defeat by the Allied Forces in both the Pacific and Asia became imminent. The Japanese settlers in Manchuria, however, were ill informed about the war. For them, the end of empire came abruptly, with the Soviet invasion of Manchuria on August 9<sup>th</sup>, 1945 and Japan's capitulation six days after that. As the citizens of a defeated country, they lost the Japanese state's protection overnight. The death toll among civilians (among whom were a large number of agrarian colonists) was particularly high, in comparison to the ones in other areas of Japan's vanquished empire: approximately 179,000 civilians perished over a period of a year between the summer of 1945 and the spring of 1946. Why were so many Japanese civilians in Manchuria killed *after* Japan's capitulation?

Toward the end of the war against the US, the mobilization of able-bodied Japanese men (from age 18 to 45) in both Japan proper and its overseas territories became a "bottom-scraping" (*nekosogi*) operation. This radically altered the composition of the Japanese population in Manchuria: those who were left behind were largely women, children and the elderly in its cities and villages. When the Soviets invaded Manchuria, these unprotected civilians were quickly abandoned by fleeing Japanese forces, becoming easy targets for enemy attacks, which explains the purportedly high numbers of women raped by Soviet soldiers. In addition, local peasants, many of whom had earlier been displaced by the Japanese agrarian settlers, turned their rage against the remaining settlers. The civil war between Communist and Nationalist forces in China, both of which tried to mobilize Japanese civilians for their own military operations,

---

Matusaka, *The Making of Japanese Manchuria, 1904-1932* (Cambridge, MA, 2001), Prasenjit Duara, *Sovereignty and Authenticity: Manchukuo and the East Asia Modern* (Lanham, MD, 2003), and Mariko Asano Tamanoi, "Introduction" in *Crossed Histories: Japan in the Age of Empire*, (Honolulu, Hawaii, 2005), 1-24. I only note here that, after the Manchurian Incident, Japan established its puppet state of Manchukuo in Northeast China in 1932, which had a short life of only thirteen years.

created more confusion among the Japanese. As the civil war intensified, severe winters and unhygienic conditions caused malnutrition and diseases, from which many more Japanese died.<sup>8</sup> Most of the civilian victims were thus women, children and the elderly, and about half of them were the family members of agrarian colonists.

Let us move from Manchuria to one of the ports of entry to Japan located in Hakata on the Island of Kyūshū, where the surviving settlers landed between 1946 and 1949. The official history of Japanese returnees from Japan's vanquished empire does not single out women as a group. Rather, this history, published by the Japanese Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, treats all the Japanese repatriates as *dōhō* (our compatriots). Nevertheless, there is one section in these government publications where the authors specifically separate women from men: at the ports of entry to Japan, women older than fifteen years of age were encouraged to receive medical exams.<sup>9</sup> Although the official history stops here, the state's notice published in the Western Japan Newspaper (Nishi Nippon Shinbun) on July 17<sup>th</sup>, 1946 reveals the nature of these medical exams specifically designed for women. This notice encourages those women, who suspect themselves to be pregnant and/or infected with sexually transmitted diseases, to report to the nearby clinics of the entry ports. The notice also portrays them as the fragile victims of empire who survived Japan's defeat by giving up their bodies to Japan's enemies, but who could not dare to confess their "secrets" to their parents and husbands.<sup>10</sup> The

---

<sup>8</sup> I must alert the reader to the fact that, being aware of the imminent defeat of Japan, many among the high-ranking officers of the Japanese government and military chose to return home before Japan's capitulation. For them and their families, the Japanese military provided exclusive transportation services. The demilitarized soldiers, who were better protected by international treaties, were therefore far more likely to return to Japan safely than civilians.

<sup>9</sup> See Japanese Ministry of Welfare, Labor and Health, *Hikiage to engo sanjū-nen no ayumi* [The thirty year history of repatriation and the state's assistance extended to the repatriates], (Tokyo, Japan, 1978), 134.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted in Kamitsubo Takashi, *Mizuko no fu: hikiage koji to okasareta onnatachi no kiroku* [Epitaph for the aborted fetuses: The records of repatriated orphans and rape victims] (Tokyo, Japan, 1979), 181-83.

Japanese state called the pregnancy of these women “unlawful pregnancy” (*fuhō ninshin*): the mixed-race children of such unlawful pregnancy, if born, would harm the national (and therefore lawful) integrity of the nation that had just lost its empire. These women therefore underwent painful abortions without anesthesia.<sup>11</sup> How did these women remember their experiences of rape? How did they live the rest of their lives in Japan? Did they try to forget the experiences or keep silent? Or with the passing of time, did they try to remember them? With these questions in mind, I searched for the memoirs written by the Japanese women who once lived in Manchuria and met the fateful crimes committed by Russian soldiers. This search, however, was in vain for reasons I will discuss in the next section.

\*\*\*\*\*

To my knowledge, none of the victims of rape committed by the Soviet soldiers in Manchuria has ever written an autobiography. The only rape victim who penned a memoir is a woman who was raped by her compatriot, a Japanese man.<sup>12</sup> The victims of rape, however, routinely appear in the memoirs written by both female and male former settlers, who claim that the Soviet soldiers raped thousands of Japanese women. Among such authors, one who came close to actually witnessing incidents of rape is Gotō Kurando. According to his memoir, these incidents took place in the agrarian settlement of Sihetun (Shigōton in Japanese) on September 8<sup>th</sup>, 1945, when a group of Russian

---

<sup>11</sup> Kamitsubo, *Mizuko ho fu*, 167-209. See also Jin’no Morimasa, “*Manshū*” *ni okurareta onna-tachi: tairiku no hanayome* [The women who were sent to Manchuria: The continental brides] (Kyoto, Japan, 1992), 188-91. Kamitsubo estimates the number of such “unlawful pregnancy” at the Futsukaichi Clinic, which was located near the Port of Hakata, at more than 500 in the immediate wartime period.

<sup>12</sup> Kuriwaki Tatsu, “Naichi e kaetta mono” [Those who returned to Japan proper], in *Manshū sayonara*, ed. Hikiage Taikenshū Henshū Iinkai (Tokyo, Japan, 1981), 640-655. I learned the existence of this autobiography thanks to Furukubo Sakura. See “*Manshū ni okeru Nihonjin josei no keiken: Giseisha-sei no Kōchiku*” [Japanese women’s experiences in Manchuria: The Construction of “victimhood”]. *Josei Shigaku* (1999) 9:1-14.



soldiers came to confiscate the weapons that Japanese settlers still possessed. For this purpose, each pair of Soviet soldiers made a team and began inspecting settlers' houses. By then, almost all the settlers had already vacated their houses and gathered in an open field, quietly watching Soviet soldiers stealing weapons as well as other valuable household items. Two housewives, however, were late in coming out of their houses and were trapped inside during this inspection. It is these women who were allegedly raped by Soviet soldiers. In his autobiography, while Gotō did not witness any crime scene, he tries to protect the honor and dignity of the victims by suggesting that the assailants “failed” to rape these women. One of the husbands, he writes, tried to kill the soldier (who allegedly attempted to rape his wife); Gotō’s job was to prevent him from doing so in order to save everyone else in the colony. He writes:

I told him, “I know you are eager to kill him, but this time only, please be patient. If you are to go into the house and kill him, you may feel better, but what will happen to your wife and us? If you kill him, his army would kill us all. So, please, please, do not move from here.” I bowed to him again and again but felt really sick inside myself, knowing nothing else to tell him.<sup>13</sup>

In this passage, the victims of rape have no voice.

However, Gotō later offers the voice of one of them, whom I call Mrs. A, whose husband was absent at the time of the above incident as he had already been mobilized by the military. Mrs. A later confided her “secret” to Gotō’s wife at a refugee camp for the Japanese in Fushun. Gotō apparently overheard this dialogue between these two women, and recorded it in his memoir.

---

<sup>13</sup> Gotō Kurando, *Manshū: Shura no mure* [Manchuria: The horde of the dead] (Tokyo, Japan, 1973), 106.

Mrs. A: “I am so afraid of returning home.”

Gotō’s wife: “Why?”

Mrs. A: “Well, you know what happened....”

Wife: “Well, what was that?”

Mrs. A: “Something that happened in our settlement of Shigōton, don’t you remember? Soviet soldiers came and .... When I think of what happened to me then, I can’t go on with my life. Even if I can manage to return home [to Japan], I dreadfully fear facing my husband again.”

Wife: “I truly understand you, but you kept you honor, didn’t you?”

Mrs. A: “Yes, I managed to....”

At this moment, Gotō himself intervened in their conversation. He records his voice saying the following:

Gotō: “Mrs. A, you could not help it. No one could help it. It was a battlefield. What happened to you is just the same as what happened to any soldier in the battlefield: a wound he would sustain the rest of his life. I am sure your husband will understand you.”<sup>14</sup>

Here, Gotō and his wife seem to be aware that rape actually took place but both pretend that nothing *serious* happened. Yet, this question of whether rape did take place or not does not matter eventually, as Gotō writes that Mrs. A died a few months later, a casualty of the epidemic disease. Thus, the victims who were allegedly raped by Japan’s enemies have lost their voices. To retain their honor, the victims not only lied—as Mrs. A apparently did—but also died, physically and/or metaphorically. Gotō took his mission—to make sure that rape victims disappear—seriously.

---

<sup>14</sup> Gotō, 227-28.

Gotō's autobiography belongs to a large literary genre called *hikiage-mono* (repatriate memoirs). The peak of the publication of this popular genre of books was from the late 1960s to the late 1980s, during which time the dominant discourse surrounding "the repatriates" (*hikiage-sha*) was: the repatriates were the victims of the end of the Japanese Empire, and due precisely to their enormous suffering after Japan's defeat, they contributed greatly to the peace and prosperity of postwar Japan.<sup>15</sup> Gotō, however, is among the minority of authors who remembers, in addition to the fact of being victimized (his daughter died of epidemic disease in Manchuria), the fact of being the victimizer of the Chinese and the Koreans. Elsewhere in the same autobiography, he thus writes:

As far as I know, not a single Chinese or Korean man attacked a Japanese woman, despite the fact that these women were all walking around wearing only underwear [to protect them from Russian thieves]. I find this a miracle: not even a single local man attacked them. At the same time, I feel so ashamed of myself remembering local farmers only in this manner. Both the Japanese [who raped Chinese women] and the Russians [who raped Japanese women] are far inferior to these Chinese and Korean men.<sup>16</sup>

Gotō's autobiography contains the already fragmented "facts" and "phrases," which, as we shall see below, have become available to others to repeat in their own accounts and which have contributed and/or resisted to the formation of dominant discourse about the repatriates in postwar Japan. Yet, the alleged victims have eventually become faceless as they disappeared in his autobiography: Mrs. A died of disease, while another victim was never been mentioned again.

---

<sup>15</sup> See Orr, James J. *The Victim as Hero: Ideologies of Peace and National Identity in Postwar Japan* (Honolulu, Hawaii, 2001).

<sup>16</sup> Gotō, 127-128.

Hegel's idea of *Gedächtnis* is insightful here. According to Michael Inwood the term means three things: (1) the whole stock of experiences, etc., that can be recalled, but need not be recalled at the moment; (2) the ability to retrieve or recall knowledge and past experiences, and to recognize them as encountered before; and (3) the ability to remember or memorize things, in the sense of adding them to one's stock of memories, i.e. to one's *Gedächtnis* in the sense of (1).<sup>17</sup> For the time being, I will not discuss this concept, but proceed to see how the whole stock of experiences has been shared among the authors of repatriate memoirs.

Interestingly, the female authors of repatriate memoirs try to stress how they used their own resourcefulness to avoid Russian soldiers. At a refugee camp for the Japanese, Takayama Sumiko heard the stories of many Japanese women who had been attacked, raped and killed by Russian soldiers. According to Takayama, Russian soldiers destroyed the entrance door to the refugee camp in search of young women almost every night. Indeed, she heard on almost every night the screams of young women who were allegedly raped by Soviet soldiers. To guard herself, Takayama hid herself in the attic every night after dark. Since she took a large bucket with her (to urinate into) to the attic, she could pass many nights there without going downstairs. One day, when a group of women made such a commotion at the sight of Russian soldiers, one of these soldiers fired a gun to the ceiling, a bullet nearly striking Takayama as it passed through her hair and scalp. Although half of her hair fell off, she escaped being raped.<sup>18</sup>

Yasui Tomoko built a barricade at the entrance of her house in Xinjing (Changchun). Still, "a huge Soviet soldier" passed through the barricade and chased her

---

<sup>17</sup> Inwood, *A Hegel Dictionary*, 187-188.

<sup>18</sup> Takayama, Sumiko, *Nono-san ni narundayo* [You will become Buddha] (Nagano, Japan, 1987), 154-55.

upstairs. Using her ingenuity, she invited him into the room while remaining outside, and immediately locked the room. She then ran to her neighbor's house and stayed there for several days. Fortunately, she did not see this soldier again.<sup>19</sup> Yasui also remembers a friend who, like her, was able to escape an attack by a Soviet soldier. This incident occurred on a crowded train when a “drunken Soviet soldier” attempted to take her out. But this woman remembered a wristwatch she had kept in her bag. She offered it to this soldier and escaped being raped.<sup>20</sup> We must remember that, after Japan's defeat, the Japanese women who were harassed and attacked by Russian soldiers could not ask for help from Japanese soldiers. Thus, they had no other recourse than using their own imaginations to survive. And only those women who succeeded in doing so seem to have penned their memoirs.

Interestingly, one source of the resources that these “lucky” women counted on was the so-called “professional women,” the Japanese women who professionally sold their bodies to others. For example, Yamamoto Kiyoko writes:

Since [we heard that] Russian soldiers would attack and rape us, all of us women shaved our heads and wore men's work clothes. Even so, we heard, they would rape us. Hence those who were willing to sacrifice their bodies for us, such as former *geisha* or women who used to work at bars, ended up going with Soviet soldiers. Behind their backs, we clasped our hands in prayer and called them *tokkōtai* (*kamikaze*, or suicide pilots).<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Yasui Tomoko, *Hitosuji ni hoshi wa nagarete: Manshū hikiage no haha no shuki* [A flowing star: A mother's records of the journey of repatriation] (Tokyo, Japan, 1972), 103.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 106.

<sup>21</sup> Yamamoto Kiyoko, “Nihonjin no kouri” [The Japanese who sold their children], in *Manshū sayonara*, ed. Hikiage Taiken-shū Henshū Iinkai (Tokyo, Japan, 1981), 550.

Like young *kamikaze* pilots who sacrificed their lives for the sake of Japan, these women sacrificed their bodies solely because they were “professionals.” Yet, not even one such “professional” woman wrote her memoir.

One exceptional case, however, is Kuriwaki Tatsu, who lived in Xinjing as a single woman at the time of Soviet invasion. After the war’s end, she left the city, joined the Japanese refugees, and fled to Yizhou, where she lived in a school dormitory with hundreds of other Japanese. Here she was raped, not by the Russian or the Chinese but by the Japanese head of the refugee camp.

One day, I went to an outdoor toilet as usual. Someone was following me, but it was pitch dark. I then realized that it was the head of the dormitory, Mr. Hirayama. He grabbed my right arm and took me to a remote place. My protests were in vain. I knew I had to follow him [as our leader], but I had never dreamt of following him in this particular manner. I was locked in a small room afterward. I was nothing but a doll for this man’s sexual desire. Since he brought me food every day, I did not have to work. But when I thought of my sister and her two children [who were with her in the same dormitory], I did not know what to do.<sup>22</sup>

While Kuriwaki became the victim of a Japanese man, her sister was brutally attacked and raped by a Russian soldier. In this case, according to Kuriwaki, the rapist’s superior sent her sister to a hospital, where she received proper treatment. Nonetheless, she died in June 1946. Her children died of malnutrition soon after their mother’s death.<sup>23</sup> Thus, in Kuriwaki’s remembrance too, the one raped by Japan’s enemy—her sister—disappears. Kuriwaki herself tried to flee from Hirayama several times, first in Manchuria and then back in Japan, but in vain. Eventually she agreed to marry him, gave birth to four children, and led a life surrounded by offspring who “were all born out of a loveless

---

<sup>22</sup> Kuriwaki, 645-646.

<sup>23</sup> Kuriwaki, 646-647.

marriage.”<sup>24</sup> In the end, however, Kuriwaki survived while her sister vanished, and penned her memoir.

\*\*\*\*\*

Here let me turn to *kioku* and *omoide*. In presenting the autobiographies of Gotō, Takayama, Yasui, Yamamoto, and Kuriwaki, I must remind the reader that I had no access to these authors’ oral narratives. I did interview Takayama in 1991 in Nagano where she lived then, yet by the time of my interview, she had been on the national lecture circuit, speaking of her experiences of escape from Manchuria to a variety of audiences. In addition, she had already published the memoir that I have cited in this essay. For these reasons, I found her oral narratives somewhat “framed,” the frame I had already seen repeatedly in reading hundreds of repatriate memoirs.

Note that all the authors of repatriate memoirs share two memories as “facts,” which became available to them as they must have shared their memories while they were at refugee camps in Manchuria and, after repatriation, by reading each other’s memoirs. I would like to call these memories *kioku*, by which I refer, borrowing some words from Lass, to a string of faceless names, phrases, statements that have become available to all, including the repatriate authors and their readers (or the Japanese public), to call upon when necessary. They are:

- 1) A large number of Japanese women were raped by the Russian soldiers in Manchuria;
- 2) These women victims disappeared in postwar Japan because they were murdered, died of illness or were professional prostitutes.

---

<sup>24</sup> Kuriwaki, 654

In repatriate memoirs, the Russians are the ultimate victimizers of the Japanese. They were “big,” “hairy,” “drunken,” “stupid,” and were mostly former convicts released and recruited by the Soviet military. This is also because, in postwar Japan, about 575,000 former soldiers arrested by the Soviets as POWs and war criminals, of whom about 55,000 perished due to gruesome working condition at labor camps, have also nurtured the memory of Russians as the victimizers.<sup>25</sup> Even today, negative images of them are mobilized in the media when, for example, the Japanese government deals with the Russian government over the ownership of the so-called “northern territories.”

Note, however, that after Japan’s capitulation, Chinese men in Manchuria, who could not afford to marry Chinese women, “bought” Japanese women as their wives. However, postwar Japan does not remember these Chinese men as “rapists” but as “saviors,” even though Japanese women were forced to marry them to survive. This, then, makes us wonder what differentiates “rape” from the sexual intercourse sanctioned by a marriage that is forced upon a Japanese refugee. Although Yasui does mention a case of rape of a Japanese woman by a Chinese man that she apparently overheard, she treats it as a single, rare case, incomparable to the numerous cases of rapes committed by the Russians that she remembers.<sup>26</sup>

Why did the authors of repatriate memoirs create the fiction (or fictionalized *kioku*) that the rape victims disappeared in postwar Japan? I have two answers to this question, the first being provided by Kuriwaki’s memoir. Here, I think of the work by Lydia Liu, “The Female Body and Nationalist Discourse,” which examines the counterpart of Kuriwaki—a Chinese woman raped by a Chinese man in the 1930s in

---

<sup>25</sup> Japanese Ministry of Welfare, Labor and Health, *Engo gojū-nen shi* [The fifty year history of the state’s assistance extended to the repatriates], (Tokyo, Japan, 1997), 257.

<sup>26</sup> Yasui, *Hitosuji ni hoshi wa nagarete*, 187.



Manchuria. She appears in *Field of Life and Death*, a novel written by a woman, Xiao Hong (1911-1942). Hong grew up in Manchuria and lived and worked “in a time of national crisis.” After the publication of the novel in 1935, the acclaim and criticism it received were dominated by a nationalist discourse.<sup>27</sup> Male Chinese critics read the book as a national allegory and expected the raped woman to serve “as a powerful trope in anti-Japanese propaganda.”<sup>28</sup> Yet according to Liu, Xiao Hong was also of the opinion that the Chinese woman “was condemned to permanent exile by the stigma of her gender,” as she was expected to give up her natal home and enter her husband’s home.<sup>29</sup> In other words, while men could enhance their manhood through participation in the anti-Japanese movement, women had to fight on two fronts: against Japanese imperialists as well as against Chinese men.<sup>30</sup> In *Field of Life and Death*, the female figures—poor peasant women—were excluded from the community of Chinese nationalists under Japanese domination because, owing to their class and gender, they were unable to fight against the Japanese soldiers alongside Chinese men. One such woman, called Golden Bough in the novel, decided to go to Harbin after the death of her brutal husband to earn money as a seamstress. There she was raped; the rape, it turns out, was “committed by a Chinese man rather than by a Japanese soldier.”<sup>31</sup> For such writing, Xiao Hong was bitterly criticized for a lack of nationalism against the Japanese. Meanwhile, the national community of sufferers that the Japanese repatriate memoirs purported to create includes a Japanese woman raped by a Japanese man while excluding a Japanese woman raped by

---

<sup>27</sup> Liu, Lydia “The Female Body and National Discourse: Manchuria in Xiao Hong’s *Field of Life and Death*,” in *Body, Subject, and Power in China*, ed. by Angela Zito and Tani E. Barlow (Chicago, IL, 1994), 158.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 171.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 162.

a Russian man. The logic of this inclusion and exclusion is parallel to the logic that the male Chinese critics used against Xiao Hong: a Chinese woman raped by a Chinese man should be excluded from the community of nationalists while a Chinese woman raped by a Japanese man should be included into the same community. The repatriate authors and their readers have thus carefully selected *kioku* for the goal of creating a national community of the victimized.

Another answer could be this: the passage to recollection has been closed to the women who were raped by Japan's enemies *and* had to face their compatriots at home. In other words, the victims are not able to relive their experiences, nor are they able to refuse to relive them. Here, the following passage by Hanna Arendt, who questioned the authenticity of recollection of Holocaust survivors, is extremely insightful.

But recollection can no more do this than can the uncommunicative eyewitness report. In both these genres there is an inherent tendency to run away from the experience; instinctively and rationally, both types of writer are so much aware of the terrible abyss that separates the world of the living from that of the dead, that they cannot supply anything more than a series of remembered occurrences that must seem just as incredible to those who related them as to their audience.<sup>32</sup>

Certain experiences, such as rape by enemy soldiers, evade human understanding and human experience. Hence they lead the victims to become “uncomplaining animals,” while others, who were never raped by the Russians, have remembered for the victims. However, since the victims cannot supply “more than a series of remembered occurrences,” the others—the authors of repatriate memoir in this case—have remembered the victims from other sources, rumors, hearsays, imaginations, and other repatriates’ memoirs.

---

<sup>32</sup> Arendt, Hannah, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (San Diego, CA, 1973), 441.

*Erinnerung*, according to Inwood, refers to “the internalization of a sensory intuition as an image,” yet the image is “abstracted from the concrete spatio-temporal position of the intuition, and given a place in the intelligence (which has its own subjective space and time).”<sup>33</sup> Hence, as Lass has argued, one may potentially “commit violence upon recollection,” the process that generates many pieces of *kioku*. It is thus *Gedächtnis* that liberates one from intuition and image. The victims of rape, then, cannot possibly be liberated from *Erinnerung*, precisely because they cannot recall without reliving their experience: they keep internalizing the past without ever being liberated from it. In contrast, the authors of repatriate memoirs, who wrote about the victimization of Japanese women by the Soviet soldiers, can freely use the stock of memories already liberated from the spatio-temporal position of Manchuria after Japan’s defeat. Indeed, they penned their memoirs from a totally different spatio-temporal position: postwar Japan in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, which regarded them as victims. This spatio-temporal position, however, regarded the rape victims as victims only if they had already disappeared physically.

Does this mean that only the victims of rape by Japan’s enemies had and have (if they are still alive) *Erinnerung*, and if so is it possible to translate this term to *omoide*? I hesitate to say “yes” to this question because the meaning of *omoide* seems to have changed over time in postwar Japan. It may have been synonymous with *Erinnerung* in the past, in the sense of lived memory, but today we seem to call some memories *omoide* that have little to do with the process of internalization of the past. A good example is the genre of memoirs written by the children or even grandchildren of the Japanese settlers in Manchuria. Even though many of them were born after the fall of empire, they call

---

<sup>33</sup> Inwood, *A Hegel Dictionary*, 188.

Manchuria their “second home,” and present their memories as their *omoide*. Note, however, that they recall Manchuria *during the time when it was under Japan’s occupation*. Hence, they do not have to remember the Japanese women who were raped by the Soviet soldiers; instead they remember “the exotic women,” such as the Chinese, Russian and Jewish women who inhabited Manchuria before Japan’s defeat. The hairy Russian soldiers are gone from their memoirs. *Omoide* in this sense means the memories of nostalgia that have been entirely liberated from the dark past of suffering and victimization. It has completely lost its connection to *Errinerung*.